OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1-2 GEORGE V., 1910-11

VOL. CI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF MARCH TO THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF APRIL, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1911

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 23, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 145) for the relief of Paulina Verena Meyer.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 151) to incorporate The Canadian Surety Company.—Mr. McCraney.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

EMPLOYMENT OF LATE MR. HECTOR FABRE.

*Mr. MONK:

1. On what date was the late Hector Fabre named commissioner of Canada in France?
2. What salary was paid to him during his occupancy of the office?
3. How many years did he act as commissioner for the Dominion government?
4. Is it the intention of the government to make some provision for the widow of the late Commissioner Fabre?
5. Will an item to this effect be placed in this year's estimates?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Fabre was appointed to his office in France about 1882.

2. At the time of his death he was paid in salary and other expenses by the Dominion government $6,500 a year, and I believe that he also received $2,000 from the Quebec government.

3. He acted from about 1882 until September, 1910.

4 and 5. It is the intention to give to Madame Fabre his widow the best treatment under the law.

CUSTOMS ENTRY STEAMSHIP 'WANDA.'

*Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Was the ship 'Wanda' offered for entry at Brockville or at any other Canadian port before the 18th day of August, 1909?
2. Was there any notice, verbal or written, from any Canadian customs port relative to the ship 'Wanda' prior to the 18th day of August, 1909? If so, what was the effect of such notice?
3. Was the Minister of Customs consulted or interviewed by Mr. Calvert, ex-Liberal whip, or any member of the government or any officials, about the appraisement of the ship 'Wanda' or the passing of the entry thereof, before or after the receipt of Mr. Calvert's letter suggesting the valuation of the said ship should be only $1,000 or so?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The Department of Customs is not aware of any offer of entry for duty of the steamer 'Wanda,' except the entry upon which duty was paid at Brockville, September 9, 1909.
2. There was no notice from any customs port to the Department of Customs prior to August 18, 1909, relative to the entry for duty of the steamer 'Wanda.'
3. No.

PARCEL POST RATES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Does the government intend to make a reduction in parcel post rates, or establish a new parcel post system? If so, what is the nature and extent of same?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The matter is now engaging the attention of the Post Office Department.

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES, ETC.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to grant any or all of the following requests? If not, why not:—

1. An increase in salary to meet sharp advance in cost of living. Present schedule provides less remuneration per 1,000 pieces handled than did that of 12 to 15 years ago.
2. An increase in the rent allowance, and the placing of it on the straight percentage basis.
3. Necessary supplies, such as twine, ink, pens, pencils, &c., to be furnished by the department.
4. That postmasters be given greater protection in the purchase of good equipment for offices.
5. That offices be classified, and a system of promotion, optional for a time, be established, with a view to promoting greater efficiency and permanency.
6. Better newspaper labelling, with a view to greater despatch and accuracy.

7. Full recognition of the association by the government, that postmasters may establish a system of relief, and make suggestions from time to time.

8. That a copy of the Postmaster Generals' Report be sent to each accounting office.

9. That where safes are advisable, they be furnished by the department.

10. Throwing the civil service insurance open to postmasters.

11. A more adequate night allowance.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I met this morning a large deputation of the Association of Canadian Postmasters and members of the House of Commons and the various subjects mentioned in this question were discussed. I have decided to submit the case to the officials of the department and will report later on.

EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS.

Mr. BEST:

1. Did the federal government tender a reception to Cardinal Vannutelli in Montreal during his attendance at the Eucharistic Congress in September last?

2. If so, under whose supervision or orders, acting for the government, was it carried out?

3. What members of the federal government attended?

4. How many invitations were issued?

5. What government officials besides the cabinet ministers attended?

6. Did such government officials, including the Speaker of the House of Commons, attend clothed in their official robes of office?

7. How much did it cost the country, under whose authority and out of what item of the Supply Bill or estimates was it pad?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The federal government did not tender a reception to Cardinal Vannutelli during his attendance at the Eucharistic Congress in September last.

THE DECLARATION OF LONDON.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the government received a copy of the Declaration of London from the imperial authorities, and of documents and papers connected with it, and will the government lay the copy and documents and papers upon the table of the House?

2. Has the government taken the provisions of this declaration into consideration?

3. Has the government made any representations in reference to this declaration to the Imperial government? If so, will the government bring down a copy of these representations?

4. If not, does the government propose to make any representations in reference to this matter to the Imperial government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The government has received the Declaration of London and the documents and papers connected with it. The whole correspondence is now laid upon the table of the House, and consists of:

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

1. A blue-book entitled Correspondence and Documents respecting the International Naval Conference, held in London, December, 1908—February, 1909.

2. A white-book entitled Correspondence respecting the Declaration of London.

To make the matter still more complete and intelligible, another document is also laid upon the table of the House, entitled Final Act of the Second Peace Conference held at the Hague in 1907, and conventions and declaration annexed thereto.

2. Yes, the provisions of the Declaration of London have been taken into consideration.

3. The government has made no representations in reference to this declaration to the Imperial government.

4. As the whole subject of the Declaration of London deals exclusively with questions of International law, the government of Canada not being a sovereign power did not think itself justified to make official representations on such matters, but the question may be discussed informally with the Imperial government at the next Imperial conference.

CANADA—WEST INDIES STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What contracts are at present in force for steamship services between Canada and the West Indies, and what are the subsidies paid thereunder?

2. What amount has been paid in steamship subsidies for services between Canada and the West Indies from 1896 to 1910, inclusive?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Canada — Mexico, calling at West Indian ports. Elder Dempster & Co. Subsidy $50,000 per annum.

Canada—Cuba. William Thomson & Co. Subsidy $25,000 per annum.

St. John, Halifax, West Indies, and Georgetown, British Guiana. Pickford & Black. Subsidy $65,700 per annum.

2. From fiscal year ended June 30, 1896 to fiscal year ended March 31, 1910, inclusive—$1,409.526.22.

PAYMENT OF STEEL BOUNTIES.

*Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Before the government commenced to pay bounties to the steel and iron industries, was a valuation of the physical assets of the companies secured?

2. How many government inspectors are employed to check the products on which bounties are paid?

3. What are their names, and the salary paid to each?

4. Has the attention of the government been called to the alleged fact that these companies in receipt of bounties, or some of them, have at any time refused to sell their products to consumers in Canada? If so, what are the particulars?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. No.
2. At present there are only two.
3. Fred. Muggah. $1,400 per annum.
Jas. MacNeill. $1,000 per annum.
4. No. The government has no such information.

CROP STATISTICS, MANITOBA.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. What is the policy or method through which the government obtains the crop statistics in the province of Manitoba?
2. Who are the persons who give the information or report for the constituency of Macdonald, and what are their respective post office addresses?
3. What is the extent of the territory each person reports for?
4. Do they receive any remuneration, if so, how much?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Chiefly from farmers in the various localities of the Province.
2.

Name and Post Office—
Antoine, Ernest J., St. Claude.
Ashby, A. F., St. Adelard.
Baragar, C. J., Elm Creek.
Campbell, A. M., Hanlan.
Champion, W. M., Reaburn.
Clark, Dozer, Treherne.
Clark, Fred., Bonnie Doon.
Clark, James, Carman.
Elford, W. H., Carman.
Gainer, P., Rathwell
Gautron, L. J., Haywood.
Gautron, Alex., St. Claude.
Goldsmit, Geo. S., Rosebank.
Grills, Harry, Sanford.
Hodgson, Jos., Roland.
Jaffray, Wm., Lavenham.
Johnstone, C. W., Headingly.
Kuebler, Fred., Starbuck.
Larking, Thos. L., Mount Royal.
Livingstone, Boyd, Swan Lake.
McDonald, J. C., Altamont.
Medlicott, Wm., Altamont.
Norwood, G. G., Rosebank.
Polson, W. B. S., Lake Francis Station.
Parkinson, Jos. L., Roland.
Pierre, Paul, Notre-Dame de Lourdes.
Pollon, John, Treherne.
Shepherd, Arthur G., Rathwell.
Sims, S. G., Argyle.
Vingnier, J. B., Rathwell.
Weir, Wm. M., Rosebank.
Whitfield, M., Roland.
Lawrence, Lyle, Mount Royal.

3. One or more townships or other localities in which he resides.
4. No.

VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM BUILDING.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. Is it true as reported in one of the Ottawa papers, that the large crack that appeared some time ago in one of the walls of the new Victoria Museum has developed?
2. Is it true that such defect is pulling the floor on the fourth story some inches from the wall?
3. What is the cost to date of that structure?
4. Has the building been assumed by the government yet, and who is the contractor?
5. Is the contractor the same one who did the work and constructed the Laurier tower that fell down some years ago?
6. What action does the government purpose to take in respect to this matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1, 2, and 6. Mr. Ewart, the Chief Architect, informs me that the tower of the building has settled somewhat, causing a crack in the wall, and there is a slight separation between the wall and the floor. He says that these defects are easily remedied and unless there are further developments, no action need be taken.
3. $1,200,998.01.
4. (a) No. (b) Mr. Geo. Goodwin.
5. Yes.

STATE ASSISTANCE FOR AGRICULTURE.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Mr. A. GILBERT (Drummond and Arthabaska). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice that next week, when the House will go into Committee of Supply, I will propose the following amendment:

In the opinion of this House, at least one tenth of the annual national revenue should be affected to the betterment and advancement of the Canadian agriculture, with, amongst others, the following objects:

(a) By a more effective diffusion of agricultural knowledge through our farming population;

(b) By the effective drainage of considerable tracts of lands that are not actually sufficiently drained and the cultivation of which would be rendered doubly productive by works carried on with state assistance;

(c) By the establishment of and the granting of subsidy to agricultural co-operative societies; a grant to cold storage warehouses built by such societies, according to the law; the publication and free distribution of an agricultural periodical to the members of such societies.

METHOD OF BRINGING DOWN RETURNS.

Mr. BLAIN. Every few days we hear members inquiring for returns which have not been brought down in obedience to orders of the House. Frequently it is found that these returns have been laid on the table, and the member moving the motion knows nothing about it. Why should not the department send a notice to the member who moved the motion so that he would be

at once informed when the return was laid on the table?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will agree with me that it is the business of a member of the House to look over the returns and to look at the Votes and Proceedings every day.

Mr. BLAIN. If returns were brought down in a reasonable length of time I would agree with my right hon. friend, but my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, the other day, read a long list of returns some of which had been standing for many weeks and some for months. I do not think that the right hon. gentleman would say that a member should watch from day to day for returns, which have been delayed for months after the order of the House has been passed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend agrees with me that every member watches the Votes and Proceedings every day.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid I could not allow a discussion at this stage. We will be going into Supply in a few minutes.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

RECIPROCAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the government when it is intended to resume the discussion on the reciprocity agreement. A short time ago a motion was made in this House to stay the discussion for reasons that were given, and we were told that it could not be, that we were in honour bound to continue that discussion. Shortly after it was shelved, and I would like to know if it has been shelved for good or if it is intended to take it up again?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is aware that as we are approaching the end of the fiscal year the first duty of parliament is to vote the Supplies.

Mr. MONK. I think my right hon. friend has not answered my question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I have. The first duty of parliament is to vote Supplies, and then we will attend to the reciprocity agreement, and other matters before the House.

SUPPLY—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LENNOX. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer again to the matter of the returns. It seems to me that the government should be disposed to facilitate the efforts of the various members of parliament to discharge their duties as fully as possible, and I may say that in common with very many other members I have felt very great inconvenience resulting from the fact that we do not know without very considerable search from time to time whether returns ordered have been brought down or not. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said a moment ago that it was the duty, I think, or the custom, I do not know which, of members of parliament to daily read the Votes and Proceedings.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I said the duty.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not been discharging my duty in that regard.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And many others also.

Mr. LENNOX. And in that particular I am standing upon the same ground as very many industrious members of this House. It is impossible for us daily to read the Votes and Proceedings, and if we did read the Votes and Proceedings I do not know that they would give us the information that we desire. When an order is made the matter goes off the Votes and Proceedings and there is no record of when the return is brought down in the Votes and Proceedings.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes there is.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not recall that there is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. But in any event, it would be a very light duty and one involving very little work for some of the officials of the government to notify the member when a return is made. I know there are more industrious members than I am, but there are some who are not as industrious as I am, and I may say distinctly that the difficult duty of having from day to day to look at these Votes and Proceedings for the purpose of ascertaining whether a belated return has been given to the House or not should not and need not be put upon the members of the House. Almost every day we are asking about returns. I was about to bring this matter before the House yesterday, but on looking over 'Hansard,' I found that my leader had, the day before, in my absence, made an extensive inquiry with regard to belated returns. I would urge upon the leader of the government, seeing that he has been smiling in a very pleasant way at my discussion, to reconsider what he said a few minutes ago, or to consider it further and to adopt the suggestion that we be notified as

to the time at which returns are brought down. I know that in doing so he will be accommodating a great number of members on both sidees of the House, of course more on the opposition side because we move for a greater number of returns than do members on the government side. This will tend to facilitate the work of the House, it will be a great assistance to those who are discharging a very important duty, and it will prevent us from having to take up time in making inquiries about returns.

Mr. BLAIN. We had a case in point only yesterday. My hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Porter) asked for a certain return that had been ordered by the House. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) at once spoke up and said that it had been laid on the table several days ago. Surely, it would not be very much trouble for a department, when it had a return ready to be laid upon the table, to notify the member who had made the motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is done to-day; the minister who brings the return asks for leave to lay on the table the return to the order of the House of such and such a date, containing such and such information and moved for by Mr. So and So. Then it is recorded in the Votes and Proceedings. But, it is not worth while to take up time in the discussion of a difference of this kind. If it is more convenient the government will be only too glad to oblige members of the House.

TREATMENT OF COLOURED PEOPLE.

Mr. O. J. WILCOX (North Essex). Mr. Speaker, for the reason that on three different occasions during this session the question of the colour line being drawn in a department of the government has been brought up in this House, I desire to ask my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) a question or two. As a result of the matter being considered, I have received a communication from one of my coloured constituents asking what all this talk is about, and if it is true that my hon. friend is drawing the colour line in his department. I desire to say that I would be very much opposed to the government pursuing such a course. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) brought before the House the fact that one George Simpson, of Toronto, who had passed a very difficult examination for a position in the Naval Department, whose character was most creditable, of whom the president of the Young Men's Christian Association, according to the Ottawa 'Free Press,' had spoken of as a most admirable young man, was not given the position to which his examination had entitled him, but was transferred to the Department of Agriculture. I have also been informed by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) that some time ago a young coloured man applied for a position in the Census Department. He was also transferred to the Department of Agriculture. I know of my own certain knowledge that last session the Rev. Mr. Hackett, who I was informed was a bishop of the Episcopal Methodist Church for the province of Ontario, who has sixteen different churches under his charge, was ruthlessly and indiscriminately ejected from the corridors of this House. That would lead me to the conclusion that the colour line was being drawn. To give the history of the coloured people would be a rather difficult task. Facts and dates are the language in which any race of people write their history, and for the reason that the facts and dates relating to the coloured people have not been preserved, I regret to say, as well as they should have been, we have not before us their complete history. But, we have the history of the coloured people for the past 47 years since they were emancipated, and it is no exaggeration to say that no race in the world has made greater moral and intellectual progress since then. The United States government have acknowledged the value of the coloured people in the army, and Brigadier General J. C. Gilmore, referring to their services in the Spanish-American war, writes:

> The expedition thus formed was placed under command of Major General Shafter. Notwithstanding the limited time to equip and organize an expedition of this character, there was never displayed a nobler spirit of patriotism and fortitude on the part of officers and men going forth to maintain the honour of this country. After encountering the vicissitudes of an ocean voyage, they were obliged to disembark on a foreign shore and immediately engage in an aggressive campaign. Under drenching storms, intense and prostrating heat, within a fever afflicted district, with little comfort or rest, either by day or night, they pursued their purpose of finding and conquering the enemy. Many of them, trained in the severe experience of the great war, and in frequent campaigns on the western plains, officers and men alike exhibited a great skill, fortitude, and tenacity' with result which have added a new chapter of glory to their country's history.

Medals of honour and certificates of merit were granted to coloured soldiers for distinguished services in the Cuban campaign, as follows:

> Dennis Bell, Fitz Lee, Wm. H. Tompkins, Geo. H. Wanton, James Bates, Scott Crosby, Edward Davis, J. Elliott, Benjamine Fasit, O. Gaither, G. W. Goff, J. Graham, Abram Hagen, H. T. Herbert, Adam Houston, J. Jackson, Elisha Jackson, Peter Jackson, C. W. Jefferson, P. McCoun, Loney Moore, Oscar Oden, Wm. Payne, G. W. Pumphrey, James Satchell, L. Smith, Wm. Thornton, J. Walker, John T. Williams, R. Williams.

It seems to me that no better evidence can be given of the devotion of a citizen to

the nation he belongs, than that he is willing to live and die for the flag he serves under. The paragraph referred to as to the exclusion of the coloured people was a Canadian press despatch, and appeared in Liberal and Conservative newspapers alike. I quote from the Winnipeg 'Tribune' of March 22:

With regard to Canada, popular sentiment, which already has compelled the dominion government to place the virtually prohibitive tax of $500 a head upon every Chinese entering the country, and which has shown itself so hostile to Indian and Japanese labour in the western provinces, now is manifesting a pronounced disposition to exact from the government at Ottawa stringent legislation barring the American negro from the Dominion.

I desire to ask the minister if the statements in this article are true? I quote from the 'Hansard' of yesterday, part of the discussion which took place on this question:

Mr. FOSTER. The presumption does not go so far as to say he is undersirable.

Mr. OLIVER. No. but there are many cases where the admission or exclusion of an immigrant depends on a strict or a lax interpretation of the law, so that if the immigrant is of what we would call the desirable class it may be that the restrictive provisions of the law are administered laxly, and if he is of the presumably less desirable class then they are administered more restrictedly. Beyond that there are no instructions to the immigration officers, but they are expected to act according to the instructions they have.

Now, I am unable to understand much from this language of the Minister of the Interior. His description of the enforcement of the regulation of his department reminds me of the peroration to a speech delivered by Mr. Delmas, a great United States criminal lawyer who, in explaining the fact that two and two are four, did it in this way:

'If beneath the unit two we place its fellow, and thereupon perform the operation known to mathematicians as addition we will speedily arrive at the result called by well informed and reputable mathematicians as four.'

I have to say that in my judgment the Minister of the Interior can put Mr. Delmas in the shade. I ask the minister if it is true, that Mr. Simpson was transferred to the cattle farm from the position he was entitled to in the naval service. I ask him also if it is true that a young coloured man who was entitled to a position in the Census Department did not get it. I ask him for what reason Bishop Hackett was removed from the corridors of the House of Commons last session. I ask him also if there is any sentiment in this country that he knows of in favour of placing a head tax of $500 on coloured people coming to this country, the same as he does with regard to the Chinese. I may tell the Minister of the Interior that from my knowledge and experience of the coloured people, if it is his intention to place any such tax on them because of their colour, I will be diametrically opposed to it.

Mr. McCOIG (West Kent). Mr. Speaker, I represent the county adjoining that represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox), and in my section of the country there are a good many coloured farmers who are amongst the most industrious and successful citizens of the Dominion. I feel safe in saying, on the assurance of a letter I have received from the Minister of the Interior, that it is not the intention of the government to place a tax upon coloured people coming from the United States into Canada. I took the matter up with the Minister of the Interior some days ago, and he gave me a letter assuring me that so long as these coloured people were entitled to enter under the law, they would be admitted as freely as any other people who came to our country. I am glad to know that the government has taken that stand, because I would regret deeply if this government of which I am so proud and which I am so glad to support should in any way discriminate against coloured people, especially when we have amongst us men of that race who are doing their share to build up this Dominion. I hope the government will continue along the lines they have set out on, and allow the coloured people to come in so long as they are prepared to perform the duties of citizenship which are expected from every man in Canada.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior.) I was unable to gather from the remarks of my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Wilcox) just what information he wanted?

Mr. HUGHES. He asked a series of questions.

Mr. OLIVER. Would he mind repeating them so that I may be able to answer them?

Mr. WILCOX. I asked my hon. friend if it were true that one George Simpson, who had passed the Civil Service examination for a position in the Naval Department was transferred to the Department of Agriculture by reason of his colour. I also asked if it was true that a month or two ago a young man who had passed an examination for a position in the Census Department, and was also transferred to the Department of Agriculture because of his colour. I also asked for what reason Bishop Hackett was removed from the corridors of the House of Commons last session. I also asked if my hon. friend knew of any sentiment in Canada in favour of placing a tax of $500 a head on coloured

people entering Canada, and if he intended to do it. I also stated that I was decidedly opposed to such a course if the question of colour was the reason for such a tax.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to most of the questions of my hon. friend, I am not able to give an answer, because the matters referred to are not under my control or jurisdiction, nor am I in any way responsible for them. In regard to whether there is any sentiment in Canada in favour of placing a $500 head tax upon negroes coming into the country, so far as my information goes there is a very strong sentiment on the part of a great many people in this country against the admission of negroes; but as to the intention of the government, I can only refer my hon. friend to the remarks I made last night. In the administration of the Immigration Department we have certain restrictive and exclusive provisions, and if his friends come under any of these provisions they cannot come into Canada, while if they do not come under any of these provisions, they can come into Canada.

Mr. DANIEL. In the course of his remarks last night, the hon. Minister of the Interior said:

> I wish to have the matter thoroughly understood—in the administration of the exclusion provisions of the law, there is taken into account the question of whether the proposed immigrant is ordinarily considered desirable or ordinarily considered undesirable. The immigrant ordinarily considered desirable is the man who wishes to go on the land, and if he does not want to go on the land the presumption towards him is not so favourable.

I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that these 165 negroes from Oklahoma who were stopped at the boundary were immigrants who intended to go on the land and settle as a farming community; so that, according to the minister's own statement, they belong to the desirable class. Under these circumstances it would seem plain to the ordinary observer that they were excluded because they were not of the right colour. If that was not the case, I think it is due to the House and the country that the minister give the reasons why they were excluded.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know where my hon. friend got his information, because my information is that they were not stopped at the boundary, and that they were not excluded.

Mr. DANIEL. That statement was made in the despatch which was read last night by my hon. friend from North Essex.

Mr. OLIVER. If it was in the despatch, so far as my information goes, it was not correct, because I have no information that the people were stopped at the boundary, or that they were excluded. My information is that some members of the party were excluded, but the larger number of them, having complied with the conditions laid down in the Immigration Law and in the regulations, were admitted.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister give us what information he has?

Mr. OLIVER. I have given the House all the information I have on the subject. I may say that I was not keeping myself particularly in touch with this special band of immigrants. There are many thousands of immigrants coming into the country just now, and I did not feel that it was incumbent upon me to follow the movements of this particular party. I have always understood that any one who complied with the regulations would be admitted, and any one who did not comply with the regulations would be excluded. That was all the information I had on the matter, and it is quite incidental that I am able to give the House the information that I have received.

Mr. DANIEL. On the 2nd of March I brought up a similar case, and the minister, in his reply to me at that time, undertook to examine into the occurrence and give the information later. It was a case where a party of negroes from the United States who wanted to go to western Canada, were stopped at the boundary, although they were of the desirable class, people who wanted to go on the land. So far the minister has not given me any information as to why they were turned back.

Mr. OLIVER. I did make inquiry and received a report, which I have not placed before the House, but which I will take an early opportunity of doing. The report which I have received is practically that the story was made out of whole cloth. It is true, an individual, a coloured man, came to the boundary, and he was excluded for reasons that would have excluded any other man, whether coloured or not. That was the fact on which the story in the newspapers was based.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for North Essex asked the Minister of the Interior a question which applies to my department. As I understood it, he asked whether an individual had passed the Civil Service examination for the census, and had been refused because he was coloured. There is absolutely no foundation for any such statement. He also asked whether somebody had been transferred from the Marine and Fisheries Department to the Experimental Farm. A gentleman with African blood in him was sent by the Civil Service Commission to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He was not found

suitable for the work there, and the Civil Service Commissioners sent him to the Experimental Farm. He has been working there ever since, he is a thoroughly good official, and nobody objects to his being there.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask if the Department of Marine and Fisheries gave him a trial or was he just sent to my hon. friend's department.

Mr. FISHER. I have no information on that point.

Mr. BLAIN. The House is entitled to the information because that is the charge which is made by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox). His charge was that this man had applied to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for employment, and I think he said that he was on trial in that department and passed an examination, but was afterwards sent to the Agriculture Department on account of his colour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). According to the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), there seems to be a good deal of scope in respect of such matters, and everything depends upon whether the regulations are administered strictly or with some laxity. It would be very unfortunate if any impression got abroad that any person, coming as an immigrant, was to be excluded simply because of his colour. There are a great many people of that race in different parts of Canada. They are good, honest, law abiding citizens and a credit to the communities in which they live. Some of their settlements have existed in this country for 150 years and others—I am speaking more particularly of my own province of Nova Scotia—for about 100 years. There are many communities of these excellent citizens in Nova Scotia, and it would be most unfortunate if the impression got abroad that these regulations were to be construed so as to exclude any immigrant by reason of his colour. My hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox), asked several questions, and the Minister of the Interior says that some of them do not concern his department. If that be the case, the minister in charge of the particular department concerned ought to answer. The questions were not addressed to the Minister of the Interior alone but to the government as a whole; and the admonition which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, gave us a little while ago as to the duty of ordinary members of parliament to be in their seats and know what is going on, applies, I should say, with quite equal force to ministers of the Crown, especially in matters affecting their own departments. So that if there be any other minister concerned in this question, we should have his answer before this matter is allowed to pass.

RECIPROCITY—RESOLUTIONS OF ASSOCIATIONS RE

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there are certain communications which I have received, which I wish to read to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that objection was taken the other day on both sides to the reading of petitions, telegrams and other documents relating to reciprocity on the motion to go into Supply. Does the correspondence to which the hon. gentleman refers relate to reciprocity?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I submit that communications of the utmost importance to my constituents, having been sent to me for presentation to the House and being of the same nature as a large number of other communications presented to the House by ministers and others, it would be an injustice to me and a straining of the rules of parliament to rule that these particular citizens should not be heard when so many others have been heard to the same effect. I submit that I am within the rules in offering these communications on going into Supply, and I am justified in doing so by the precedents already set.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). If these communications relate to matters which are not already in the possession of the House, I quite agree with my hon. friend, but if he desires to bring to the notice of the House resolutions touching the question of reciprocity, he is not in order in doing so on the motion to go into Supply, as that question has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster), My object is to read certain communications which I have been requested by my constituents to read to the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite willing to wait until the hon. gentleman declares to what these communications refer, but I presume they refer to the matter of reciprocity as he pleads to be heard on the ground that some other hon. gentlemen have been permitted to read documents coming in the same category. While I took no exception whatever to the presentation of such papers from time to time, I quite agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in the point he raised, that the introduction of such

matters in this way is unwise and out of order. I hope my hon. friend will not seek to obtain a decision of the House to the contrary because I am satisfied that the point made by my hon. friend from North Toronto was made in the interests of debate, and it would be a pity to introduce these matters other than in their proper place, which is in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BURRELL. Whether on the motion to go into Ways and Means or into Supply, I cannot recall which, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), got up and read, not resolutions or other communications, but newspaper editorials. I think, therefore, that the point made by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), is well taken, namely, that the House, having established a precedent by receiving other communications on this motion, he should be allowed to read those which he received from his constituents.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am of course in the hands of the House. I thought at first it was my duty to allow these communications and documents to be read on the motion to go into Supply because considerable latitude is always allowed on this motion; but inasmuch as objection has been taken to this on both sides, I am entirely in the hands of the House. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), raised the point that this was an iregular proceeding and ought not to be allowed, in which he was supported by the right hon. the Prime Minister, and I, therefore concluded that such was the opinion of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Although I did take that position and still stand by it I do not see why Mr. Speaker should put the responsibility on me. The responsibility is on Mr. Speaker, and the House is in his hands, rather than he in the hands of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. According to the authorities the Speaker can appeal to the House on certain occasions. My first impression was to allow the reading of these matters on the motion to go into Supply, and I was prepared to continue in that course, but objection has been taken on both sides. As the right hon. the Prime Minister is now here, I would refer the point to him. The point is that the hon. member for New Westminster wishes to read certain communications from his constituents regarding reciprocity, and objection having been taken, I sought the advice of the House as to whether this should be allowed or whether it should be deferred until the House is in Committee on Ways and Means to which the reciprocity resolutions have been referred.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This matter of reciprocity having been referred to the Ways and Means Committee, it would be out of order to bring it up except in that committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not quite so sure of that, although I speak with deference to the view the Prime Minister has expressed. We certainly had rather a bad example from the treasury benches when the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) read a long editorial with regard to this subject from some newspaper in British Columbia. Either the hon. minister was out of order or not. in doing that. If he was in order, my hon. friend who now proposes to address the House is certainly equally in order. The difficulty arises at once that, after a certain practice has prevailed up to a certain period, there is more or less difficulty in cutting it off at a given point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may be wrong, but my recollection is that the example set by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was after we were in Committee of Ways and Means, or on going into Committee of Ways and Means, and, therefore, it was not out of order. But, even if we were then out of order, the consequence being what some foresaw and what is brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I think it would be better to change our course, and adhere more strictly to the rules.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Prime Minister think that there is a distinction between going into Committee of Ways and Means and going into Committee of Supply?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that when a subject matter has been referred to committee, whether of Supply or of Ways and Means, it should be left to that committee. The subject matter of reciprocity has been referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, and I am sure that my hon. friend from Halifax will agree with me that, under such circumstances, the Committee of Ways and Means is in possession of it, and it would be out of order to refer it to another committee.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The Prime Minister refused to tell us when he will next go on with the question of reciprocity, the result of this decision will be to preclude members of this House from making reference to newspaper utterances or even petitions from our constitutents, and so will absolutely block the discussion on the question of reciprocity.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House can only proceed with one matter at a time. Reciprocity is one matter, but there are

others, and one that it is proper to deal with, even before reciprocity, is the voting of Supply.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). With the permission of the House, and as the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was not in his place when I spoke before, and you have referred the matter to him, I would like to say a word in explanation. I did not state what communications I proposed to present to the House, but I do state now that they are communications that, to my mind, have a direct bearing on the question of Supply inasmuch as we have been told this afternoon that we shall be required to vote Supply before another very important subject is taken up. To my mind, that strengthens the position which I took at the outset, that, on the motion for Supply, I have the right to present to the House, before the Speaker leaves the chair, any communication which may seem to be a reason why we should not proceed to vote Supply until we first hear these reasons. And I submit that, if the ruling suggested applies to this motion to go into Supply, it will apply equally to a motion to go into Ways and Means, and we shall have no opportunity to present these communications until the Speaker has left the Chair and the House is actually in Committee of Ways and Means. It seems to me that is quite clear —that the two motions are identical so far as the reading of communications is concerned; and, if so, none of us will have an opportunity of presenting messages of our constituents, until, in the ordinary course, the time comes when each in his time has an opportunity to speak in Committee of Ways and Means which may not be for a month or more, and may be at a time altogether too late for communications we seek to present to have any effect. I think I have the right, and I respectfully ask the ruling of the Chair on the point.

Mr. SPEAKER. Objection having been taken, I have to sustain the objection, on the ground that the matter has been referred to the Committee of Ways and Means of the House, and we are now on a motion to go into Supply. The authorities say that, when a matter is referred to a committee, it cannot be discussed in the House.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I believe I am entitled to hear quoted the rule referred to.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) what the members on this side of the House are to do with the large number of communications that are being received every mail entering protest against the reciprocity proposal. If we cannot present them, and cannot direct the right hon. gentleman's attention to them, what are we to do with them?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Keep them.

Mr. SPEAKER. Bourinot at page 585 says:

> Members may discuss various questions on the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair, without moving amendments thereto—a great latitude being always allowed on such occasions; but they may not refer specifically to any vote which has passed, or is about to be discussed in committee, nor to any resolution of the Committee of Ways and Means.

This matter, having been referred to Committee of Ways and Means, the rule applies.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). There is a rule of the House required, I believe, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know the language of the rule of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The custom of parliament governs when there is no specific rule.

Mr. BURRELL. May I ask for an explanation of that particular point? As you quoted Bourinot, Mr. Speaker, I understood it was a question of discussion of a subject, whereas, I understand, my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster), does not wish to discuss the subject but simply puts before the House a message of his constituents.

Mr. SPEAKER. It was argued the other day that messages, &c., read here were arguments for or against the question referred to Committee of Ways and Means. And my decision is that the question cannot be discussed on a motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a few moments ago, in answer to my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), who put a very modest request with regard to petitions made for or against this matter of reciprocity from the constituents of members in every part of Canada, and what was to be done with them, said, 'Keep them.' Do I understand the first minister to give that advice to members on his own side, as well as to members on this side, as to communications from our people who are vitally interested in this matter of reciprocity, and who ask us to lay their views, whether for or against the proposal, before the House. Is the only answer we can give in the words of the first minister, 'Keep them?' I think, Sir, that must be a mere parody of parliamentary usage and procedure. Surely, the first minister must revise this advice to us, and I would ask him to revise it now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the constituents of my hon. friend have remonstrances to the House they can be offered by way of petition, and petitions will be received by the House every day. Petitions, by a new rule, are sent to the Clerk, or they may be

brought to the attention of the House. There are rules governing the order of business, and these rules must be observed. Many members of this House are delayed in reaching matters in which they are interested. On the Order Paper, there are dozens of notices of motion and Bills which, under the rules of the House, cannot be reached at all this session. That is unfortunate; but our business must be taken in its proper order. The question of reciprocity having been referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, it must be taken up by that committee. There may be delays, but it is part of the system, and my hon. friend must possess his soul in patience until the business is reached in regular course.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me quote the rule which throws some light on this subject. Rule 25 provides:

The ordinary daily routine of business in the House shall be as follows: Presenting petitions,——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. That gives every man the right to present a petition from his constituency and that right cannot be denied him. What we got into the other day was not the mere presenting of petitions out of their places but the discussion which was carried on by means of resolutions and petitions and reading from the newspapers. That is what I objected to. But the matter of a constituent coming before this House through his member is a matter of right that cannot be taken from him and is affirmed by the rule that every one who has a petition to present gets an opportunity once every day to present that petition. But the presenting of the petition and the discussion of the question are different things.

Mr. LENNOX. He has the right to read it, has he not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT, ATTEMPT TO RESTRAIN BOARD.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN (South Huron). I observe a despatch in the 'Ottawa Citizen' this morning from Montreal to the effect that certain solicitors in that city have taken proceedings against the Board of Investigation under the Combines Investigation Act. It is claimed by the company that the appointment of the board is without jurisdiction, illegal, and that their appointment should be declared ultra vires and null and void. This is a matter of very great importance and I would ask if it has been brought to the attention of the government and what action the government propose to take in the matter.

Mr. KING. I received this morning from Mr. Justice Laurendeau, of Montreal, a communication in which he states that as chairman of the board of investigation appointed to inquire into the United Shoe Machinery Company and others alleged to be in a combine, he has been served with a petition for a writ of prohibition and asks what the board should do in the premises. The government have instructed counsel to appear to oppose the granting of this writ of prohibition in order that the proceedings contemplated by the Combines Investigation Act may be continued under that measure.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS, &c.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I beg to ask why the return of correspondence with regard to the Markey lease has not been brought down. All that correspondence is on file and it would not take a clerk three minutes to gather it up and put it on the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Marine is not in his seat, but I shall call his attention to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the First Minister use his influence to have it brought down?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall always be happy to accommodate my hon. friend when he is so reasonable as he is at present.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would also ask why the hydrographic survey of Fort Churchill and the Nelson river which were completed last summer have not been laid on the table of the House. There is no reason why at least the Fort Churchill survey should not be brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree that there is no reason why all the surveys should not be brought down. If the reports are completed they will be brought down.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Department of Agriculture contingencies, further amount required, $6,000.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Most of this is required because we have had a large number of clerks on the sick list during this year and have had to employ temporary assistants to get through the work. When clerks who are paid out of the civil government are on the sick list and their pay is stopped, while the money is saved to the government, we are not able to use that money

for the payment of temporary clerks, who have to be paid out of contingencies.

Mr. STAPLES. Did the minister say the pay was stopped when clerks were on sick-leave?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I have adopted a practice of allowing two months' sick-leave with pay during the year, but the question became so serious that I did not see my way clear to give more than two months' sick-leave in the year.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). How many temporaries were put on?

Mr. FISHER. Twenty-eight, I think.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Were there not more put on than the number of persons who were absent on sick leave?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, some more; we had other work.

Mr. SPROULE. How much have you paid, or will you have paid, for temporary clerks by the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. FISHER. $4,590, at the rate of $500 per year.

Mr. SPROULE. Those who were employed as temporary clerks were paid at the rate of $500 in proportion to the length of time they had been working?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—health of animals—further amount required, $50,000.

Mr. FISHER. There was $250,000 in the main estimates, but we found, in consequence of various rather extraordinary expenses, that that was not sufficient to cover the work of the year.

Mr. SPROULE. This will make $300,000?

Mr. FISHER. Yes: the year before the expenditure was $325,000. We expected that we were going to be able to get off with $250,000, but we will get off with less than we spent last year.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the heavy work that necessitated this exceptional expenditure?

Mr. FISHER. There was a very serious outbreak of rabies in western Ontario which required a very heavy expenditure, and the employment of extra officers.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was spent on that?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think I can give that exactly because our officers were doing that and other work as well, but at the same time the work necessitated extra officers. It would be very difficult to divide the work. There was also very much more expensive dipping of sheep in consequence of the fact that we agreed that all export sheep to the United States should be dipped under the supervision of our officers. We are also required to see that empty stock cars coming back from the United States and passing certain points are cleansed and disinfected under official supervision.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that was always done.

Mr. FISHER. Not to the same extent. The railways were required to do it and we had one or two of our inspectors going about spotting to see whether it was done or not. Under this new arrangement we make this inspection much more efficient and thorough.

Mr. SPROULE. We were always told that it was very efficient, but now the minister tells us that this extra cost means that it is done much more efficiently. Heretofore, it must have been done in such a perfunctory way that it was no safeguard to the country notwithstanding the fact that the country was led to believe that it was a safeguard, and that it would be carried out in a proper way. I would like to ask the minister if he could give us any additional information regarding these parties who were employed in connection with the rabies outbreak. Were they regular officers or were there others employed, and if so, what instructions were they acting under and how were they paid?

Mr. FISHER. I could not say positively whether we took on any extra officers or not, but the work involved very considerable extra expense in travel and inspection on the part of permanent officers. We put on that work officers who usually were not travelling because although it was exceptional work we did not wish to put on extra officers. Travelling expenses, therefore, had to be met to a greater degree than is usual in the employment of these officers. We also used the Dominion Police in a good many cases and we had to pay for their services and expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. All these officers are employed all the year around, are they not?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Well then, that does not mean that they must be paid for doing more work, because they are idle a great deal of the time.

Mr. FISHER. No, they are not idle, but this work being of a temporary character, instead of adding to the permanent officers, we turned to our officers ordinarily engaged in other things. We did not neglect those

other things, but we did postpone some things so as to secure efficient work for this branch.

Mr. SPROULE. But all the officers of this branch are not engaged all the year round. During a great deal of their time they are without work.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. There is nothing for them to do.

Mr. FISHER. Our permanent officers are busy all the year around.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister may say so, but it is not the experience of those who know them.

Mr. FISHER. Well, I would like to have it reported if they are not.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see how of necessity they could be employed constantly. The ordinary veterinary surgeons throughout the country are open to be called here or there to make tuberculin tests, or, in the event of outbreaks, to go and look into them, but those things only happen occasionally. There is no steady work for those people.

Mr. FISHER. We try only to have enough to make pretty steady work for them.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid there are a great many of them who are not very steadily employed.

Mr. FISHER. I think that if my hon. friend looked into the matter he would find that they are pretty steadily employed.

Mr. SPROULE. Rabies were pretty prevalent in the western country where I belong, but I never heard of a single case of any employee of this department being engaged in connection with the outbreak. It would be interesting to know just what they did. There were certain notices published in the papers stating what should be done with persons who had been bitten, and with animals affected, but I do not know of any veterinary surgeon being employed in connection with that work. There were mad dogs in that part of the country and a great many cases of bites, but I never heard of a veterinary being employed.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend may not have heard of it, but at the same time whenever a report came in or any suggestion of rabies was received an officer was sent to investigate. If there was any breaking of the law or of the regulations there was a prosecution. In many cases dogs were killed and specimens sent in to be tested in the laboratory to determine whether or not it was a case of rabies. Our officers had to carry on the cases against people who were charged with violating the regulations. There were a great many domestic animals sick and many reports received about cases which did not turn out to be correct. A great many cases were reported which turned out not to be correct, but the officers had to investigate, and they had to travel and spend their time.

Mr. SPROULE. Their time was paid for in their annual salaries.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but the travelling and other expenses amount to a considerable sum.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there a report in each individual case?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a case of rabies is reported what action is taken to protect the people? If we know how much was spent on these services we would be able to tell approximately whether the money was properly spent or not. These reports must be available somewhere.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend desires it I can compile a statement of the number of cases reported to the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to get the information about individual cases so that we may know the localities in which rabies existed.

Mr. FISHER. I will bring down the file of the reports. I may say that out of this $50,000 about $25,000 was paid in extra compensation for the slaughter of animals which we did not have to pay last year.

Mr. SPROULE. In the case of what diseases is compensation paid?

Mr. FISHER. Glanders, hog cholera and dourine. Most of the compensation was for glanders. Fortunately we have that disease pretty well under control in eastern Canada, but there is still a considerable amount of it in the west.

Mr. SPROULE. No compensation is paid for bovine tuberculosis?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the government were considering whether they might not wisely extend compensation in respect of that disease.

Mr. FISHER. Part of this appropriation is for the expenses of a joint commission to investigate the subject of bovine tuberculosis. There is an International Veterinary Association for Canada and the United States and Mexico, and at a meeting held some thirteen months ago it was decided to appoint a commission to thor-

oughly investigate and make a report on the matter. Dr. Rutherford veterinary inspector general of Canada was made chairman of that commission, and we appointed Senator Edwards, and Mr. Torrance, Veterinary Surgeon, of Winnipeg, and two or three others to be members of that commission, along with representatives of the United States. That commission has held meetings in San Francisco, St. Louis, Buffalo, Washington and Toronto, and it has prepared a report which is ready for presentation. I have been very carefully considering with the veterinary director general what we can do to carry out the valuable recommendations made in that report to prevent the spread of the disease.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that commission meet more than once a year?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there were three meetings held in one year.

Mr. SPROULE. When was the last sitting of the committee?

Mr. FISHER. Quite recently. Speaking from memory, I think that was the fifth meeting.

Mr. SPROULE. That committee has made a report to the Department of Agriculture. Has that department, which the minister says has been carefully considering this subject, reached any conclusion yet as to what should be done, and, if so, what is it?

Mr. FISHER. I am not yet in a position to make any announcement. I will lay the report on the table in a few days, and I think my hon. friend will see that there are some recommendations in it which will require very careful consideration before we can undertake to carry them out. I would like to carry them out, but I fear that some of them are not feasible or practicable in the present condition of affairs in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. We have been discussing this question for the last 12 or 14 years, and from time to time the minister has told us that he has been considering it. During that time all these inquiries have taken place, and a report has been presented to the Minister of Agriculture. How long does it take him to carefully consider the report and determine what should be done? I do not see why it should take so much time. It seems to me that the subject is worthy of better consideration. This is considered one of the preventable diseases, and it is too

important a matter to be dealt with in this slipshod way. Some people think it is a great injustice for the department to order animals to be slaughtered without any compensation to their owners, whereas animals slaughtered for hog cholera must be paid for.

Mr. FISHER. We have never ordered the slaughter of any animals for this disease.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the law not provide that animals affected with infectious or contagious diseases must be slaughtered?

Mr. FISHER. The law provides that a list of the diseases for which animals must be slaughtered shall be made. Tuberculosis is not one of them.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the minister making any provision for the greater protection of live stock in Canada under the reciprocity arrangement, which I presume will come into force before the next session of parliament?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not?

Mr. FISHER. Because I think that our provision at the present time is ample. The question of reciprocity does not enter into the question of the health of animals in Canada. We have certain rules and regulations for the protection of animals which we enforce whether a hundred or a thousand animals come in.

Mr. BLAIN. According to my hon. friend's remarks on the reciprocity agreement, we are to export our hay, and therefore the cattle will be fed in other countries.

Mr. FISHER. I did not make that statement.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend made the statement that it was a splendid arrangement because the farmers of Quebec would have an excellent market for their hay, and if the hay goes out of the country it will be fed out of the country. Keeping that in view, and keeping in view the fact that we are to have a greater exchange of animals with the United States, I ask the hon. minister, whom I have always understood to claim that the health of animals was better in Canada than in the United States, if we are to have a larger number of animals coming into Canada

from the United States than before, what protection is he going to give the Canadian farmers against those animals bringing disease into Canada that have hitherto been unheard of here? Has my hon. friend considered this? I am speaking from a farmers' standpoint, as I represent an agricultural constituency, and my farmers are interested. I want to know whether my hon. friend is taking some precautions in regard to the health of the large number of hogs, cattle, sheep, horses and other products that will come in from the United States under that agreement? My hon. friend has not taken very good care of the farmers in the agreement, because everybody is to have protection except them. What provision is my hon. friend making for looking after the health of these animals, or has he overlooked that part of the agreement altogether?

Mr. FISHER. I do not propose to be drawn into a discussion on the reciprocity question, and will therefore merely say that our present quarantine regulations are sufficient to protect animals in Canada. Should any outbreak of disease occur in other countries, we may have to make special provision to meet it, and shall do so, as we did a few years ago, when the outbreak of foot and mouth disease occurred in the United States. We then took exceptional precautions; and notwithstanding that disease prevailed all along our southern border, no contagion came across.

Mr. BLAIN. There is protection now, and therefore they could not get through.

Mr. FISHER. The question of duty or no duty does not affect our quarantine arrangements in the slightest degree. My hon. friend wants to know if I am going to make any special provision to meet the large increase of trade.

Mr. BLAIN. If there is to be such an increase.

Mr. FISHER. I say that the increase in trade will make no difference in the regulations. Should any outbreak of disease occur or any special danger arise, we shall take the necessary precautions. If the health of animals in Canada is good, as I understood my hon. friend to admit, that is largely due to the efficiency of our quarantine arrangements which prevent the entry of disease from foreign countries. Our machinery is quite able to do that work. Should extraordinary circumstances arise, we shall have to spend more money; but until they do, I am not going to ask parliament to vote any more.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know what the regulations are with regard to the importation of animals, cattle, horses, sheep, swine and poultry?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot give in detail all that information. I may say, however, that cattle from across the line, which come in for immediate slaughter, are allowed entry without hindrance.

Mr. FISHER. Cattle for immediate slaughter.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. minister mean by immediate slaughter?

Mr. FISHER. When fat animals are brought in to be slaughtered at their destination.

Mr. SPROULE. In a given number of days?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know that there is an exact number of days stated, but they are to be slaughtered at their destination.

Mr. FOSTER. Within what distance of the border?

Mr. FISHER. Without transhipment. When they reach their destination they have to be immediately slaughtered. Cows for dairy purposes and animals for breeding purposes have to be accompanied by a certificate that a tuberculine test was made within one month or possibly two months before shipment. Hogs have to be detained at the frontier for supervision during 30 days, so as to check hog cholera if there should be any. Every horse that comes across the line has to be subjected to the mallen test for glanders.

Mr. SPROULE. Under the reciprocity regulations, animals may come in any time, how then can you detain them 30 days? Would that be carrying out the understanding?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it is thoroughly understood that quarantine matters are entirely above treaty obligations. The life of human beings and animals have to be dealt with regardless of tariff questions or anything of that kind.

Mr. PORTER. That is not made a part of the agreement.

Mr. FISHER. It is a general understanding among all nations, and the United States authorities thoroughly understand that. It is not in the agreement because it is a matter of course.

Mr. SPROULE. Then there is something radically wrong with a friend of the minister's who said not very long ago in my hearing, one of the great advantages of this reciprocity arrangement was that under it our butchers can get in supplies from across the line inside of two or three days. If hogs, however, are detained for 30 days they can not do that.

Mr. FISHER. I am not responsible for that statement. The statement I have just made is perfectly correct.

Mr. SEXSMITH. In the reciprocity arrangement it is provided that no regulation shall be made or maintained to unreasonably hamper a free exchange of products. I would understand that to mean that the quarantine of 30 days on hogs would be removed.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SEXSMITH. And that representations from either side would receive due attention and any just cause of complaint removed. If we are to have reciprocity in hogs under this agreement, the minister is taking that away by his quarantine regulations.

Mr. FISHER. The agreement does not in any way modify the quarantine arrangements; but if, for the purpose of blocking trade, we were to vexatiously and improperly enforce quarantine arrangements, that would come under that clause. But the quarantine arrangements for the protection of the health of animals cannot in any way be influenced by this tariff arrangement.

Mr. LALOR. Have the United States quarantine arrangements against Canada such as we have against the United States?

Mr. FISHER. The United States quarantine arrangements are not the same as ours. I could not say offhand just what they are in regard to hogs. But Canada has very little hog cholera, whereas, unfortunately the northern tier of states of the United States has a great deal of it. We have been absolutely obliged to keep up quarantine to prevent the introduction of hog cholera into Canada.

Mr. SEXSMITH. With a guarantee that the hogs are all right, they can come in—

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Not with the certificate of a veterinary?

Mr. FISHER. That makes no difference in the case of hogs.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister tell us whether he urges upon the farmers in general the advisability of shipping hay and grain instead of feeding on the farm?

Mr. FISHER. That would be a question of circumstances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister claim that it is generally understood to be a wise policy?

Mr. FISHER. It may or may not be, according to circumstances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not the fact that the minister went to Kingston some years ago and delivered a lecture in the course of which he made a statement showing the different values taken from the soil from different products of the farm, and strongly opposed the shipping of hay or grain off the farm?

Mr. FISHER. Quite possibly I did, under the circumstances that surround Kingston.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We must try to refresh the hon. gentleman's memory for this is an important matter, and the minister has made an important statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have to call the hon. member's (Mr. Armstrong's) attention to the fact that we are now discussing an item for the health of animals. If he proposes to apply what he is saying to that, it will be in order, but a general discussion of agricultural problems will not be in order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This, I understand, is a vote of $50,000 for the animal industry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, the health of animals.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Food would naturally come in on that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is applied in that way—

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is the application I wish to make, and it is an important application. Some weeks ago, the Minister of Agriculture made a statement in this House to the effect that the farmers of certain sections of our country would receive wonderful advantage from the shipments of hay and grain—

Mr. MILLER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) is discussing not the food the animals eat, which is the only food that can affect their health, but the food that they do not eat. Therefore, his arguments do not apply.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. gentleman say they do not eat hay or grain?

Mr. MILLER. Not the hay or grain that is exported.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is a very clever statement on the part of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller). I wrote to Dr. Wm. Saunders, Director of the Experimental Farm in Ottawa, asking him about the fertility taken from the soil by certain crops, and received the following reply:

Ottawa, Ont., March 9, 1911.

J. E. Armstrong, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—On receipt of your letter of the 6th inst., in reference to the fertility taken from the soil by certain grain crops, &c., I referred the matter to the chemist, Mr. Shutt, who has prepared the attached memorandum.

I inclose herewith Bulletins Nos. 31 and 40 of our series, which are referred to in Mr. Shutt's memorandum.

Yours very truly,
WM. SAUNDERS,
Director.

March 9, 1911.

Memorandum for Mr. J. E. Armstrong, M.P., re Soil Fertility.

1. The approximate amounts of plant food taken out of the soil by the more common farm crops and lost to the farm when the produce is sold, are given in tabular form on page 6 of Bulletin No. 40, a copy of which accompanies this memorandum. It should be noted that the pounds of nitrogen, phosphoric acid and potash there given are those contained in and would be removed by ten crops. It should further be borne in mind that these amounts are to be regarded as approximately only (there being many factors that might very considerably affect them). The figures, however, I believe represent fair averages and are more or less comparative for the crops cited when grown under similar conditions.

2. When the crops are fed on the farm and reasonable care is taken of the manure—that is, a sufficiency of litter is used to absorb the urine and there is no excessive fermentation or leaching before the manure is put on the soil, we may conclude that from 75 per cent to 90 per cent of the plant food in those crops might be returned to the soil. In ordinary farm practice, however, very considerable losses in plant food are sustained between the production of the manure and its application to the land.

3. Dairy cattle in milk make a greater demand on their food, or put otherwise, extract larger amounts of the elements of fertility from it, than do fattening stock. Thus, in fattening steers and sheep, from 90 per cent to 95 per cent of the nitrogen of their food may be recovered in their manure, but in the manure (solid or liquid) of milking cattle there would not probably be more than 75 per cent. The differences between say, 75 per cent and 90 per cent, of course, appears in the milk. If butter only is sold, the loss to the farmer in the elements of plant food is practically negligible.

Young and growing stock utilize more of the elements of fertility in their food than do mature and fattened stock. Thus, in the manure (solid or liquid) from calves there may be present from 30 per cent to 50 per cent only of the nitrogen of their food.

FRANK T. SHUTT,
Dominion chemist.

P.S.—A copy of our bulletin on Barnyard Manure is also sent as it contains information bearing on the factors that affect the composition of manures, the return of plant food to the soil and other closely related subjects.

Great injury to the fertility of our lands occurs from a system of farming which consists merely in the growing and selling of hay and grain, and still further losses of plant food of very considerable magnitude follow the careless management of such manure as is produced.

Now, in this buletin, No. 40, at page 6, I find the following statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not find that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) is applying his argument in any way to the health of animals. It will be necessary to do so if he wishes to speak on the item before the Chair.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was referring to the food given to the animals, which would naturally pertain to their health, and, at the same time, to the advisability or otherwise of taking away from the farm such crops as hay and grain—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The argument I found the hon. gentleman was delivering was with regard to the latter portion. I was quite willing to hear him if the argument is to be turned in some way, with reasonable haste, to the argument before the Chair. But it appeared to be rather a prolonged argument with regard to the effect on land of certain crops rather than on the health of animals.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have no intention of making a long statement. These figures are here, and if you will accept them as read—

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would be very glad to have them placed on 'Hansard,' because they are very important and of deep interest to the farming industry.

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: (reading)—

SOIL EXHAUSTION BY GROWING CROPS.

The extent or rate of soil exhaustion from cropping is indicated by the particulars in the following table, which gives the approximate amounts of the essential elements of fertility removed in ten years from an acre of land by ordinary farm crops, where the yields mentioned are obtained:

PLANT FOOD REMOVED BY CROPS IN TEN YEARS.

Yearly Yield per Acre.	Nitrogen.	Phosphoric Acid.	Potash.
	Lbs	Lbs	Lbs
Timothy hay, two tons per acre	600	400	900
Oats, 50 bushels per acre of grain, with 2,200 lbs. of straw	460	164	356
Spring wheat, 25 bushels of grain per acre, with 2,200 lbs. of straw	422	233	395
Barley, 35 bushels per acre of grain, with 2,000 lbs. of straw	325	164	270
Indian corn, grown for fodder to the late milk or glazing stage, 15 tons per acre	660	330	1,170
Turnips, roots only (the tops being left on the land to plough under), 15 tons per acre	540	300	1,140
Mangels, roots only, 15 tons per acre	570	270	1,149
Carrots, roots only, 15 tons per acre	600	270	780
Sugar beets, roots only, 15 tons per acre	630	240	1,110
Potatoes, tubers only, 200 bush. per acre	408	192	684
Apples (trees in full bearing), fruit, leaves and wood	650	156	900

The figures are followed by this statement:

We thus see that reduced yields must inevitably follow successive cropping (unless plant food is from time to time returned); for the amounts given in the above table represent for the most part withdrawals from that limited store of immediately available plant food to which we have already drawn attention. If, during the ten years referred to, the land has had regular dressings of barnyard manure, say, once in five years, of about 20 tons to the acre, there would by this means be restored to the soil about 400 pounds of nitrogen, 200 pounds of phosphoric acid, and 360 pounds of potash, with the further advantage of a large addition of humus. With a suitable rotation of crops this return would do much towards making up the losses mentioned.

The crop producing power of soils is also lessened under such circumstances as we have referred to, by the wasting of their organic matter.

In Bulletin 31 on pages 10 and 11 I find:

The mineral constituents come originally, as already stated, from the rocks that form the base of the soil. They are being constantly removed for croppings. Thus, a four years' rotation of wheat, barley, potatoes and hay will remove per acre approximately, in addition to nitrogen, 222 pounds of potash and 80 pounds of phosphoric acid, and a rotation of wheat, oats, mangels and hay, 342 pounds of potash and 83 pounds of phosphoric acid.

I am anxious to press on the minister the importance of our people feeding the products of their farms to animals on the farms instead of exporting them from the country. It has been the policy of the department for a great many years, and the minister's own officials use the strongest kind of language in condemnation of not feeding these products on the farms. I hope the minister will put himself right in regard to a statement he made some time ago.

Mr. BURRELL. The minister said that cattle for breeding and dairy purposes had always to be accompanied by a health certificate. Did he mean to imply there was no other test?

Mr. FISHER. Not if they are accompanied by a certificate of tuberculin test signed by an official of the federal government at Washington. We exchange lists of these officials with the American authorities and mutually accept such certificates.

Mr. BURRELL. I understood that horses were subject to the Mallein test, although accompanied by a health certificate.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, because the horse may easily contract the disease after the test is given. Tuberculosis is different and the tuberculin test cannot be made unless you are sure that the animal has not been injected with tuberculin for two or three months.

Mr. BURRELL. Is the Mallein test exactly similar with that in the United States? I understood their test was more severe and satisfactory than ours.

Mr. FISHER. Ours is the regular Mallein test, we do not consider the American test satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. What regulations are there for sheep and poultry?

Mr. FISHER. For sheep a certificate is required that there is no disease in the district from which they come. There is no regulation as regards poultry.

Mr. SPROULE. How are cars disinfected when coming into Canada?

Mr. FISHER. They are cleansed and disinfected every time they cross the boundary. If there are animals in them they are carried through to destination and then the cars are cleansed and disinfected. When animals are unloaded for feeding in railway yards these yards are disinfected in the same way as the cars.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the method of disinfection?

Mr. FISHER. The cars and yards are washed with a regular disinfecting preparation and are also whitewashed with lime whitewash. Sometimes where there is an

air-tight building formaldehyde is evaporated.

Mr. SPROULE. The whole value of any system of disinfection depends on the manner in which the work is carried out. If we were told exactly how it is done and what disinfectants are used, I as a medical man could bring my knowledge to bear on it and decide whether it was of real value. I hear them talking about spraying whitewash on the yards and cars and throwing formaldehyde on them. To tell a medical man that you can disinfect by throwing formaldehyde in that way is to tell him something that is repugnant to his knowledge and idea of what should be done. He would not attach much value to it. It would be an easy matter for disease to be communicated from animals which had been in this yard previous to others occupying it unless it were well done. My object is to ascertain just how it is done so as to bring my own judgment to bear as to whether it is effective or otherwise. If we are spending money for it, it ought to be useful in so far as it is possible for human ingenuity to make it so.

Mr. FISHER. I agree with my hon. friend. It is done in the best way it possibly can be done, and I think the fact that there has been no epidemic in the country for a good many years is pretty fair proof that it is done effectively. The cars are first of all scraped clean of manure, they are then washed with a scrubbing broom dipped in a disinfecting fluid, then whitewashed, with lime whitewash which in itself is supposed to act as a destructive force upon the spores of disease. The yards are treated just in the same way. My officers inform me that this treatment is effective. It is possible that occasionally germs of disease may exist, but I think that this is only the case in very rare instances. This disinfection is done in the way in which it is done in all the animal quarantine stations that I know of in the world. I know it is done in the largest in England, and in the United States quarantine stations. It is done by our officers as efficiently as we can have it done.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told that it has not always been done in that way although I am not going to vouch for the information or to say whether it is correct or otherwise. I have been told that the manure is shovelled out of the car, and that then the car is whitewashed, not that the car is washed first and then whitewashed. If only that is done it is not sufficient. If the other were well done it would, in my judgment, be valuable and most likely effect what is desired.

Mr. FISHER. We have several inspectors, and they are trying their best to have it carried out properly. If at any time we find remissness it will be pretty short shrift for the man who allowed it. I cannot pretend to say that either I or the veterinary general has seen it done in every case. We have to trust to our inspectors, but I think that we have a good corps of inspectors, and that the work is efficiently done. I will be very glad if my hon. friend will give an instance where there is a doubt of its efficiency, and I will see that it is investigated.

Mr. SPROULE. What check is kept on these quarantine officers whose duty it is to do this work? Is there any inspection or report with regard to them?

Mr. FISHER. We have different grades, one grade above the other; we have certain men who are in charge of others they are one grade higher and then others who are in a still higher grade. We have three or four travelling inspectors who go around all the time and whose business it is to watch the other officers. All inspections require close supervision, and we try to make them efficient. One of the most difficult things in administration is to insure thorough efficiency in a second grade of inspectors, but we do the best we can and to-day we have a system which, I think, secures that result.

Mr. SEXSMITH. How many inspectors have you permanently employed?

Mr. FISHER. Twelve.

Mr. SEXSMITH. At what salary?

Mr. FISHER. One at $2,100, one at $2,000, one at $1,700, three at $1,500, 12 at $1,400, 16 at $1,300. Then, there is a whole lot at $900, and $700 and two temporary employees at $100.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand it, an American cattle buyer can purchase cattle in Chicago, send them through Canada in bond to Montreal, and then export them to Europe. May I ask the minister whether the ordinary inspection applies to such cattle?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, when they leave the port of Montreal.

Mr. BLAIN. But I mean as they enter Canada.

Mr. FISHER. They are subject to our regulations. As long as they are kept in bond we do not inspect them in the same way as if they were to be let loose in Canada. We do not allow any animal, American or any other kind, to leave Montreal without inspection and a certificate of health, because it would be injurious to the credit of Canada if an unhealthy animal were allowed to reach Europe.

Mr. BLAIN. According to that cattle coming from Chicago, entering Canada at Windsor and going on down to Montreal, pass over the line without any inspection at all?

Mr. FISHER. They are shut up in the bonded cars.

Mr. BLAIN. They pass into Canada without any inspection whatever?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, in bond.

Mr. BLAIN. They go down to Montreal, and there is no inspection until the time arrives when they are to be exported, and then I understand that my hon. friend applies his inspection to them? Is there not some regulation of the department to take charge of those cattle or are they allowed to pass through without inspection?

Mr. FISHER. They are in bond, and they will not be released.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there no regulation at all?

Mr. FISHER. They are in the hands of the customs officers, and they are in sealed cars. They are allowed to be taken out at certain specified places for feeding and watering if they are long enough in the cars to require it, and that is done under the supervision of my officers who see that they do not come into contact with any other animals. As long as they are in the hands of the Department of Customs we do not deal with them.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there an officer where the cattle are taken out to be fed who inspects them?

Mr. FISHER. Not inspects them, but simply sees that they do not come into contact with any other animal or are removed from the yards. They are in bond. They will not be allowed loose in Canada, and the yards where they are fed are part of the bonded transit through Canada. We do not undertake to inspect them.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, as a matter of fact, the American buying cattle in Chicago is in a better position than the Canadian who brings his cattle in from Chicago?

Mr. FISHER. Not a bit.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand it, the farmer from Canada going to Chicago to bring cattle into Canada would require to have them inspected at the boundary line?

Mr. FISHER. If they are going to stay in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. What difference would it make with regard to spreading disease whether they were in bond or not in bond?

Mr. FISHER. They do not come into contact with other Canadian animals.

Mr. BLAIN. They can bring the disease in here without any interference on the part of the department. Am I right when I say that these animals cross the line without inspection?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. And if they are diseased they travel along the railway line in Canada, they are taken out at different points to be fed and watered, they remain a week in Montreal before shipment and it is only when they are shipped that they are inspected by the officers of the Minister of Agriculture. I do not think the minister should plume himself for taking precaution because there is no precaution in that.

Mr. FISHER. These animals are passing through Canada in bond and they cannot come into contact with any Canadian animals in any way. The yards where they are fed and watered are disinfected before other animals go into them, and in Montreal in 99 cases out of 100 they are put on the ship the day they arrive. We inspect them at Montreal because, being cleared from Montreal, they are entered as animals from Montreal when they arrive on the other side, and if there should be disease among them it would be credited to Canada. During their transit through Canada they are in bond and according to a fiction of the customs law they are not in the country at all. The spread of disease can only occur by contagion and precautions are taken against that. The best proof that there is no danger is that a considerable number of these animals have passed through Canada and for many years back there has been no case of disease attributable to the passage of these animals through the country.

Mr. BLAIN. With all due respect to the minister's superior knowledge, in my opinion these animals should be inspected when they enter Canada. Why are they not inspected at one of these feeding points for instance?

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter of convenience.

Mr. BLAIN. Would it not be better?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there is any danger as it is.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister cannot credit his department with taking precautions because no precautions are taken, and the only defence of the minister is that up to the present time there has been no disease.

Mr. SPROULE. If a carload of cattle is shipped from Chicago to Winnipeg would they come under any regulations

provided they were taken to Winnipeg to be slaughtered.

Mr. FISHER. If they went straight to Winnipeg for immediate slaughter they would come right in.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister said that sheep must be accompanied by a certificate from a competent veterinary surgeon. Suppose a car of sheep were taken from Chicago to Toronto or Winnipeg, would the certificate be from the stock yards at Chicago or from the farming country where the sheep were raised?

Mr. FISHER. The certificate they would get in Chicago would be acceptable.

Mr. SPROULE. Where pure bred animals are sent to the United States for breeding purposes under what regulations would they enter the United States, and are the United States regulations the same in that respect as ours?

Mr. FISHER. The regulations are the same on both sides of the line.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought there was some restriction in the United States with regard to registration?

Mr. FISHER. My answer was only in respect to the regulations with regard to quarantine, and they are the same. So far as pedigrees are concerned, the regulations are practically the same but the United States have made what I cannot help but call a vexatious and discriminating regulation which says that the thoroughbred animal in order to get free entry must be imported into the United States by a United States citizen. Our regulation does not require that. Some people in Canada have asked us to pass a similar regulation to that of the United States, some do not want it and so far we have not done so.

Mr. SPROULE. An American buying an animal in Canada will pay a higher price for it if it is registered in the United States than he would if it is not registered there, whereas a Canadian buying an animal in the United States to bring to Canada can do so without any restriction that would reduce its value by its not being registered here.

Mr. FISHER. That is true. The United States imposes the regulations that the importer of the animal must be a United States citizen in order to get it in free. The Canadian is subject to this disability, which gives the American a little advantage over him. Even though the animal is registered in the United States, a Canadian cannot take it in free, but an American citizen can. But a Canadian can have a Canadian animal registered in the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems that the American has an advantage over the Canadian which enables him to force down the price here, while we cannot do the same in the United States.

Mr. BLAIN. How many animals have been rejected at Montreal or any other Canadian port during the past fiscal year, I refer to animals in transit in bond?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say at the moment. I do not think there is any considerable number. I can have that information when we are on the main item.

Mr. BLAIN. At page 115 of the minister's report for last year, referring to animals in transit, I read:

> The transit of such animals shall be subject to such regulations as the minister shall from time to time prescribe.

What are those regulations?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot tell off-hand. I will get that also for my hon. friend.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these bonded cars always disinfected, not simply those carrying diseased animals, but those carrying animals which are not diseased?

Mr. FISHER. They are all disinfected, whether there are diseased animals in them or not.

Mr. PORTER. What becomes of the condemned animals at the port of inspection?

Mr. FISHER. The owner can dispose of them. I think they are killed there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With regard to the discrimination practised by the United States authorities against our cattle imported into that country, many pure bred cattle particularly shorthorns, which are registered in the United States and are rought into Canada, are not considered worthy of registration in the Dominion. They are recognized by Canadian breeders as merely grade cattle. Are these animals allowed to come into Canada free of duty?

Mr. FISHER. No. The Customs Department is given a list of organizations whose certificate will be accepted for free entry, and no association is recognized in that way unless its certificate is accepted for registration in the Dominion records.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What I want to bring to the minister's attention is this: Numbers of cattle are brought from the United States that are registered in the official herd-books of that country. Are the pedigrees of those cattle submitted to the Dominion authorities before the cattle are permitted to enter?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I find on page 115 of the hon. minister's report that the importation of branded or ranch horses, mules and asses, other than those which are gentle and broken to harness and saddle, is prohibited. Under the proposed agreement these will come in absolutely free.

Mr. FISHER. They are prohibited because of the impossibility to test them with mallein, and we do not allow any horse to come in from the United States without the mallein test.

Mr. BLAIN. How will it be in the future?

Mr. FISHER. Any animals that are prohibited now because we cannot subject them to the mallein test will be prohibited in the future under our quarantine regulations.

Mr. BLAIN. But under the pact they are to be admitted absolutely free. Will the hon. gentleman's regulations hold good against that pact.

Mr. FISHER. I think so.

Mr. BLAIN. Therefore, no matter what the agreement says, these horses will not be permitted to come into Canada. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the mallein test for?

Mr. FISHER. To see whether the horse is afflicted with glanders.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why cannot branded or unbroken horses be tested? I will guarantee to test 50 per day for the minister.

Mr. FISHER. Will the hon. gentleman come in and work for us?

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the salary is good enough.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I would suggest that during recess the minister should consult the Department of Justice and ascertain whether the statement he makes is correct or not. Under the proposed agreement these animals are to be allowed in free, but the minister says their entry may be prohibited under his quarantine regulations.

Mr. FISHER. I would be very glad to consult the Department of Justice, but I am afraid I could hardly do it between now and eight o'clock.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Are we to understand that, under this quarantine regulation, branded or ranch horses are not to be permitted into Canada.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Leeds says I have to get the opinion of the Department of Justice on that point, but in my judgment the proposed agreement cannot interfere with quarantine regulations.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are we to understand that quarantine regulations may be put into force which will render the reciprocal arrangement impracticable.

Mr. FISHER. Quarantine regulations are just as useful and as capable of being enforced under the proposed agreement as at present. Of course I shall have to get the opinion of the Department of Justice on any particular point that may come up, and will be careful to do so; but I have always understood that matters of public health and quarantine are not affected by any trade agreement.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then the regulations could be so worded as to practically include those cattle.

Mr. FISHER. That would be an unfair and unreasonable action. I would not undertake to use the quarantine for that purpose.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Under the pact it is agreed that no regulation shall be made or maintained which unreasonably hampers a more liberal exchange of commodities. That refers to the free interchange of horses.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend will see that that refers to customs regulations, not to quarantine regulations. It has particular reference to an old complaint we had against the United States when former arrangements were made and customs duties imposed by which, while the contents of cans were allowed in free, the cans themselves were charged duty.

Mr. MILLER. Is not the British embargo a similar case? Great Britain does not impose duties on live cattle entering that country, but under the embargo, live cattle are prevented from entering.

Mr. BLAIN. They have no agreement to let them in free.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LENNOX. At six o'clock we were discussing the question of quarantine, and the effect upon our quarantine system of the proposed reciprocity agreement. The hon. member for Grey instanced the fact that the British government were able to enforce the embargo against our cattle notwithstanding the fact that it is a free trade country, and I think as a rule where countries are on equal terms, that either could enforce its quarantine regulations. But in this case we are making a specific bargain with the United States after we

have put into force regulations in reference to quarantine, and a strong argument may be advanced that the subsequent bargain, by implication, overrides our regulations. I am not much impressed with that view of the matter although there is no reservation in the reciprocity agreement. I waive that point, but I feel it is all important that we are entering into an arrangement which may conflict with this vital matter of our quarantine regulations, and that possibly we may have difficulty owing to the American interpretation of the agreement. My experience is that in cases of contract where there is no court to which the parties can resort, the result of a dispute is that the stronger must and does prevail. I am addressing myself to the question of protecting our cattle by these quarantine regulations, and am endeavouring to warn the minister as he is the guardian of all the hogs, cattle and poultry of Canada, that he should be on the alert, that there is great danger of the Americans so using their influence over us, by force of numbers, that the reputation of our meat products will be seriously imperilled. The Americans might be quite prepared to admit that our regulations are valid and within our rights, but they may argue that this is not a fair exercise of that right, and that under colour of quarantine regulations we are excluding their cattle from our markets. While I have great respect for the American people as individuals, the history of our transactions with them in the past is not such as to make me feel that we can safely leave to the United States the interpretation of our action in reference to quarantine, they will say we are not acting honestly, and they will endeavour to hold the club over us. While I do not think I can frighten the Minister of Agriculture, I guarantee that they will frighten him when the time comes and we will be the sufferers, that they will impose their interpretation of our right to enforce quarantine regulations, and that the minister will be compelled to allow their live stock to enter Canada imperilling the safety of our flocks and herds. I ask the minister to act on behalf of the farmers for once and to come to the rescue of the reputation of our live stock. I know he has sufficient influence in the cabinet, acting on behalf of the farmers, to melt the stony hearts of the First Minister and the Minister of Finance although they seem to be obdurate on this reciprocity question, and I appeal to him to protect the interests of the farmers in this matter.

Mr. FISHER. I assure my hon. friend I will not be deaf to his appeal. I appreciate his efforts and I will try to deserve them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did the minister during the recess inquire as to whether this agreement would have the effect alleged?

Mr. BLAIN. When are we to receive information as to the opinion of the Justice Department?

Mr. FISHER. I will discuss it with my colleague certainly, and get his views as soon as I can. I hope that when another item of mine comes up I will be able to tell my hon. friend what the views of the Minister of Justice are.

Mr. BLAIN. My understanding is that my hon. friend would have the compact agreed to by his government, including himself and, after it has been agreed to, when he has a little time on his hands, he is going to submit it to the Justice Department. I would have supposed that a minister who is looking after the interests of the farmers would have submitted this question to the Justice Department before they consented to the contract or made the agreement. The charge that I make with respect to this matter is that my hon. friend has forgotten the farmers' interests altogether, both with respect to the care of the health of our animals and on general principles. My hon. friend remembers very well the applause that the government heaped upon him from within, not from without, because he was a practical farmer.

Mr. MILLER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says 'hear, hear;' I am delighted to have his support.

Mr. MILLER. My hon. friend has my support in saying that the Minister of Agriculture is a practical, a very successful and a thoroughly up-to-date farmer. I would like to ask the hon. member for Peel whether, if my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture obtained a legal opinion from my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, he would be satisfied with that opinion?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has entirely misunderstood me. I was pointing out the applause that was coming from the government and my hon. friend's side of the House because the Minister of Agriculture was an up-to-date farmer. I was not suggesting that I was believing in that applause.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, I misunderstood you, then; I thought you were.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend was mistaken about that. What I would like to know is whether my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has not forgotten the interests of the farmer with respect to this matter.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that, according to the regulations here, before cattle are put on board cars, the cars must be disinfected. I would like to ask the minister whether cars into which American cattle are placed for the purpose of being carried into Canada in bond to our seaports are disinfected, and whether the American regulations are sufficient to protect our cattle from the diseases that may be brought into Canada in this way?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I am informed that the United States authorities inspect the cattle before they start for Canada in bond for export to Europe.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has quite misunderstood my question. According to the regulations in Canada, there must be an inspection of the cars and they must be disinfected before the cattle are allowed to go on board. It is very important to know if similar precautions are taken by our neighbours in sending cattle into Canada in bond to be exported to the old country. My information is that they are not inspected.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that there is an order in the United States to the effect that cars coming across the boundary line must be inspected and disinfected before they come over.

Mr. BLAIN. My point is whether the cars on which cattle are loaded on the United States side of the line are inspected and disinfected as they have to be in Canada.

Mr. FISHER. The regulations in the United States provide that railway cars used in the transport of animals subject to these regulations must be thoroughly cleaned and disinfected before such animals are placed therein, and that all litter from previous shipments must be removed, and the cars whitewashed with lime and carbolic acid. Canadian animals will not be allowed into the United States and animals from the United States will not be taken into Canada if this is not done.

Quarantine—salaries and contingencies of organized districts and public health in other districts—further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. FISHER. This is in regard to human quarantine, and it is to cover the amount which is required for the rest of this year. A good deal of this expenditure is at Grosse Isle. We had to keep the quarantine station at Grosse Isle open longer than usual in consequence of having had disease there very late in the season. After the ships cease running, we usually close the station, but a few people are left in the hospital or in quarantine and we have to keep the station open. We have also to make some expenditures with regard to the establishment of a quarantine station at Prince Rupert, B.C. We have had to spend $10,000 for a launch and the equipment for her and the requirements for the proper housing and keeping of her at the station. Then there were a number of small items at Grosse Isle. We had to get new ovens for the bakery and we were obliged, in consequence of a case of cholera there, to pay professors Adami and Vallee for bacteriological investigations. We have also installed telephone communication between different parts of the station.

Mr. BLAIN. How much did the launch cost?

Mr. FISHER. The launch, her accessories and delivery at Prince Rupert, cost about $10,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Where was she purchased?

Mr. FISHER. At Victoria, and she had to be sent up to Prince Rupert.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Did Mr. Kelly supply it?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember from whom we purchased the launch, but it was not from Mr. Kelly.

Mr. TALBOT. May I ask the minister if any representations have been made to his department as to the buildings at Grosse Isle in case of sickness or disease holding up passengers on the late boats in the fall of the year? I was told that while they were suitable enough during the summer they were not habitable in the fall.

Mr. FISHER. The statement of my hon. friend is partially true. We have been rather unfortunate for a couple of years back to have persons detained in quarantine late in the season at Grosse Isle, and while we endeavoured to keep the buildings as warm as possible, I found it necessary to ask the Minister of Public Works to provide an estimate for the erection of new buildings.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a special vote taken for this launch?

Mr. FISHER. It was paid for out of our regular vote for the maintenance of the quarantine station. We appointed a doctor at Prince Rupert and to enable him to get to the ships we had to provide him with a launch. That is one of the reasons why the regular vote is short for other services.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister explain last year when the vote was taken that part of it was for this launch?

Mr. FISHER. No. It is just as much a part of the work for which the vote was taken as the purchase of medicine or the appointing of an additional member to the staff if that were necessary. The vote was for maintenance and equipment of the station and the launch was required towards that end.

Mr. BLAIN. Under that idea the minister could appropriate the money voted for almost anything connected with the quarantine station?

Mr. FISHER. That is what the money is voted for.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to me that it is straining the matter to purchase a launch out of a general vote without explaining it to the committee.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). What is the total vote for the quarantine service?

Mr. FISHER. For the current fiscal year $130,000 is voted and we find it necessary to ask for $25,000 more. Last year the total expenditure was $138,000.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Some time ago when we were considering supplementary estimates, under the vote for exhibitions I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about the Winnipeg World's Fair, and he stated he would like to see the First Minister before answering. The right hon. gentleman is now in his place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question put by my hon. friend is as to whether or not the government has come to any conclusion on this subject?

Mr. HAGGART. (Winnipeg). Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to inform my hon. friend that the government has not come to any affirmative conclusion upon this matter.

Mr. STAPLES. When the right hon. gentleman returned to Winnipeg from the west, a special delegation—I do not know whether it was political or non-political —had a long interview with the Prime Minister, and would the right hon. gentleman have any objection to tell the House what he told that delegation with respect to this necessary appropriation for the World's fair. I believe the Prime Minister asked the province of Manitoba to put up two and a half million dollars on the understanding that if they succeeded he would supplement that with an equal amount. I believe that the delegation that waited on the Prime Minister have made provision for their share of the contribution, and surely the Prime Minister is prepared to carry out his promise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have a very distinct recollection that I met my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) in the west, but I do not remember that we ever talked over this matter. At the interview I had with regard to the exhibition I do not remember that I saw the hon. gentleman, and the information he has on the subject must be from hearsay. I have had so many interviews upon that subject that I do not know to which he refers, but I have no distinct recollection or vague recollection or any recollection at all that I committed myself or the government to the plan proposed.

Mr. STAPLES. I base my statement on a newspaper report which I am satisfied I could produce.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly.

Mr. STAPLES. It gives a full report of what took place at the interview in question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no doubt my hon. friend could get a report of this interview, but I shall be obliged to dispute any report which goes to show that I made a promise to the effect referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Would it be asking too much if I asked the Prime Minister when we may expect the government to come to a conclusion on that question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not too much to ask, but it is another thing to answer. I may say that personally I am very favourable to the idea of having an exhibition, but whether that exhibition should take place in 1914 as was suggested to me is a question that requires consideration. I do not know when my hon. friend may be able to have an exhibition, but I hope he may have it some time in the not too distant future.

Mr. SPROULE. It is important that the government should come to some conclusion a long time in advance so as to give a fair and full opportunity to the western people to make the necessary provision for such a large undertaking. The only reason why the minister might be reluctant to come to a decision is that he might not be there at the proper time to carry it out. That may be a good reason, and if so, we shall have to wait until the decision is made by some one who will be there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid I cannot allow this discussion to continue. There is no item before the Chair. It was only by courtesy that the hon. member for Winnipeg was allowed to bring the matter up.

Railways and canals, chargeable to capital —to increase railway accommodation at Campbellton, N.B., Governor General's warrant, $75,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, when the station buildings at Campbellton were burned in the fire which destroyed the town, the Governor General's warrant was issued for $250,000. We did not wait a moment to even advertise for tenders; we put our own staff at work. The result will be that we shall spend on new yards, roundhouses, and station, about $327.000. The loss at Campbellton, amounting to $76,000, we have provided for out of the revenue of this year. There is a little error in this item, and we shall have to ask for a supplementary vote later, as the total estimated cost will be $327,880.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I notice by the papers of to-day that another fire has taken place, this time at Truro. Has the minister the details?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the details yet. I think the loss is exaggerated in the newspapers. Our freight shed at Truro has been destroyed. It was not very valuable. We have a vote to build a new one. What the extent of the loss of freight is I do not know.

Railways and canals—collection of revenue —Intercolonial railway, further amount required, $250,000.

Mr. GRAHAM We took a vote of $9,000,000 for this year, thinking that would be sufficient; but we have been much more prosperous than we expected. Instead of earning $9,217,000, we expect to earn $10,000,000, and consequently, as on all railways, the cost of operation has been correspondingly increased.

Mr. PRICE I have reason to complain of the freight-car service of the Intercolonial. My company has several mills on the Intercolonial line, and we have had a great deal of trouble for a long time in getting cars. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Railways why it is that the freight car service is so bad.

Mr. GRAHAM. We labour under a difficulty on the Intercolonial that the larger railways do not. When the pulpwood season begins, our cars go to the United States. At the present time we have many cars across the line which we are trying to get back. The United States railway companies pay us 25 cents or 35 cents a day for each of these cars. We have several chasers after them now. The larger railways can keep even, because they bring back as many American cars as they have on the other side. Few American cars come to us. There has been a much larger traffic this year than we anticipated. While our usual renewal equipment amounts to $300,000, I am asking this year to make it $400,000 and possibly a little more. We hope next year to be in a better position to supply the car shortage than we are this year.

Mr. PRICE. I am afraid that this is the old story that we have been hearing for several years. This is not the only year in which there has been a shortage of freight cars. The same thing has gone on for many years, and there has been a great deal of complaint about it. The Minister of Railways has a particularly charming way of telling us what will be done in the future, but that will not put us off. What I want to know is, why can we not get a better service of cars? I understand what he says about cars carrying pulpwood being diverted to the United States, but why are they not brought back? If we do business with the Canadian Pacific railway or the Grand Trunk railway, or any other line that does business on a business basis, we can get cars. But the Intercolonial is not being managed on a proper basis. When I say that I do not say it in a political sense. It was badly run under the Conservatives, and it is badly run under the Liberals. What we want is a proper business management of that railway. I will illustrate the matter by a reference to our own business. We have to keep up a lot of lighters and tugs which we would do away with if we could get the Intercolonial Railway to do the business. I am not talking of a few thousand dollars of business which the railway has lost in this way. Why is this matter not looked into? I cannot see why, under proper business management, we cannot get better served with cars. At times when we put in a demand for cars, say at Rimouski, and say we want four a day, one day we may get two and the next day eight, then two days will elapse without our getting any, and then we may get three. The result is that not only are we left without cars on certain days and have too few or too many on other days, but we have to keep men on in case we should get the number of cars we require. That makes business more costly and makes it almost impossible to run the business properly. The minister should see that the Intercolonial railway is run in such a way as to give the greatest convenience and help to business people.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not agree with my hon. friend when he says the Intercolonial railway is not run in a business way. Of course he has the right to his own opinion, but my experience is that it is run as a business proposition just as much as the Grand Trunk railway or the Canadian Pacific railway. I leave it to my hon. friend himself. The Intercolonial railway is handicapped in this way. It has not an

international traffic as have the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway, but stops at Montreal. These other companies have as many cars on the American lines as the American companies have on theirs. Very few American cars, however come on the Intercolonial railway as we are not an international road. When the Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Pacific railway take a car over their line, they keep it to themselves; whereas we have a greater percentage of cars across the line which it is impossible to get back when we require them. They are kept by the American railways and these railways pay a certain amount per day as long as they chose to keep them.

Mr. LENNOX. How much does a freight car cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. A freight car costs about $1,100.

Mr. LENNOX. You get 25 cents a day for its use.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is an arrangement between all the companies by which they pay so much per day. I think it is 25 cents.

Mr. PRICE. Why not raise the rate to 50 cents?

Mr. GRAHAM. We used to have a rate of 50 cents, but the railway companies, through their interchange bureau, reduced the price.

Mr. PRICE. You had better change it.

Mr. GRAHAM. We cannot. All the railways charge the same rate. All these other railways retain as many foreign cars for their own use as they send out of their own over other lines, but the Intercolonial railway is not so situated as to be able to do that. The American cars seldom come to us although ours go to them, so that in this respect we are handicapped. We are, however, making efforts to overcome that difficulty and are buying additional rolling stock this year. If my hon. friend will give specific cases, I shall try to remedy the grievances complained of, for I am just as anxious as he can possibly be that the best facilities should be afforded people to do business with us.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think there is a good deal in what my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Price) says. I had considerable confidence in the Minister of Railways' ability to work out a new system, but only yesterday or the day before he received a letter which makes me doubt whether he has really been doing all he could in the interests of the Intercolonial railway. He has the original letter in his department, but I have here a copy which I propose to read, and I would like him to tell me whether he thinks, on reading that letter, that he has been doing his duty:

Red Pine P. O.
Gloucester Co., N.B.

Dear Sir,—I feel it my deauty to write to you For such a specification for ties. I dond think you are as bright as you might bee. You must think these people down hear are fools, where would you fine any timber that is clear of nots worme holes and chekks that is going to be worked into ties at 23c. a peace. Our union wont and that settles this part of the country. You dident say in your specification whether we should hawl them ties in a spring waggon or not and you dident say wheather we should have sent a full size photograf or a tintipe, please state in your next specification. You needent tell us to see the member, what he noes about ties dont ammount to shucks. Tell us what color you want them painted and what cind of trimmings you want on the stack. How much rent do we have to pay per month until you settle up, do you want the corners of them ties champerd and gilted or not. I would supose they would haf to be maid on a bright suny day, and if they get any dirt onto them would ivory soap be fit to wash them of, if not please state in your next. Meby it would be a good plan to have a shedd put over them ties.

We are all prety wel, hoping this will find you and the member likewise.

Yours truly,
THE SECRETARY,
Gloucester Farmers Union.
New Brunswick.

Answer soon.
Mister Graham,
Minister I.C.R. railway and ceterry.
8 oct. 1909.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is meant by the sitting member in that letter? Is that the member representing the county?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Railways should have some recollection of an important letter of that kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to be an advertisement for Ivory soap.

Mr. BLAIN. If it is, the minister had better refer it to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). Would he also explain what the sitting member for the county has to do with the Intercolonial in respect of the purchase of ties.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be difficult to explain something that has no existence.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to read a copy of a letter which I have received with regard to the service on the Intercolonial railway. It is written to Mr. Rippey, superintendent of the car service at Moncton, N.B.:

Quebec, March 9-21, 1911.

Dear Sir,—We have written you previously to this regarding our service here, and we wish particularly to draw your attention to

the fact that we have at the present moment contracts for 800 to 1,000 tons which have to be shipped between now and the 30th of March. You will understand that we are shipping pulp to United States points, and at the moment there is a scarcity of ground wood pulp.

Immediately the thaw begins there will be lots of water and lots of ground wood pulp in the States, and unless we can ship by the above-mentioned date, these contracts will be absolutely and irrevocably cancelled, and we will lose the business and you also will lose the hauling. We would, therefore, ask you to immediately rush us in, some how or another, enough cars to ship this 800 to 1,000 tons. Most of this pulp is going to Berlin, N.H., and we understand that the Grand Trunk railway will supply cars to this point.

We have to-day written the Grand Trunk railway about it in the hope that they will do their utmost to get cars to us for this shipment. This car service is frightfully important to us, as you will understand, and we would be much obliged if you would give it your immediate attention.

Yours truly,
PRICE-PORRITT,
Pulp and Paper Company.

There is a case in point.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend (Mr Price) will let me have a copy of that, I will have it looked into immediately.

Mr. PRICE. With pleasure. During the winter months, the price of pulp generally goes up because the mills in the United States are not able to grind, but as soon as the water rises in the spring, the United States mills begin to grind, and the price goes down. So, it is a great object for shippers in Canada to get their pulp sold and away before the high waters come. But the mills situated on the Intercolonial railway cannot get cars to ship out pulp, so, instead of netting $15, $17 or $18 a ton, we shall have to ship at a time when we net about $12 a ton. That is a hard case. I think the minister ought to consider the matter, and that, in a special case like this, cars should be furnished.

Mr. HENDERSON. I confess, I was a good deal surprised at the statement of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) that the Intercolonial railway constantly had about 4,000 cars in the United States. It does seem as if some system could be devised by which these cars could be got back more regularly. The hon. member from Quebec (Mr. Price) has complained that the Intercolonial railway is not being run on business principles. I do not know exactly to what he refers, or what suggestion he would make to enable the Minister of Railways to get back these cars; but I do know that other railways make strong efforts, when cars are wanted, to get those cars for their customers. On one occasion, I went to a director of the Canadian Pacific railway complaining about the want of cars and urging him to get a supply. He gave me a letter to the superintendent telling him to get this man whatever cars he wanted—to beg, borrow or steal them. I do not think he begged them or that he stole them, but I think he borrowed them—perhaps without leave. But immediately we got an abundant supply of cars. I would suggest to the minister that he adopt such a plan. I believe that other railways in Canada are using his cars. I notice where I live, west of Toronto, Intercolonial railway cars are sometimes on the track. What kind of freight can they be carrying?

Mr. REID (Grenville). When?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, but I cannot imagine what kind of freight they are carrying from the Intercolonial railway to that point; certainly not pulp.

Mr. GRAHAM. Fish.

Mr. HENDERSON. As I say, it seems to me that other roads in Canada are using Intercolonial railway cars, and that it is not necessary to go to the United States to secure cars. But, if a strong effort was made, surely some system could be devised by which these cars would be got back more promptly, and patrons of the Intercolonial railway not compelled to lose business for the lack of cars. This certainly goes far to explain why the Intercolonial railway has not been the success we hoped it would be. I think the minister would be justified in taking an estimate to double his supply of cars, unless he can devise a plan to get back his cars from other roads.

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). I think I am safe in saying that the grievance complained of by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Price) and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), is not confined to the Intercolonial railway. I cannot speak as to the Canadian Pacific railway, but I know that on our branch of the Grand Trunk railway at certain seasons it is absolutely impossible to get cars for love or money. Sometimes you get one a day when five or six are wanted, other days three or four, and so on. I fancy this is a grievance common to all railways during the season when the freight offering is heaviest.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understood the Minister of Railways to say that a freight car similar to those used in hauling pulp costs over $1,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. They cost about $1,100 each, if I recollect aright.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And the minister allows them to wander all over the country at 25 cents a day, or something less than $100 a year? Is that the maximum price he can charge? The reason I ask is, that

in the business in which I am engaged, the Grand Trunk railway or the Michigan Central railway will charge us up $1 a day for cars that are held for more than a certain length of time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Demurrage.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the other roads using Intercolonial railway cars can be charged a maximum rate, it would seem to be wise for the Intercolonial railway to fix the rate at a figure that would yield at least reasonable interest on the money. The life of a car is comparatively short, and, at 25 cents a day, it might be advantageous for any road to take cars and keep them for any length of time instead of building cars of their own.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the Intercolonial railway had the making of the price, that could be done. But all the railways agree on a certain rate which they charge one another. If the cars of other railways come on the Intercolonial railway, we can keep them at the same price. But you could not run a railway for twenty-four hours without entering into this arrangement, because your cars would not be taken on any other line. I think the price is too small, but it is the price paid and charged by the other roads, and we have to accept it. As I pointed out to a railway man the other day, they can keep our cars at loss to us, and a gain to themselves. We have men out now trying to find our cars and rush them back.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand that when a car is billed to a certain point, the railway that receives it can make use of it for the carriage of goods all over its lines?

Mr. GRAHAM. Take, for instance, an Intercolonial car going to Chicago. Of course, they are not going to haul that car back empty. They will take it to one place and keep it, perhaps, a week, to another place and keep it for a few days, and so on, when they ought to bring it back more promptly.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I understand that the system is, that if an Intercolonial railway car is billed, say to London with a load of goods, routed by the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific railways, as soon as it is unloaded it must be returned to the Intercolonial railway. But they have the right to load it with goods going, let us say, to Kingston or other point east of London, and at Kingston it may be loaded for some other point further east, but I understand that it must not travel west, but must travel continuously only on the way back to the owners. The same applies to American cars. We unload them every day at our place, but we cannot use them to ship goods to any point east; they have to go back to the bridge, but they can carry freight for points between Gananoque and the bridge. We sometimes need cars to send goods eastward, and there are American cars there, but the Grand Trunk railway people tell us that these cars are not allowed to be sent to Brockville or other points east.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has the essence of the arrangement. They load from Gananoque west to Kingston. It will stand there a day or two before being loaded and then perhaps they load it and send it to Napanee and it may be kept a month for what should be a three or four days' straight run.

Mr. PRICE. A few weeks ago cars on the Intercolonial railway from Quebec down were ordered to be sent to Sydney, and we could hardly get any cars on points below Quebec. Is there any reason why Sydney should get the advantage over other points? Is there any reason why Sydney people should be able to ship when other people cannot?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure whether the Sydney people have an arrangement to get so many cars each day or not. They are steady shippers and may have such an arrangement but I do not think they have any special contract and are not more entitled to receive cars than my hon. friend.

Mr. PRICE. Could the minister give some assurance that if other people would give daily shipments, taking so many cars per day, the government would contract to supply those cars? If that could be done there are several other shippers who would be glad to enter into contracts of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend will write me a note I will take the matter up with the traffic department and have them enter into correspondence with him.

Mr. BLAIN. The fact that 4,000 Intercolonial cars are allowed to go out of the country at 25 cents a day is a fair subject for criticism, particularly as the hon. member for Quebec-West has stated that in many cases in his own large business he has applied for cars and has not been able to get them. Would the minister state what proportion 4,000 is to the number of cars on the line and the average earnings of each car and what amounts my hon. friend has paid for the use of cars from other lines?

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall get that information.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like some information with regard to the arrangements for reserving Pullman berths on the Intercolonial at Montreal. I have heard that the arrangements there have not been satis-

factory and an experience of mine would seem to confirm this. On December 15, I wrote from here to Montreal asking for a reservation for the 18th but at Montreal on the 18th I was informed that there was no reservation, that no letter had been received, and that there was no berth available. After some argument during which I stated that I was a member of parliament and would bring the matter up in the House I was told to go on the car and provision would be made and in fact I secured a lower berth. I afterwards received a letter from the agent stating that my letter was not received until the 19th. I cannot imagine that a letter would take four days to get to Montreal. It would look as if the system was a bad one and needed revision.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the first complaint I have ever heard. We have all had similar experiences on other railways and as to getting a berth after going on the car that has been my experience three times out of four between here and Toronto; some one who had reserved a berth would not turn up. The reserving of berths has been more abused by the people than by the railways and I am afraid that members of parliament have not been the least guilty as they would reserve berths on the chance that they might travel. The railways agreed among themselves that if they did not receive the money with the reservation, the reservation would be cancelled at 5 o'clock. My hon. friend's whole complaint is that the man in charge at Montreal told him an untruth in a letter.

Mr. JAMESON. I did not make that charge at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. The man said the letter did not arrive until the 19th and my hon. friend says he cannot believe that is true. If the man's statement was correct the whole complaint of my hon. friend falls. I have had a letter take four days going from the House of Commons to Brockville. If my hon. friend has any further complaint and will let me have it I shall investigate it.

Mr. JAMESON. I am not making a complaint of my own, but I think if the travelling public have any rights on the Intercolonial railway the minister should not treat this matter so flippantly. The position of the matter is that application was made to the Intercolonial railway for a reservation. I was informed that the application had to be transferred to the Grand Trunk office, and that the delay occurred or was liable to occur in that way. It may be that the letter did not reach there until the 19th, although it was written and mailed on the 15th. But, that is not the cause of complaint; the cause of complaint is simply this, that there appears to be a certain amount of red tape which causes delay in the receipt of applications and which, of course, results in inconvenience to the people who make application ahead. It is all very well for the minister to say that railways are not obliged to reserve berths, but so long as that system is in vogue we might as well recognize it as the condition. If the Intercolonial railway does not reserve berths that is the end of it, nobody is hurt and everybody should know it. But, when we know there is a practice of that sort it does not seem to me that it is right to have any delay in the securing of these berths. I was informed that it was not an infrequent thing to have difficulty of that sort. I know as well as the minister does that frequently a man will get on a train without knowing that he is going to get a berth, and get one afterwards, but I have never had the experience of going to an office, applying for a berth, being told that there was absolutely none and that it was not worth my while to get on the train and then being afterwards told that if I got on the train I would be provided for. I would like the minister to see if there is any hitch in the arrangements down there and let me know at a later date.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must confess that my experience of the post office of the House of Commons is a little different from that of the Minister of Railways and Canals. I rather think that the minister is hardly fair to the officers of the House of Commons post office. I have always found them very obliging and very prompt. Even if a letter was handed in at the very last minute, perhaps almost at the close of the mail, in fact, after the mail has been made up, they have been obliging enough to send a special messenger down in order to see that it would go. My experience of the House of Commons post office has been very satisfactory with regard to the sending out of letters. I think the minister is labouring under some mistake.

Mr. GRAHAM. Very probably.

Civil Government—Department of Customs —Contingencies—Clerical and other assistance —Further amount required, $1,500.

Mr. PATERSON. This additional amount is required to meet the salaries of the extra clerks who have been engaged during the past year.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that all the explanation?

Mr. PATERSON. That is all the explanation except you want me to give the names of the officers who have been employed. We found we had to have some

extra help. There is a provision in the Civil Service Act by which, on asking the commissioners, we can get some extra help put on.

Mr. BLAIN. Had they passed the Civil Service examination?

Mr. PATERSON. We have nothing to do with that. We simply tell the commissioners that we want an extra officer, they designate him, and their designation of him puts him on without any action on our part at all. If, within six months, his services are found not to be acceptable to the deputy, he is relieved of the office, and immediately the commissioners are asked to give us a new officer.

Customs—Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion—Further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This takes in all the ports in the Dominion. We had hoped that we had estimated for enough last year, but we found that so great has been the increase of business that we have had in some cases to open new ports and in other cases to engage additional help. We will require this $25,000 to enable us to square up at the end of the current year.

Civil Government—Department of Public Works—Contingencies—Further amount required, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure under this head up to the 30th January, 1911, was $12,321.66. It is estimated there will be a further expenditure of $2,700 for February and to the end of this month. Then there have been some extra clerks and draughtsmen at an expenditure of $1,478.34, making a total assumed expenditure to the 31st March of $16,500. The appropriation was only $15,500, so we require the additional $1,000 to cover the balance.

Public Works—Chargeable to capital—Public buildings—Ottawa Dominion Archives building—Further amount required, $2,341.68.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to settle a claim which the contractor, Mr. McGillivray, had in connection with the Dominion Archives building. The total claim was $6,140.64. It was referred to the architects and also discussed with the contractor's solicitor, and after a great deal of consideration the architects allowed $2,341.68, and this is to pay that amount.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this outside of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was claimed to be additional work or extra work and the total claim was $6,140.64.

Mr. CROCKET. What does that make the total cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building cost $116,861.67, and this would be in addition to that amount. It would make it altogether $119,203.35.

Mr. DANIEL. How long is it since the building has been finished?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must have been finished for over a year.

Mr. DANIEL. Why has this claim come in so late?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The claim was made in January, 1907, but it has been in dispute, and finally the contractor who claimed $6.140 reluctantly consented to accept $2,341 in settlement.

Mr. LENNOX. Who was the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. McGillivray.

Mr. LENNOX. A reliable man, I presume?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told a very reliable man.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a suit?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Splendid work is being done by the archives department, and I understand the building will soon be insufficient. Has the minister considered an extension of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I recognize that the building is pretty well occupied and no doubt we will have to consider the matter of extending it later on, but we have not done so yet.

Port Arthur and Fort William harbour and river improvements, additional dredging, $267,422.27.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an appropriation last session of $900,000 for dredging, and building a breakwater, and revetment wall along the Mission river. $380,000 was allotted for the work at Fort William, but this was found to be insufficient and the dredging was stopped until the matter could be considered by council. There were most urgent representations made by the people of Fort William and by the Grand Trunk Pacific that the work should be carried on as rapidly as possible. In consideration of the national importance of the work the government recommended to His Excellency to pass an order in council allowing an extension, and work was done to the amount of $257,422 for which we are now asking.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The people of Fort William say that they might as well dump the elevators into the lake if reciprocity goes through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, that is a mistake. Fort William is enthusiastic for reciprocity

and looks forward to an enormous increase of traffic from the west through that port.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And Port Arthur as well?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. What ground has the minister for that statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I heard it recently from one of the most reliable citizens of Port Arthur whom I met in Ottawa, and from another whom I met in Toronto.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The board of trade does not say so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You cannot always rely upon what a board of trade may resolve.

Mr. BLAIN. Were these gentlemen interested in the dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all, they were just interested in the prosperity of both cities.

Mr. DANIEL. Was this money owing to the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Why was it not provided for last session?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We thought the vote taken last session would pay for all the work that could fairly be done during the year, but the contractors put on an additional large dredge and they got along more rapidly than we anticipated. I think they had 7 dredges on the work last season.

Mr. DANIEL. What are they paid per cubic yard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is eleven cents but I will make sure of that before we come to the main estimates.

Mr. CROCKET. To what depth is dredging being done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Dredging is being done to a depth of 25 feet.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Who are the contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Great Lakes dredging company.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Last session I called the attention of the minister to a report that the scows carrying the material from the dredges were counted as being filled when they were only partially filled. Did the minister investigate that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not follow that because a barge goes away partly filled it is returned as filled. The instructions to the resident engineers which are repeated to the inspectors, are, that they must be careful to estimate as accurately as possible the quantity contained in the barges. My hon. friend will see from the return that some of these barges are returned as carrying away less than their capacity. We have placed the work of dredging more especially under the care of Mr. Dufresne, assistant chief engineer, who has been a long time in the department, and in whom we have the greatest possible confidence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The statement was made that many of these barges carried away only a few yards of material dumped in the bottom, and that the men who had charge of checking the quantities were receiving very small wages and might be influenced. I now understand from the minister that he has made no investigation whatever.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was not my hon. friend to give me some details?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then it would be impossible for me to investigate as to the past, but I have taken precautions as to the future. I do not think my hon. friend gave any evidence that barges which went away not fully loaded were returned as such.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister could have made inquiry from his inspectors.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the inspectors were guilty they would not be likely to confess it. We have taken every possible precaution when scow measurement is allowed for. We have compelled the inspectors to be constantly on the work and to make a solemn declaration that they have been. We require the engineers to give them complete instructions as to the mode of measurement, and the resident engineer or his assistant are pretty constantly about the work, too.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What salary do you pay the inspectors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Port Arthur and Fort William we pay $4 per day. That is considerably more than we pay in the east. West of the Great Lakes we have to pay higher wages.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the minister not call the attention of the resident engineer to the statement made by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong)?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not recollect doing so, but when we come to the main estimates, I will get that information. My hon. friend will remember that it was only a rumour, on hearsay. He did not give the name.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It was a rumour, but I got it from a reliable source.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood the minister to say that the Great Lakes Dredging Company had been more expeditious with their work than he had antici-

pated, and consequently the money ran short. Is the committee to understand that the minister is under any obligation to keep this company supplied with work, even though they increase the number of their dredges? Is there any understanding with the company that they are to have unlimited employment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. We are under no obligation to give additional work to the dredging company, but the company early in the season placed upon the work a very powerful suction dredge, for the purpose of removing the material by hydraulic action and depositing it behind the proposed revetment wall. That was for the purpose of filling in and making ground which would be used in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific terminals. That was very necessary work. Of course, it would be of no advantage to the public to have that material taken out into the lake; it is better to be used there. That dredge, added to the others which the company had already, did a great deal of work, and got ahead more rapidly than we had anticipated. In September, I think, we gave orders to the resident engineer to stop the company dredging, because the appropriation was exhausted. At once the people of Fort William, and especially those connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, Mr. Chamberlin, the general manager, and Mr. Hays, the president, communicated with me, representing that it was all important that this work should go ahead. They complained that vessels going to the elevator would be obliged still to go to the Kaministiquia river by a roundabout course. These representations so impressed me, that, in the public interest, as well as in justice to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, as they are paying out millions of dollars in the creation of one of the most magnificent systems of terminals in the world, instead of stopping the work and having these dredges stand idle during a part of the working season, I presented the whole case to council, and authority was given to me to have the work continued to the end of the season, the contractors agreeing to wait until parliament made the necessary appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the company paid first for taking out the material, and then for depositing it behind the revetment wall? Would there be two payments, or only one?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only one.

Mr. CROCKET. Before the contract was let, was there an estimate from the resident engineer of the total quantities of dredging that would be required?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the estimate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that here, but it ran into several millions. I will have it when we are asking for the amount in the main estimates.

Mr. CROCKET. This contract has been running for several years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it the intention to continue it during the coming season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. There is a great deal of work still to be done there. A certain area to be dredged is shown on the plan. It includes a turning basin several acres in extent, a channel to the elevators of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and widening and deepening the Mission river. When the work is done there will be 18 miles of water frontage at Fort William, with a depth ultimately of 25 feet of water; there will be a channel leading from the Mission river to the elevators of the Grand Trunk Pacific, capable of taking in the largest lake steamers, and there will be a turning basin covering an area of some 30 acres. The Grand Trunk elevator is designed, when the different units are completed, to have a capacity of 30,000,000 bushels. It will be one of the finest elevators to be found anywhere.

Mr. DANIEL. How late in the season is dredging kept up there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Till about the first of December.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many firms are doing the dredging work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only one at Fort William.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Have they a running contract for the whole thirty acres?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And their contract covers that stated area?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. For years to come?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The quantity is shown, and when they get done with that quantity, their contract will be completed.

Mr. BLAIN. How many dredges do the government own now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between 30 and 40.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they building more every year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are building two this year.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the dredging done by government-owned dredges, or by contract the cheaper to the country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends a good deal on circumstances.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the circumstances?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose the government dredge is at work and it meets with an accident, the machinery breaks down, entailing a good deal of expenditure on repairs, that is charged up to operating during the season. In some cases some contractors do the work at a low price as compared with the price charged by other contractors. It is a matter of comparison. If my hon. friend will take the return of the government dredging in the report, he will find that it costs considerably more in some cases to remove spoil than in others. It is pretty difficult to tell which is the cheaper system, but the department believes that it is cheaper to do the work by government dredges, than by contract.

Mr. BLAIN. What do the employees do in the winter season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We dispense with their services with the exception of one or two who work about overhauling the plant.

Mr. STAPLES. I am pleased to learn that the Minister of Public Works believes in completing a piece of work which he has begun, because ever since I came to the House and ever since the minister has been in his place, I have been calling his attention to a piece of work undertaken on Lake Manitoba just when the election of 1904 was on. The government jumped in with a great rush and expended some $15,000 on that work; but once the election was over and they did not get their candidate returned they ceased having any more work done there, and the undertaking remained in an unfinished condition. $15,000 of the people's money have therefore been put into a wharf which is now of no value because it is not completed and cannot be used. The people of that district asked the department to complete the work in order that the large expenditure made would not be utterly wasted, but so far there has been no appropriation in any of the estimates. I called the minister's attention to this last year and he promised to look into it but so far he has done nothing. Last year he was up in Manitoba and I would like to know whether he then looked into that matter and whether he intends to make any appropriation to complete this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I was up in Manitoba I had a good many representations made to me as to the necessity of certain public works, but I had none made by anybody with respect to this particular work to which my hon. friend refers. Nobody suggested that it was necessary to do any more there. On the contrary the officials of my department informed me that the work is completed so far as is necessary in the public interest. My hon. friend would not ask me to uselessly spend the public money because it had been originally contemplated that certain additional work should be done. Except when my hon. friend spoke of it in parliament, I have had no request from anybody to have the work done.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Of what public interest is the work as it stands?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a wharf and a landing and some dredging and it gives the public reasonable accommodation. That is the information I have. Would the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) tell me what good purposes would be served by doing this additional work.

Mr. STAPLES. The people of that particular locality cannot get to that piece of work until more dredging is done. If they could get to it, they would ship not only fish but wood and agricultural produce from that point. If the minister will look into his department, he will find a petition there asking that the work be completed, so that when he says that there was no request made for its completion he is not stating the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said during the past year.

Mr. STAPLES. Let me tell the minister that the people in that part of the constituency of Macdonald have faith in my ability to present the facts, and I have presented them every year since the hon. gentleman has been Minister of Public Works. What more does the hon. gentleman want? Does he want a petition from some Liberal organization? If that is what he wants I might be able to secure it for him, but I do not think he should depend entirely upon any Liberal organization such as existed when this work began for reliable facts as to what is necessary to be done. There are $15,000 of the public money absolutely of no use unless this work be completed.

Mr. BLAIN. I would have expected that the hon. minister, when touring in Manitoba, would have taken some interest in this public work and have called on my hon. friend from Macdonald, or requested him to look over the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He did not invite me out.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has been doing his whole duty in this House. Whenever this

matter of dredging was before the committee he made plain his request. The minister now states that his department reports that the work is completed. I prefer to take the statement of my hon. friend who represents the county, and I am very much surprised that the minister should have, when out in the west, allowed this public work to go absolutely unnoticed. Might I ask him what kind of a request it is he requires? He does not say that the work is either necessary or unnecessary, but his sole excuse is that he has not been asked to do anything. Surely that is not a reasonable excuse. For myself, I think it is only fair that, when a request of this kind is made year after year on the floor of the House, the minister should see to it that this work is looked into to learn whether it is in the interest of the public, so that he could say frankly and fairly to the committee whether this further expenditure that is proposed would be in the public interest or not. If the officers have reported on it, I suppose they have said either that the further expenditure is required or that the work is completed in a way to serve the district for whose benefit it is undertaken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) see that he is taking a little different course from that he has hitherto taken in this House? On some occasions when I have been obliged reluctantly to say that I have done a particular work on the recommendation of a certain member of the House, my hon. friend and other hon. members on that side have attacked me, and said that I should take the opinion, not of a member of the House, but of the officials of my department. In this case, I have had the matter looked into, and the officials of my department, who are responsible for the information they give, state that it is not necessary in the public interest to extend the work any further. Under these circumstances, much as I respect my hon. friend (Mr. Staples), much as I would like to meet his views—and he is always so kind that it would be a pleasure to meet his views—yet, I would not be justified in making this further expenditure.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister say that I, as a member of the committee, ever said it was not a proper policy to listen to the requests of members of parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood the hon. member to say——

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I recollected my hon. friend criticising my action in taking the advice of a member of this House—

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Particularly if he was a friend of the government.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not propose, on this occasion, as on former occasions, to be shunted off by the Minister of Public Works getting up and throwing a little taffy across at me. I am serious in this matter, and the people I represent are serious; and I should appreciate it very much if the minister would be a little more serious than he appears to be in discussing this work. I do not know what is contained in the report of the engineers of which he speaks, but I state as I know them to exist. Until a certain amount of money is spent there, the $15,000 already spent is absolutely of no use to the public. When the minister says that this is in the interest of the public, I am satisfied that he is not correctly advised. I hope that before the session closes, when further supplementary estimates come down, there will be an appropriation to complete this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to call on the deputy minister, that gentleman will be glad to show him the report. When on a previous occasion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) criticised me for not having made this additional expenditure, the report of his remarks was sent to the resident engineer, who then looked into the matter, and reported that in his judgment it would not be in the public interest to expend the money asked for.

Mr. STAPLES. Then, I am to understand that the $15,000 spent there has been a waste of money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I did not say that, but that it is not necessary to spend more.

Mr. STAPLES. If that piece of work is not utilized for any purpose so to speak, the money must be wasted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is always interesting to listen to the Minister of Public Works on a question such as this of which he has practically no official knowledge—for, if he had knowledge of it, he would not make the statement he has made. He tells us that his engineer in charge reports to him that no further expenditure is necessary because the work fulfils the object the original expenditure was made for. When I tell you that this wharf—which is within a few miles of the southern edge of my constituency—is unapproachable by a boat carrying any freight, and unapproachable by land, I do not see how the minister can say that the work is meeting the public requirements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What would the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) suggest in the way of a connection between the wharf and the land?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would suggest that some dredging be done in the first place, so that boats can get up to the wharf, and I would suggest that the wharf be continued on to hard and dry land. If these two things were done the wharf could be utilized. At present, the case is exactly as stated by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples)—$15,000 of the peoples' money has been absolutely thrown away unless a few thousand more is spent to perfect the work. When perfected, as my hon. friend has stated, the wharf would be utilized for shipping fish, grain and cordwood. It would be a work worthy of the greatest consideration by the minister, but, as it now stands, it is a monument either to folly or to what might be called political crassness.

Mr. HENDERSON. I presume that this matter is disposed of. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to another subject, not involving $15,000 but of somewhat the same character as that brought to the minister's notice by the hon. member for Macdonald. The hon. minister will remember that about five or six weeks ago I sent him a communication from William Sargent, of Bronte, in the county of Halton, drawing attention to the fact that the wharf at Bronte was sadly in need of repairs. Mr. Sargent is the chief shipper at that wharf, and has been obliged himself to do some replanking in order to make the wharf safe for him to go upon. The letter also draws attention to the fact that some dredging is necessary to enable a vessel, even of light draught, to get into the harbour. Since the present government came into power, they have expended about $33,000 in the construction of that wharf and in dredging the harbour. But, unless some slight expenditure is made now, that property will be of no value. I do not think it will cost very much to do some replanking and a slight amount of dredging. The vessel which this man uses will bring in about 500 tons of coal. He found it necessary to allow the vessel to lie outside until partly unloaded, which was very inconvenient. I am sure that the minister, for all that it would cost, is willing to meet the case. I do not know what the expense would be, but I think if the hon. minister would refer the matter to the resident engineer at Toronto, he would quickly give an estimate of the amount, and I do not think the minister would hesitate to do what was necessary in repairs and dredging at this harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make inquiry as to a report from the resident engineer. If the hon. member (Mr. Henderson), will be good enough to call my attention to it when the main estimates are going through I will give him the answer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do I understand the minister to say that, after he received my letter, he——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sent it to the chief engineer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then, he may have the engineer's report. If I am in the House when the main estimates come up, I will draw his attention to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And if the hon. member (Mr. Henderson), should not be here I will ask the deputy minister to inform him what the engineer's report is.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I did not catch the answer of the minister to the few remarks I made with regard to that wharf. I would like to know from the minister, assuming the matter to be as I have stated, whether he would perfect the work so that it can be used.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The most I can say is that I will ask the deputy minister to look into the matter again for further consideration, of course, always keeping in mind the report already sent by the resident engineer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the report of the resident engineer is looked at, I think it will be found that what the member for Macdonald and I say is borne out. If that is the case, can we depend on having the work completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me ask my hon. friend this: Was not there some understanding, when this work was laid out, that the Canadian Northern were going to build a spur or branch down to the proposed wharf?

Mr. STAPLES. The Canadian Northern have always been prepared to extend their spur to this wharf as soon as the government shows any sign of completing the work. But a railway would go wrong, in my opinion—and, I think, in the opinion of any man of business—to build a line to a work of this kind before the work was completed. I have been told by the people there that the Canadian Northern has always advised the municipality that they were prepared to do their part of the work provided the government would do theirs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The deputy minister informs me that the Canadian Northern have never made any such communication to my department.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not remember the wording of the petition to which I re-

ferred, but I think it stated that the Canadian Northern had advised the municipality that they were prepared to build to the wharf, provided the wharf was completed. If my memory serves me well, the minister promised me last year that he would send his engineer there and make a resurvey of the wharf. Did he send his engineer there during the summer according to promise?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I think I stated was, that I would have the resident engineer made acquainted with the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Staples), and that the resident engineer would be asked for a further report. That was done—the 'Hansard' report of my hon. friend's report were sent to the resident engineer, Mr. Dufresne, and Mr. Dufresne took the matter up again and made a report that he did not think it would be in the public interest to make this further expenditure.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. mimister will remember an application made in reference to a work at Big Bay Point, sometimes called Peninsula Park on Kempenfeldt bay or Lake Simcoe. Mr. Claxton a worthy gentleman, though belonging to the political party of the Minister of Public Works, has written the minister on many occasions. It is a place where a wharf is very much needed. I think the minister has made some investigation and I would remind him of this work and ask him to see if it is possible to have the work gone on with this seaon. I am led to believe that the minister entertained the proposition favourably. There is a large summer travel there, it is a beautiful place, and this wharf would accommodate not only many summer visitors, but also a large and thriving agricultural district. The work would not be expensive as there is deep water quite near the shore.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will ask the deputy to see if the report has been made.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would again call the attention of the hon. minister to the unsatisfactory condition of the wharf at Petawawa, I have pointed out to him on several occasions that it was impossible for the steamer to land there safely during low water. Last summer the district engineer, Mr. Corriveau, and I looked over the ground, but I have had no intimation as to whether the department intends making any improvements there. It would appear to be a matter of either dredging the river, because a sand bar runs out at one end of the dock, or extending the dock out 50 or 75 feet so that the boat could use the north channel. The Slide and Boom Company sort their logs where the dock is situated and they have to haul in their boom to allow the boats to pass which causes loss of time to the boom company, as well as inconvenience to the navigation company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineer made an examination I presume in consequence of the representations made of the last session. I shall ask the deputy to see if Mr. Corriveau has made a report and shall then give the matter my best consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister will recollect that previous to the election in 1908, he had a dredge working at Swan Creek, a few miles north of the wharf I spoke of. Work ceased two days after the election and as far as I know has not been resumed. Is there any reason why that work was left undone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot call the matter to mind, but I will have it looked into.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can the minister offer any reason for the cessation of that work and will it be gone on with until completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot remember that it has been brought to my personal notice, but I will look into it and see when it was undertaken, and why it was stopped.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Last year I called attention to the dredging at the mouth of Mossy river at the mouth of Lake Winnipegosis. The work was done in a very poor way. The minister informed me he was sending his engineer there and that he realized the requirements of the people, that the mouth of the creek had to be kept open to facilitate navigation into Lake Winnipegosis. I do not know of any work being done there since.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the information looked up and when we come to the dredging vote for Manitoba it will be my duty to give the information.

Mr. CAMPBELL. At the mouth of Pine creek, 35 miles from the mouth of Mossy river, sand is deposited in the lake in time of storm to such an extent that the mouth of the creek is almost blocked. The Hudson Bay post and the Pine Creek mission transact all their freighting business by boat, and if the dredge from Lake Winnipegosis was sent out for a week twice a year it would facilitate freighting, both for the Hudson Bay Company and the people resident there and the Indian school.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I remember receiving a petition from the Indian mission and some merchants asking that dredging at Pine creek be done. I had it referred in the ordinary way to the resident engineer, but I have not seen the report yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister will remember a cut made by his department in the Assiniboine river near Rat Portage, in

the year 1908, on which work ceased the day after the election. Is that work completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that work was completed. Everything that was contemplated was done and I have understood the work is likely to be very successful.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister will also remember that last summer at the request of certain petitioners through myself, he had the matter of another cut in the river further down looked into by an engineer. He will remember my stating that his engineer made inquiries quite as earnestly about the political complexion of those to be served as about the real usefulness of the work and, that on getting an adverse report in that regard he recommended that no work of this character be done. I gave the name to the minister at the time and he promised to look into it. Would the minister say what his report is?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember as to that, but my hon. friend, having called attention to it, I will see if there is any communication on the subject. Certainly, I would like to know the name of the engineer.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I gave the name.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was he a civil engineer, and was he connected with the department?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand he was quite civil to the gentlemen he encountered there. His name was Mr. Stevens: I do not know what his professional qualifications are, but they seemed to be very largely political.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a Mr. Stevens in the office at Winnipeg.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister tell me how many dredges were employed on the work at Port Arthur during this last summer, and how many thousand yards they took out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were seven different dredges in the fleet of the Great Lakes Dredging Company. I do not know if I can give my hon. friend the quantity taken out by each dredge, but I will get that. Would it make any difference if I gave it to him when my main estimates come up? Of course, it is in the Auditor General's Report, but I shall put it in a succinct form for him.

Mr. SPROULE. It would not be in the Auditor General's Report for the present year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. I will get it for the hon. gentleman for this year as far as the returns show it.

Mr. MEIGHEN.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to get that because I have a few observations regarding this matter. It has reference to a subject that I discussed at some length last year. If I remember correctly the amount of money voted for dredging at Port Arthur last year was over-expended by—was it $400,000 or $600,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not just remember the amount, but it was considerable.

Mr. SPROULE. It was nearly $2 for every dollar that was voted. Parliament has an object in voting money. Its object is to vote sufficient for the needs of each particular work, and yet not to vote too much. The minister is supposed to have sufficient data to justify his recommending to council that an appropriation of a given amount be voted for a particular work, and it is supposed to be sufficient to carry on the work during the year. That was done in this case, but the expenditure on the work was $400,000 or $600,000 more than was voted. That is a very pernicious, a very unsafe and a very improper system. The minister could not justify it upon the ground of urgent need. It was not on the ground that parliament was reluctant to give him the amount of money which he asked for to be expended upon that work because parliament did not refuse it, and in so far as I am aware, no one would have objected if the minister had asked for twice the amount to be expended that year. There was something wrong about the government, or the government's officials, or otherwise they would have ascertained more closely than they did just how much they needed. But we have this example of a very improper and dangerous practice of the government spending nearly twice as much as parliament voted. Parliament did not vote the money, but the government spent it all the same. When the discussion took place I said what I repeat now, that parliament would not have been at all reluctant to have voted twice the amount of money so long as the minister would give us an assurance that it was needed. Port Arthur is an important place, there is a great deal of work to be done and if the minister had said twice as much money was needed it would have been voted. But that is not the bad feature of it. The pernicious feature of it is, to my mind, the right which the minister takes to over-expend so much at the present time under a similar resolution. Last year there was $900,000 or nearly $1,000,000 voted. That is a pretty good sum, and my hon. friend might have kept within the mark, but he comes and asks now for $267,000 to provide for the over-expenditure of that amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is very much less.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, that is about the same plea that the girl put up that it was a very little one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not a bad plea.

Mr. SPROULE. But the sin is always the same and the principle involved is exactly the same. The principle is that the minister takes it upon himself to expend money which has never been voted by parliament, and which, therefore, he has no authority to spend. If it was any sudden or urgent case, such as a bridge being swept away or anything of that sort, he could resort to a Governor General's warrant and there would be no complaint. I am not saying that the money was improperly or unwisely spent, but I say the principle is a bad one of over-expending what parliament has not granted. This is the finishing up of the present year. We have no information about how much each of these dredges has earned. If all the dredges were employed here they must have earned a pretty large sum if they have earned nearly a million and a quarter of dollars in one summer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The seven dredges are only at Fort William. There are dredges at Port Arthur as well, and then there are the breakwater and the revetment wall to be included.

Mr. SPROULE. This is $267,000 for additional dredging.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but the $900,000 was for dredging at both harbours, and there were the breakwaters and revetment walls in both places.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, I am doing an injustice to the minister in assuming that this was all spent on dredging. But the principle is practically the same. He requires so much money for his works up there, and it ought to be his duty to have his engineer give him a correct estimate about how much is needed for the year, submit that to council, get the approval of council, bring down his estimates, give parliament his reasons why it is needed, and parliament would grant it as it did last year. If this were done I think it would be a very exceptional circumstance which would justify the over-expenditure of the amount that he has over-expended this year, or that he over-expended last year. Now I should advise him, if I may be permitted to give him advice, to try and bring to bear upon the operations which he has under consideration some business intelligence and present to the House a reasonable estimate of what is needed. The House is not reluctant to grant it, and then, when the vote is made he should keep the expenditure within the vote because if he does not do that there is something lax about it, something wanting in the judgment of his engineers, and something bad in himself. This transaction is one that should not be indulged in too frequently. It may be justified occasionally, but the minister seems to indulge in it every year. I think it is about time the House gave him to understand that it will not consent to this kind of business in future to any great extent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to get an explanation from the minister as to why, in granting this contract covering the number of acres that he refers to and extending to a depth of 25 feet, one firm was given the whole work. It seems to be an enormous undertaking.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, tenders were called for all the work. I think new tenders were called for after I became minister for a depth of 25 feet. I think the original tender was for a depth of 22 feet.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it to be deepened 25 feet over the whole 30 acres?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, eventually. Some of the work was first let at 22 feet, but it was decided to make it a uniform depth of 25 feet.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many years will the work extend over?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends a good deal on the extent of the development there. There will be 18 miles of harbour frontage on the Mission and Kaministiquia rivers. Things are moving very rapidly at Fort William and Port Arthur, and we will have to meet the exigencies of the situation by going just as rapidly as the business demands. I should think it would take three or four years to fully complete the work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG The minister has explained that there is a profit in dredging with government dredges, and I think a year ago the member for Welland (Mr. German) affirmed that view. Would it not have been wise in undertaking such a large work to secure government dredges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the contrary, the member for Welland thought the work could be done more cheaply by contract than by government dredges.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the minister differs from the member for Welland on that point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we have government dredges we can keep better control of the work than we can over contract dredges. Unless we can take the measurements in situ and let the contracts for the work in situ there will always be a possibility that perhaps the government is not getting full value for its money. We have to depend so much upon the honesty and the judgment of the inspectors that while I think

on the whole the country is being honestly served, yet we cannot always be sure of that. If the work is done by government dredges we know that we get what we pay for because there is no inducement to anybody to pretend that more is being done than is actually done. Upon the whole I am in favour of enlarging the government dredging fleet, and I would like to see the time at no distant date when practically all dredging would be done by government dredges. My hon. frend from Welland takes a strong view the other way.

Mr. BLAIN. What was paid to this firm last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $383,425.

Mr. BLAIN. Who are the members of that firm?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think Mr. Whelan is connected with it, and I think Mr. Gorman, and I heard the name of Mr. O'Brien mentioned, but I do not know personally who the officers of the company are.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that Con O'Gorman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he is a very prominent and reliable contractor.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the Bowman-Whelan firm?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know whether Mr. Bowman is connected with it or not.

Mr. SPROULE. How much out of the $1,167 for dredging was spent at Fort Willian and Port Arthur?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work was going on at Fort William and at Port Arthur where Mr. Phin is the contractor, and there were other large works going on which I cannot specify in detail to-night. I shall do so when we are considering the main estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble is that these promises are conveniently forgotten or neglected, or perhaps the member is not present when the main estimates come up. I am not unreasonable enough to suppose that the minister would have this information at hand now, but I would like to know later on how much is expended on dredging and how much on the different other works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get it in detail.

Mr. SPROULE. It was stated last year that this work was urgent because the Grand Trunk Pacific wanted to build an elevator and ship wheat. How much wheat did they ship last season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot exactly say, but I think they shipped several million bushels.

Mr. PORTER. Recently very strong representations have been made and a deputation waited on the minister in reference to the necessity of deepening and enlarging the Welland canal, and as an auxiliary scheme to that strong representations were made as to the deepening of the route by way of the Murray canal and the Bay of Quinte. Belleville is the principal shipping point on the Bay of Quinte and the shipping facilities there are altogether inadequate for the trade at present carried on. I understand that representations have been made to the minister that the docking facilities at Belleville are altogether insufficient, that there are one or two shoals, not of any considerable extent, in the Bay of Quinte which if removed would afford a depth of from 14 to 16 feet throughout the bay, except the Murray canal where the depth is eight or nine feet. Has the minister yet determined what action will be taken on these representations? Owing to the establishment of a number of large and very important industries, particularly the Lehigh cement works, which is one of the largest in Canada, these industries are very much hampered in carrying on their business effectively by reason of not being able to load boats to more than half their capacity. It has also been represented to me by the superintendent of one of the steamboat companies that the passenger and freight boats going up and down the lakes would very much prefer, if it were possible, to go through the Bay of Quinte, touching at some of the ports there, than to go down the lake—for two reasons: First, that route is much safer, and secondly, they would touch a number of important points, where they would gather both freight and passenger traffic. We are led to believe that the traffic would increase and that a larger number of boats would come there if such accommodation were afforded. I have been told that representations to this effect have been made to the minister, and I would be glad if he would inform me what is to be done in the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I intend in a day or two to take up, with the officials of my department, the subject of dredging in the province of Ontario, and to lay out the work for the coming season, and this matter is one that will have consideration. There is a great deal of dredging to be done to give the various harbours a depth of 14 feet. No one can be impressed more than I am with the importance of giving that depth wherever we can do so, but it is going to cost a large amount of money. We have lately made great improvement at points along this line of transportation, including Niggar Island and Telegraph Point.

Mr. PORTER. Those works are not completed, I believe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will be completed this season. I had the pleasure of going through the Bay of Quinte and through

the Murray canal, and was impressed with the advantage of that well-sheltered route.

Mr. PORTER. Have the representations which I have outlined been made to the department, by the Board of Trade, acting in conjunction with the city council of Belleville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and a report has been made by the resident engineer.

Mr. BLAIN. When the minister is laying out the programme for the coming season, I suppose he will keep in view Port Credit, where he has been doing some work during the past year. We are very glad to know that he is looking into that important port, and expending some money there; but I do not know whether the money was expended on the proper point or not. Some complaints have reached me that it was expended not so much in the interest of the public as in the interest of some private firms doing business there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Port Credit is owned by a private company, is it not?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, but I understood that the minister was expending some money there last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that I was at Port Credit and looked into the situation. The old Port Credit harbour is owned by a private corporation. The depth of water is not very great, and we did some dredging to give an entrance to the place where the brick works of the company of which Mr. Haney is president are situated. I saw there a very large operation being carried on.

Mr. BLAIN. That was not in the harbour at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at the old Port Credit harbour. In return for the work we did there, Mr. Haney's dredge did dredging in the old Port Credit harbour, and he agrees to give to the public the free use of the new basin and which he has constructed. If my hon. friend looks into the work which we have done, I think he will see that it was very much in the public interest.

Mr. BLAIN. The work was done in the manner I have stated. My hon. friend has taken the dredge at Port Credit, and dredged out the lake in the interest of a private company, and has overlooked altogether the dredging in the harbour itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, no.

Mr. BLAIN. He has left the dredging of the harbour to the gentleman who owns the brickyard. Is that a usual policy of my hon. friend? I may say that when my hon. friend did the county the honour of paying it a visit, he did not think it worth his while to notify myself. I would have been glad to have come down and looked over the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I went there on very short notice. I did not know until the morning of the day that I went there that I was going, and there was not opportunity of getting in touch with my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. What information has the minister in respect to the work which was done in the harbour by the gentleman who owns the private brickyard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work has been done and reported upon.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like my hon. friend to lay on the table the report, because this is a new policy altogether—to use the public money in dredging out the lake in the interest of a private company, and to get the gentleman who owns the private company to do the dredging of the harbour in the interest of the public. I think we should have a complete report from my hon. friend as to how this work was brought about, and at whose solicitation. My hon. friend thought it well to spend public money which was not voted for the purpose of dredging out Lake Ontario in front of the brickyard there. I am sorry that my hon. friend, notwithstanding my earnest appeal in past years for the expenditure of some money there in the interest of the public, would think it a proper policy to spend the money in the interest of a private corporation. I am not very conversant with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rather thought my hon. friend was not.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite sure I am as conversant with it as my hon. friend is. My hon. friend would not expect me to be conversant with a policy which nobody ever heard of. My requests were always that my hon. friend would spend some money in the Port Credit harbour in the interest of the public.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which is owned by a private corporation.

Mr. BLAIN. Which is owned by a private corporation. My hon. friend should not allow that to interfere with the expending of money, because he states now that the gentleman who owns the brick works has expended some money in dredging at the privately-owned wharf. Why did not my hon. friend put the government dredge there, and do the work in such a way that there would be no complaint from the residents of the village? If my hon. friend wished, I think I could give some reasons to account to the committee why this was done, but perhaps I had better reserve these for some future time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a complaint has come to the department regarding the dredging at Port Credit. I went there myself and came to the conclusion that it would be in the public interest that there should be good wharf and dockage accommodation at that place. The company owning the brick works and the dock built a breakwater and agreed that the public would have at all times the use of that dock, so that it is open to the public just as much as any dock in any harbour. At old Port Credit, the dock is owned entirely by a private company. That was a most unfortunate policy, but the old government of Ontario, long before confederation, gave away many harbours to private companies.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has purchased many of them back.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and that is a good policy. I think that the government should own every important harbour on the Great Lakes and develop them in the public interest. Port Credit is a private harbour. It was thought that the government dredge could do the dredging at this new dock rather better than the dredge owned by the private company.

Mr. BLAIN. Why?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know exactly. It may have been owing to the depth of water, as some dredges can dredge better at a certain depth of water than others, or it may have been due to some difference in the material. The company put its dredge to work in the old harbour and did more work there than the government dredge did in the new. The facilities for transportation traffic at Port Credit have thereby been greatly increased, and my hon. friend, instead of finding fault, should give the department credit for the work done.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand the minister's statement, there were two works done—one on Lake Ontario in front of the property owned by the brickyard company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The owners of which built a breakwater which gives shelter and creates a good harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. And the same brick company has built another wharf there on private property, and my hon. friend has allowed the company's dredge to dredge out the lake in front of its own wharf which it constructed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is dredging the approach at the old Port Credit harbour in the harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. At whose request did my hon. friend take the public money and dredge out the approach in the interests of a private company.

Mr. BLAIN

Mr. PUGSLEY. We did not dredge it in the interests of a private company. Mr. M. J. Haney, who is the president of the brick manufacturing company at Port Credit, undertook the building of a new dock, excavated out of the dry land, so as to give a well sheltered harbour. He wanted to know if I would dredge the approach from the main channel of the lake into this new dock or basin which this company was creating. He informed me—and I saw the work that had been carried on—that in addition to the bricks which would be shipped by rail, large quantities would be shipped by water, and he proposed to build a breakwater which would give a sheltered harbour. I said I could not undertake the work unless the dock was made open to the public so that every vessel owner would have the same right to use it as the company.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a contract to that effect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, filed in the department. Then in exchange for our dredge doing the work there—and it was a better harbour than at old Port Credit—the company's dredge did work at old Port Credit harbour—a work of greater value than the government dredge did at the new harbour. We have not had a complaint on the part of any one. The expenditure is not great, only $1,700 altogether.

Mr. BLAIN. Both of the works must have been done, according to the minister's statement, alongside private owned property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BLAIN. I know something about it. The minister says that the government dredge dredged out Lake Ontario in front of private property.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, in front of a new dock which is to be a public dock.

Mr. BLAIN. The fact is that the money was expended immediately in front of property owned by the brickyard company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I admit that.

Mr. BLAIN. Now the minister says that the company constructed a breakwater there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. And the other dredging was done——

Mr. PUGSLEY. In old Port Credit harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. Alongside the brickyard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I said that the other dredging was done in the old Port Credit harbour, and not near the brickyard at all.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the money expended by the brick company in building a breakwater was expended on property owned by the company that owns the harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They built a breakwater, yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Did they build it on the property of the company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Out in front of this new dock which was built by them, and has become a public dock.

Mr. BLAIN. Who owns the property on which the breakwater was constructed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Department of Marine and Fisheries I suppose. It is on the land covered with water.

Mr. BLAIN. There can be no doubt that the money expended by the government, and the money expended by the private corporation were all expended immediately in front of property owned by the brickyard company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And which has become a public dock under the agreement.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister states that the money expended by the government was right in front of property owned by the brickyard company, and that the money expended in dredging by the private company was expended in front of its own property.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) surely does not wish to misrepresent me.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would advise him to go down to Port Credit, it is in his own constituency, and he ought to pay a little attention to it; let him go there once in a while. What I told him was that near the brickyard, where the Grand Trunk railway has its tracks, the brickyard company has created a new dock and has excavated a basin upon the shore of Lake Ontario.

Mr. BLAIN. For what purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To give accommodation to vessels carrying bricks—which are turned out in vast quantities to Toronto and other places where there may be a market.

Mr. BLAIN. In their own interests, not in the interest of the public.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Open to the public by agreement made with the department. Every vessel may go there and use that harbour, and use it free of charge. That I insisted upon. A breakwater has been built out, so that perfect shelter is afforded. I do not hesitate to say that the business which will be done there is five times the business which has been done in the old Port Credit harbour, or that will be done there in the next ten years, unless something happens to develop traffic. We did some dredging at the entrance to the new basin. Then, the companies' dredge, in exchange for that, was sent down to the old Port Credit harbour and dredged out that harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. In front of the work——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all, in the old Port Credit harbour, where the hon. gentleman thinks the dredging ought to be done, the harbour owned by the Port Credit Harbour Company. As I have said, work of a greater value was done there than the dredging done by the government at the entrance of the new harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. Notwithstanding the suggestion of the minister that I had better go to Port Credit, I may tell him I know the circumstances.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Better tell them then.

Mr. BLAIN. I have done so. The minister knows the circumstances too—and the public knows them better than either of us. I stated that the hon. gentleman has taken the public money——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain), say the dredging has been done—take the dredging done by both dredges.

Mr. BLAIN. I say that the dredging done by the government and paid for out of the public treasury was done immediately in front of the property owned by the brick company. Does the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where was the other dredging done?

Mr. BLAIN. Is not that true?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is exactly what I stated. But where was the other dredging done?

Mr. BLAIN. I will reach that if my hon. friend will possess his soul in patience. We have it established that the hon. gentleman took the public money, which was voted for dredging in the interests of the public, and expended it on work immediately in front of the brickyard works, to which no vessel except those owned by the brick company has any right of access or will be permitted to enter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That I entirely deny. Under the agreement—the hon. member is welcome to a copy—any vessel has the

same right to go there as the vessels belonging to the brick company. And that is a public wharf.

Mr. BLAIN. What property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The new basin.

Mr. BLAIN. I was directing attention to one point—that the minister took the public money and dredged, not the harbour of Port Credit, but Lake Ontario immediately in front of the property of the brick company. He does not deny it, but he says that the wharf there is open to the public. Does not the agreement that he has in the department apply to the other dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BLAIN. I shall be very much surprised if it does not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where was the other dredging done?

Mr. BLAIN. Immediately in front of the property owned by the same brick company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the old Port Credit harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. No, the hon. minister knows very well that the brick company does not expend money in the old Port Credit harbour, but they would expend it on their own property, and they did. And I venture to state—and the minister will not contradict me— that the money expended, both that by the government and that by the brick company, was not expended in the privately-owned harbour at Port Credit.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The 'privately-owned harbour' of which the hon. member (Mr. Blain), speaks is the harbour to which he is so much attached, and in which he wanted dredging to be done, although it is privately owned. My information is that the dredging done by the brick company in exchange for the use of the government dredge was done in the harbour owned by the Port Credit Harbour Company, what we call the old Port Credit harbour. The other dredging that was done by the government dredge was in front of and to make a channel leading to the new basin which was created by the brick company and to which under the agreement with the Department of Public Works, all vessels have the same right to resort free of charge.

Mr. BLAIN. I shall not continue the discussion because my hon. friend is not clear on the point.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am as clear as can be.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BLAIN. No. Who suggested to my hon. friend that the money should be expended immediately in front of the property owned by the brick company? There was no such suggestion in the House when the money was voted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I looked over Port Credit harbour and saw the very poor accommodation which even with a considerable amount of dredging would be given to vessels and saw this new basin which was being excavated so as to give splendid accommodation and perfect shelter for vessels, I thought it would be in the public interest to have that new harbour created there, with a fine breakwater in front of it. I was asked by the president of the company to dredge a channel leading from the lake towards this basin. I said I would not do that unless they would make that a public harbour so that all vessels would have the right to go there and use it free of charge. The company agreed to that. Then in addition to that their dredge went into the old Port Credit harbour owned by this Port Credit Company to which my hon. friend refers, and did dredge it to a greater value than the dredging that was done by the government dredge. If my hon. friend doubts me let him call at the department and the deputy will show him the return and the contract.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not doubting my hon. friend. At least the policy the minister has laid down so frequently in the House and does not adhere to it, that no money shall be expended out of the public treasury on a private owned property, is set aside by this unheard of agreement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not my hon. friend ask me to do this dredging in this private harbour at Port Credit?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Owned by the Port Credit Company, and did I not do dredging there through the dredge that we exchanged with the Brick Manufacturing Company. Did I not do the dredging in the old Port Credit harbour?

Mr. BLAIN. I say not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say we did.

Mr. BLAIN. I must not detain the committee, but I will ask my hon. friend to bring down the correspondence and agreements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to do that on the main estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. Did my hon. friend ever make such an agreement with another private company since he has been minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the agreement that we made with the company that has

created this new harbour and the basin to which all vessels have a free right of access without paying any tolls is one I would like to make to-morrow with the Port Credit Company or any other company so they would give up their wharfs to the free use of vessels without payment of tolls.

Mr. BLAIN. What proposition has my hon. friend to make?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Port Credit Company have some dilapidated wharfs that they might very well turn over to the public and we would do dredging and make improvements and the public would have a right to go there with vessels without charge. I think one of the greatest drawbacks to these harbours on the Great Lakes is that they are owned by private companies who have allowed them to fall into decay so that the wharfs are of no value and yet they hold on to them as if they were valuable properties.

Mr. BLAIN. I agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. PORTER. Can the public approach the new harbour from the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes, by highway and by railway track.

Mr. BLAIN. The track is private.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is owned by the Grand Trunk is it not?

Mr. BLAIN. No, it is private, it is hundreds of yards from the Grand Trunk through line.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a highway running through the property.

Mr. BLAIN. A general highway runs past there, yes.

Mr. PORTER. The agreement covers the use of the dock by the public.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Victoria Harbour, Ontario, improvements, further amount required, $111,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to carry on work at the new harbour created at Victoria harbour. The Canadian Pacific Railway have built a magnificent elevator there they are building a magnificent railway track from Victoria harbour to Port Hope, with a grade of three-tenths of one per cent over which they expect to haul large trains and we are doing the dredging. The appropriation became exhausted in September. I submitted the matter to council as in the case of Port Arthur and Fort William and council consented on hearing the facts to allow them to go on with the additional work till the end of the season.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has the minister received a request from the council of the township of Wolfe Island asking for dredging to be done around the wharf lately purchased by that municipality which is to be free to the public?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not quite sure at this moment, but I think I recollect getting a letter. I am considering the question. I think that now the wharf is owned by the municipality there would not be the objection that existed when it was a private wharf.

Mr. EDWARDS. The minister raised that objection last session when I brought the matter up, but the township council have purchased this property and will require to spend a large sum to put it in condition. It would be a great advantage if vessels could come in close and unload coal on the island. It would mean a saving of 50 to 60 cents a ton to the islanders as well as to the council for use on their ferry boat. I have a letter from the reeve and council asking me to call this to the minister's attention and saying they have sent a similar letter to the department. I hope for a definite expression on that matter this session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will depend on the report of the chief engineer, if it can be done for a reasonable sum, I do not see why it should not be done.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Has the contract been let for the proposed dam at the outlet of French river at the foot of Lake Nipissing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). When is it proposed to commence building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is one year we have given the contractors to construct the dam. I presume they will get to work right away in the spring.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the amount voted last year for Victoria harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $145,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another over-expenditure of $111,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the minister think this is a rather bad principle? The only feature about these over-expenditures that seems to be at all defensible is the fact that they were submitted to council. But still I think the principle is unsound.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I went up there during the summer and I saw the great work which the Canadian Pacific railway is doing. They have built a magnificent elevator and they are building a wharf. They are really creating a splendid harbour on the eastern shore of the Georgian Bay to assist in the

national transportation between the east and the west. Their officers showed me what a great drawback it would be if I stopped the work. I gave orders to stop it when the appropriation was exhausted. The Canadian Pacific railway officials communicated with me and particularly Mr. McNicoll, the general manager, showed me that if I stopped my work they would have to stop theirs. I asked myself: If this work has to be done might we not just as well allow it to be done this year as next year, and thus facilitate the great work that the Canadian Pacific railway are carrying on, a work that I am bound to say is of national interest. I submitted the facts to council, they approved and I allowed the company to proceed during the remainder of the dredging season. These are the facts, and I think my hon. friend would have done exactly the same as I did and as council did had he been in our places.

Mr. PORTER. Will the changing of the traffic from east to west to north and south not render the value of that expenditure a nullity?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only difference is that the traffic goes the other way. We have two hundred and twenty millions going north and only one hundred millions going south. The development that is going to take place in the west—we see evidences of it in the thousands of Americans who are coming in and developing our western country—is going to so increase the traffic that the Canadian Pacific railway and Grand Trunk railway will not be able to handle it with the facilities they are even now providing, and they are looking forward to still greater improvements in the near future to meet this rapid development. They are not afraid of reciprocity—not a bit; they know that they are going to get all the traffic of the Canadian west and a large portion of the traffic of the American west, too.

Mr. PORTER. I think the minister is not a good prophet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure of it, and no man can think otherwise. Now, do not let us discuss reciprocity to-night; I want to get these estimates through.

Mr. WRIGHT. Has the minister any estimate as to what additional amount will be required to finish the work at Victoria harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is being carefully made up for the information of the committee in connection with the main estimates. We think it will take $150,000 to finish up the dredging work which will be required. Of course, the harbour is now open to vessels. They had their big lake ships during the summer season, but in order to give perfect facilities it will take $150,000 more.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a public wharf, or is it owned by the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is privately owned by the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. SPROULE. And the public have no rights on this wharf at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will really all be Canadian Pacific railway traffic. Theirs is the only line running out of the port. It will be used for shipping the grain of the west which will be brought to their elevator. Of course, I presume they will be glad to welcome lake vessels because they will bring grain to the Canadian Pacific railway and in that sense it will be public. I do not imagine they are going to charge any tolls on vessels coming there because they will be glad to secure the business.

Mr. SPROULE. If they do not it is all right, because the public will have the use of it, but if they do it is questionable wisdom.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If they do it will just handicap their transportation business. I do not think they will make any charge at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It is spending so much money to have a private enterprise. I feel very strongly about the principle of overexpending appropriations. It is not government by parliament; it is not government by the people's representatives. Their judgment is not asked on the expenditure of this country, their consent is not asked, but it is government by executive. In the history of Canada, or any country governed like a colonial dependency of the British Empire, when and where have we examples of the practice carried to the same extent which is indicated in the few items we are dealing with to-night?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Ever since confederation there has been as large if not a larger proportion of supplementaries than we have.

Mr. SPROULE. They have not always been over-expenditures, the same as these.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, every one is exactly the same.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that in my experience there has ever been a time during the last 25 years that this House has been indulged in to the same extent as at the present.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Did I understand the minister to say that the dam at the outlet of the French river would be completed in a year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The deputy minister thinks it will be completed in a year.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). There is a very serious state of affairs prevailing at that place. A year ago last summer that dam which had cost some $14,000 or $15,000, was blown out by the government, and since that time navigation on the lake has been very materially affected, and the industries around the lake have been in rather a bad way for want of water. It seems to me that this work should have been proceeded with before this. If the former dam was required, and it was required, I do not see why it should have been blown up. I am aware that people complain that some of the land around the lake was being flooded. I know that is the case, but the reason was because the dam had been improperly constructed, and did not provide for the overflow of water in the spring. I was under the impression when that dam was blown out and the $16,000 spent there thrown away, that the department would look after the matter in a business way and take immediate steps to reconstruct it. I did not urge the matter very earnestly upon the minister for the reason that I thought pressure was being brought from another quarter which, perhaps, would have more effect. Possibly I did not do my duty in that I neglected to urge more strenuously on the minister and the department the completion of this work at an earlier date than is contemplated. I have met the engineers of government there repeatedly both before the dam was blown out and since then, and thinking that the department was thoroughly posted as to the requirements of the different business interests around the lake I did not urge the matter as strongly as I should. I am painfully surprised to know that the work is to be so greatly delayed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think my hon. friend need accuse himself that he has not urged the matter on the attention of the department more forcibly because I do not think it would make any difference for the reason that we wanted to move carefully. I took the responsibility for having the old dam blown out because if it were not done a large portion of the town of North Bay would have been flooded, and a large portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway track washed away. I had to act quickly, and I gave orders to have it blown out by dynamite so as to prevent the destruction of valuable property. We have had to pay pretty heavy land damages, and before rebuilding the dam I thought the engineers should look into the matter with the utmost care so as to be sure that no such result would occur again. I have proceeded as rapidly as we reasonably could in view of the large amount of work the department has to attend to. We will get the dam built as rapidly as we can and I think I can assure the hon. gentleman that during the present year it will be completed, and I trust it will be found entirely satisfactory.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is a dam in the county of Frontenac that I wish the minister would blow up and I will not ask him to rebuild it because it costs the municipality from $400 to $700 a year to pay for the damage done by flood.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some dams do more harm than one would think.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has any appropriation been made this year for dredging Kingston harbour. The interest I have in it is that the dredging of that part of the harbour down towards the old smelter site would facilitate the removal of the iron ore.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That matter is not only under consideration but under favourable consideration. I received a deputation a short time ago, and that is part of the work laid down in our programme.

Draping Dominion public buildings on occasion of death of His late Majesty, $27,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When His late Majesty died we had to ask for a Governor General's warrant for $35,000 and we only expended $27,000.

Mr. PORTER. Upon what principle was that money expended in the various towns and cities?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We were guided somewhat by the population and the importance of the different cities and towns. I could give some illustrations.

Mr. PORTER. Give me Belleville.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Belleville $100, Berlin $100, Alexandra $50.

Mr. EDWARDS. How much for Kingston?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $391.10 for the different public buildings there.

Mr. PORTER. Through whom was the expenditure made in Belleville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The usual course would be for the chief architect to give directions to the caretaker to expend in draping the building not more than $100.

Mr. PORTER. From the appearance of the Belleville building I should think it would not cost more than $20.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to hear that.

Mr. PORTER. It was a disgraceful display. It was very freely remarked on in

the city, that the decoration of that building was a disgrace, and I think I am justified in repeating what was said by those who ought to know, that it did not cost more than $25. I suppose some account will be furnished to the department of how the $100 was expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there should be full particulars showing the materials and labour.

Mr. PORTER. I should like very much to see the items.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have that obtained for my hon. friend.

Ottawa public buildings, heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $17,700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I gave the full particulars when the same item in the estimates for next year was before the committee.

Mr. PORTER. Has this been occasioned by any increase in the number of engineers, firemen and watchmen?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, owing to additional buildings.

Mr. STANFIELD. Do your engineers and firemen have certificates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineers do, where the buildings are heated by steam under high pressure—not the firemen.

Dominion buildings, salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., $17,300.

Mr. RUSSELL. What wages do these people get at the present time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give that tonight, but I will make a note of it.

Mr. PORTER. Is there a regular scale on which those employed in that service are paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there is a regular scale. The guiding principle is the floor area of the buildings which have to be taken care of.

Dominion cattle quarantine stations, renewals and repairs, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount voted in the main estimates was $5,000, and the Department of Agriculture require this additional amount.

Mr. PORTER. Where are these stations located?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Bridgeburg, Gretna, Portal, Deloraine, Sarnia and other places.

Mr. PORTER. These are all new places except Sarnia.

Mr. EDWARDS. When were these new places established?

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be during the year now just closing.

Mr. EDWARDS. What was the reason for establishing so many new quarantine stations? Was it in anticipation of the proposed unmentionable bargain between this country and the United States?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not suppose that, because I do not imagine that the Minister of Agriculture ever dreamed we would get so good a bargain.

Mr. PORTER. Are these places to accommodate cattle brought into this country in bond?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The memorandum which has been supplied to me by the Department of Agriculture states that the vote is asked to supplement the grant of $5,000 made by parliament at its session of 1909-10 for the construction of corrals and dipping vats along the boundary line between Canada and the United States, and the maintenance of the quarantine stations generally throughout the Dominion in a proper state of efficiency during the year. The department had asked for $20,000 last session, but for some reason it was reduced to $5,000, and the department has asked to supplement it by this appropriation.

Mr. PORTER. I presume this is for the purpose of treating cattle coming in from the United States to prevent the spread of disease in this country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume so.

Mr. PORTER. If that is the case, it does not exactly square with what the Minister of Agriculture told the committee this afternoon—that the cattle were not treated in that way until they reached the port of embarkation for the European market.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They may be coming in to Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta to be used there and not for shipment.

Mr. PORTER. I suppose, from the answer given a few moments ago, that these were located in older parts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Gretna and Portal are in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Bridgeburg is in Welland county.

Mr. EDWARDS. If I understand the minister correctly, the first request for this amount was made a year ago, but by some mistake it was put down at $5,000 instead of at $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. By whom was the request made for this vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was made by Dr. Rutherford, who is the veterinary general of the Dominion.

Mr. EDWARDS. When?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The very day after the vote was reduced, he came and called attention to the fact that an error had been made in reducing it.

Mr. EDWARDS. My reason for wanting to know if the Minister of Agriculture had made the request is because I am under the impression that he said we would not require so many quarantine stations on this side of the line if the proposed arrangement came into effect, because the cattle would be all going the other way. They would be shipped south instead of coming into this country.

Mr. PORTER. Is this to cover expenditure already made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Cribbins Point Wharf, Nova Scotia, $350.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the renewal of the superstructure and will finish up the work.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the Crown got a title to this property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

L'Ardoise, beach protection work, $600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the last session there was a vote of $1,800 for the construction of beach protection works at this place. The appropriation had been expended, but the work was not entirely completed, and the chief engineer decided it was absolutely necessary that this additional expenditure should be incurred.

Mr. PORTER. Was this done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, by day labour.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this complete the expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Margaree Harbour, to complete repairs of breakwater, $1,850.

Mr. PUGSLEY. During last session we voted $2,300 to repair the breakwater, and this additional amount is required to make a good job.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there any expenditure before the present year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell as I have no memorandum of that.

Mr. PORTER. Where is this harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Inverness county.

Mr. CROCKET. What amount was voted last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $2,300. The work consisted in the removal of the outer end of the breakwater, the construction of a new block and the repairing of the main breakwater. When the work was undertaken in the spring, it was found that further damage had been done in the winter and it was necessary to make some extensive repairs, entailing an additional expenditure of $750. This was authorized by order in council of 26th September, 1910. The resident engineer reported that unless this amount was expended the work already done would be liable to be carried away in the winter's storms. It was done by day work.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there an estimate made of the cost before the work was begun?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was estimated that $2,300 would do the whole thing.

Mr. CROCKET. A total of nearly $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, by reason of the work being damaged during a storm after the estimate was made.

Mr. CROCKET. When did the storm occur?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer reports that the damage was done during last winter, and also, I understand, further damage in the spring. In fact, the district engineer reports that while the work was being proceeded with an accident occurred due to a series of severe storms and gales.

Upper Prospect, breakwater, $637.50.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a work called for by District Engineer Russell.

Mr. CROCKET. What was voted last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three thousand dollars.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the end of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, this finishes the work.

West Dublin Bay, additional dredging, $4,599.85.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that by contract or is it government dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Contract.

Mr. CROCKET. At what price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three tenders were received. We let the contract at 45 cents per cubic yard. That is a lower price than the lowest tender, but we declined to give it at the lowest tender price, and got it at 45 cents a yard.

Mr. CROCKET. Why was the lowest tender refused?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We thought it was not low enough.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the lowest tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For class A $8, for class B $5, and for ordinary spoil 50 cents.

Mr. CROCKET. The department thought 50 cents excessive?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, for that particular work.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister has been paying more than that in New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends on where the work is being done.

Mr. CROCKET. Were new tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. How was it awarded at a price below the lowest tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was awarded to the lowest tenderer, but we told him we would not give it to him unless he would reduce his price five cents, and, after negotiation, he accepted it.

An hon. MEMBER. That is not another McAvity five cents?

Yarmouth improvements, additional dredging, $42,700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who is McAvity?

Mr. CROCKET. McAvity is the minister's partner in the ownership of the St. John 'Telegraph.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is wise, but not quite so knowledgable as he thinks he is.

Mr. CROCKET. Is not the hon. minister asociated with Mr. McAvity and Mr. John E. Moore in the purchase of the St. John 'Telegraph.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give the hon. gentleman information that is relevant. He pretends to know it all; it would be unwise for me to give him information that might disturb his thoughts.

Mr. CROCKET. I make the statement and the minister will not deny it, that he was associated with Mr. John E. Moore and Mr. George McAvity in the purchase of the St. John 'Telegraph,' which is known as 'the dredger's organ.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a wonderfully good paper, a favourite paper among the people.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What about Yarmouth?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Thank you, yes. The dredging work at Yarmouth is very important. Hon. members know how the business there is improving. Larger steamers have been or are to be, put upon the route. The appropriation made for Yarmouth was exhausted a considerable time before the close of the dredging season; and, being urged very strongly by the Board of Trade and the business men of Yarmouth——

Mr. DANIEL. I thought the minister did not take much stock in board of trade opinion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was saying—being urged very strongly by the Board of Trade and the business men of Yarmouth as well as by the member for the county, to continue the dredging, I brought the matter before council, and we decided to go on.

Mr. CROCKET. At what price is the work done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At 28 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. CROCKET. What amount was voted last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sixty thousand dollars.

Mr. CROCKET. Did it overrun the estimate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; I stopped it when the appropriation was exhausted.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the practice of the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are the orders I have given—peremptory orders.

Mr. CROCKET. How long was the work stopped before being resumed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A fortnight or so.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister resume, after the appropriation is exhausted, without an order in council.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can, but I usually get an Order in Council, and did so in this case.

Mr. CROCKET. Who are the contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Dominion Dredging Company.

Mr. CROCKET. Were tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Specification as to the quantity of dredging to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. And this overran the estimate to the extent——

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I explained that there is a large quantity of dredging to be done, and the work is allowed to extend over, I think, three years. The appropriation was only $60,000. The contractors said that it did not make any difference to the department when they did the work, if they were willing to wait for the money. I stop-

ped them at first, but allowed them to go on. They have a certain amount to do, and when they get that done their contract will be ended. Formerly, under public tender, we paid 50 cents per cubic yard for dredging at Yarmouth. Under the new rule I have laid down, under which we endeavour, as far as possible, to specify the quantity of dredging, and instead of confining it to one season allow a reasonable time to do the work, we get it done for 28 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the end of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they go on next year.

Mr. DANIEL. Have the contractors ever used a suction dredge there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in Yarmouth.

Mr. DANIEL. I have visited Yarmouth, and I recognize that a good deal of dredging is required to afford proper accommodation for the traffic there. I should think that for much of the material that is to be dredged there, better, quicker and cheaper business could be done by a suction dredge than by the ordinary dipper dredge. Has the minister taken that into consideration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not. There is no contractor having a suction dredge except one in the maritime provinces.

Mr. CROCKET. Where is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the Miramichi river. The W. J. Poupore Company have the contract.

Telegraph lines, Okanagan Valley telegraph line, &c., $5,479.56.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the explanation of the increased cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The line proved to be 12 miles longer than the estimate, and the average cost was $140 a mile, largely due to the increased cost of poles.

Belleville drill hall, $325.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an amount for interest which my department charged to the corporation of the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese, which he thought I should not charge. It was in connection with property owned by the government which was sold to the church. They made a strong point of the fact that for many years the hospital lot, property belonging to the church, had been used by the Militia Department without payment of rent, and on looking into all the facts I thought it right to remit the interest.

Mr. PORTER. It is a fact that this lot was used by the Militia Department for many years without charge.

Public Works—Collection of revenue—Telegraph lines—Saskatchewan and Alberta—Maintenance and repairs, $12,400.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been an extension of the telegraph line and there was not sufficient provision made for the maintenance. This is to cover maintenance charges.

Mr. DANIEL. Why is this put under the head of collection of revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the reason that we receive a revenue from the telegraph service, and we put the operating expenses on the opposite side of the account.

Mr. EDWARDS. Do you not receive any revenue from those other lines that you are building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do and you will find in the main estimates that the charge for maintenance will be under the collection of revenue, but the cost of the actual construction of new lines is put under construction account.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding House adjourned at 12.23 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 24, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 154) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I wish to introduce to the House deals with a grievance affecting the people of Canada and the commercial integrity of Canada in so far as our merchants are concerned. It is in reference to the Inspection and Sale Act, and is as follows:

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. Section 321 of the Inspection and Sale Act, chapter 85 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

2. Any person who marks or causes to be marked a wrong name, or the name of any person or firm other than the one who actually packs the package, on any fruit package shall be guilty of an offence.

3. Section 325 of said Act is amended by striking out the words, 'for export,' in the first line thereof.

4. The said Act is amended by adding immediately after section 327 thereof the following:

327a. This Act shall apply to all fruit packed and offered for sale, either wholesale or retail, in Canada.

The Act on the statute-book, as far as it goes, is perfect, but the object of this Bill

is to apply its provisions to the fruit that is sold to the people of Canada. The Act as it at present exists is applied principally to goods that are sold for export. I quote the following statement from the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Ontario:

'There is a tremendous market at present in the west,' said Mr. Duff, 'but we are up against the man who is dishonest, the man who puts little apples in the middle of the barrel. There is nothing that we should instil into the minds of our people more than to have common honesty towards their fellows. In the end it means thousands of dollars to us.'

While we protect the man who gets our fruit outside of this country, we do not protect our own people in the purchase of Canadian fruit. A gentleman in this city informed me that the other day he bought a barrel of apples. Upon opening it he found the top layers all right, but the inside was filled with inferior fruit. He reported it to the grocer, and the grocer said: I am very sorry, I will send for it, and send you another barrel in its place, the mark upon which indicates absolutely perfect fruit. He sent him another and it was found to be in just the same condition. The mark on the barrel had been forged, and this Bill is for the purpose of preventing that sort of thing.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, of course, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lewis) ought to have the right to introduce his Bills, but I am afraid that they are all stillborn. At this stage of the season he cannot hope to get more than the benefit of an advertisement.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 153) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act, as regards the weights of a bushel and a bag of certain articles.—Mr. Fisher.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Indians, Quebec, medical attendance and medicines, $3,500.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). This vote is rendered necessary because of the unexpected prevalence of small-pox and chicken-pox among the Indians.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where was this outbreak?

Mr. OLIVER. This is for the province of Quebec, but I regret to say similar expenditures were necessary in other provinces. There were quite a number of cases of small-pox and chicken-pox in Bersimis and Seven Islands. It was reported to the department that there were 400 cases of small-pox and chicken-pox among the Indians along the north shore of the St. Lawrence. The disease commenced among the white people and spread to the Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. If the disease was chicken-pox it was comparatively harmless, but if it was small-pox of course every precaution should be taken to prevent its spread.

Mr. OLIVER. While chicken-pox is perhaps never serious among white people it has been found that it is sometimes dangerous among the Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a great similarity between the symptoms of chicken-pox and small-pox, and it would not be wise to let even chicken-pox go without taking precautions.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has stated the case correctly.

Indians, Nova Scotia, medicine and medical attendance, $5,000.

Mr. OLIVER. A small-pox epidemic broke out in several parts of the province of Nova Scotia, and special medical attendance had to be provided. In some cases the houses of the Indians had to be burnt and new ones erected, and in all cases the clothing was destroyed. There were cases in Kings county, Haliburton county, Antigonish and Cumberland counties. The cases were quarantined, and the Indians had to be supported during the quarantine. The Indians were all vaccinated. In New Brunswick small-pox broke out among the Indians in some districts and similar precautions were taken.

Indians, Northwest Territories—Rev. John Semmens, allowance for taking adhesions to Indian Treaty No. 5, 79 days at $5 per day, $395.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Semmens took the adhesions of the Indian in the neighbourhood of Fort Churchill and York Factory. These adhesions were necessary to bring under treaty the territory which it is proposed to add to Manitoba. The whole of that territory is now under treaty.

Mr. BRADBURY. Was this payment made to Mr. Semmens in addition to his regular salary?

Mr. OLIVER. This is a special allowance for this special duty. The duty of the inspector is to inspect the Indians who are under treaty, and instead of appointing a commissioner to take these adhesions and providing him with a salary and expenses we thought it better and more economical to employ Mr. Semmens and pay him an extra allowance of $5 per day.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What is his salary?

Mr. OLIVER. $2,200.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What becomes of his duties as inspector when he is performing this special duty?

Mr. OLIVER. He is of course not able when is he securing adhesions to the treaty at York Factory, to inspect the reserves in the north-eastern part of Manitoba; but we considered that it was economy to employ his services and allow him extra pay for that work, instead of employing another commissioner who would have to receive full salary for the time he would be employed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. During the time that he was so occupied, does the minister consider that his duties as inspector were neglected in any way?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then I do not see where the economy is, because if he was getting a salary of $2,000 a year as inspector, he could have done this work for nothing.

Mr. OLIVER. A large number of his inspections are performed on his way to York Factory and Churchill or on his way back, so that while he was not inspecting during the time he was taking the adhesions to the treaty, there was a minimum loss of time from his inspection duties, and the work was done at a minimum cost.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was not his salary under this clause running concurrently with his salary as inspector?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then I do not see where the economy comes in. If a man can perform these duties concurrently with his regular duties, either his regular duties do not give him enough to do or he should have performed these extra duties without extra remuneration.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter for the consideration of the House. The opinion of the department was that it was sound economy and better work to employ him in taking the adhesions, because he would have to travel a less distance and occupy less time away from his inspection duties than would have been occupied by another person; and besides, by reason of his long experience with the Indians, and their confidence in him, he was more likely to do good service for the department than a man who was a stranger to that line of business. We believe the public service gained more by the system we followed than it would have gained had we retained him in his inspection work exclusively, and engaged an outside commissioner to take the adhesions.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As I understand, when a man is employed by the government in this department, and is paid such a salary as this man receives, the department is entitled to the whole of his time; so that if you are paying him anything extra, you are paying him something that he is not entitled to. I make this complaint, not particularly in this case, but because I observe all through the estimates that it is getting to be a rule in all the departments that a man who gets a good round salary for his services, is paid various little extras. It is a bad precedent. When a man is expected to give his whole time to the service, and is paid liberally, if he is asked to do some other work, there should be either a deduction made from his salary, or he should do the other work without extra pay.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do these 79 days include the time that he was going to make the inspection? If he was inspecting during that time, he was not entitled to the $5 a day, because he was getting a salary besides that.

Mr. OLIVER. I admit that there is fair ground for the argument of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, but in the judgment of the department the circumstances in this case were of such an exceptional character that the best interests of the government and the interests of actual economy were better conserved by the course we pursued. When you engage a man and pay him for the whole of his time, you do not possibly pay him for the whole of his talent. You engage him to do work under certain conditions which are suitable and favourable, and he engages on the understanding that he will perform those duties under those suitable and favourable conditions. You ask that man to do something else, under conditions which are neither suitable nor favourable, conditions which put him in danger of his life from day to day, conditions which are entirely distinct from those of the duties which he is properly called on to perform. It is true, we could say to a public servant, you must either do whatever duty we see fit to assign to you or leave the service; but I do not think it would be fair, or that it would tend to good work in the public service, to do so. We engage a man to do a certain work; if we require him to do different work, under different circumstances and conditions, and with different responsibilities, I think it fair and right and reasonable that we should give some consideration to those circumstances.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not see that the work done here is any different from the ordinary work of inspection of Indian reserves. I would agree that if you hired a man to work in an office, and wanted him to work outside at manual labour, there would be ground for my hon. friend's argument. But this is to all intents and purposes the same class of work.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a great difference between travelling by steamer on Lake Winnipeg to Norway House, which is the ultimate limit of the inspectorate over which Mr. Semmens presides, and taking a canoe from Norway House to Fort Churchill and York Factory, a distance of 300 or 400 miles through an absolutely untravelled country. When his Excellency, the Governor General made a trip last summer on this same route, under the most favourable conditions, the fact was heralded throughout the world as something extraordinary. Mr. Semmens goes over a great deal more ground under conditions not nearly as favourable, and my hon. friend says that it is entirely in his day's work. I do not think it is. When a man goes to negotiate an adhesion to a treaty, or for all practical purposes to make a treaty with Indians who have not hitherto been under a treaty, I submit that his duties and responsibilities are radically and entirely different and of a much higher class from those of ordinary inspection. It is only fair that that condition should be recognized, namely, the extraordinary difference in the means and mode of travel and the important difference in the duties of the two positions.

Mr. BRADBURY. I agree with the minister that there is some difference in the work; but when he says that the duties are more arduous or more dangerous, I must differ with him. In the territory Mr. Semmens inspects, he has to travel considerable distances in canoes just as he would if he were going to York Factory. A trip to York Factory is not so dangerous, it is simply a pleasure trip, thousands of men have gone down that river, and the trip from Norway House down the Nelson river along the chain of lakes is really a pleasure trip, especially in the case of a man, travelling as an inspector, and making the journey with a large staff in attendance —really travelling in state. I do not object to a man getting paid for his work, and Mr. Semmens is perhaps one of the likeliest officers to do it, but what I object to is that, in addition to his salary of $2,200 a year, he should be allowed extra for this work. The department has two inspectors, Mr Swinford and Mr. Semmens, who apparently are working over the same territory and within a short distance of each other. Each of them gets $2,200 per year, and I think that if you take them from their regular work and give them any other work, they should not draw any extra salary. An employee of the government, drawing a yearly salary, should give his whole time to the country, and I do not approve of this system of allowing government employees to get these additional perquisites. There are other men in Manitoba just as competent as Mr. Semmens to do this work, and it would not have cost more to employ any one of them. At the same time I am not criticising Mr. Semmens in the slightest degree, because I think he is an experienced man and especially adapted for this work, but he should not be paid a double salary.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In listening to what the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) has just said, I wondered if this was the same Rev. Mr. Semmens whom he criticised a night or two ago with regard to the St. Peter's reserve. To-day my hon. friend has painted him in glowing colours whereas, the other night he depicted him as a betrayer of the Indians. I cannot understand this blowing hot and cold.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This man Semmens is, to borrow a term from the Senate, a reformed preacher. He has given up his charge as a preacher of the gospel and has become a heeler, more or less, for the Liberal party in the west. I object to $400 extra being paid to him in addition to his regular salary, for he is paid a regular salary to give up all his time to Canada. This trip he made from Winnipeg to Selkirk was made during the time for which he was paid by Canada; and as my hon. friend from Selkirk has said, nine times out of ten, it is a pleasure trip. There is no defensible reason why we should be asked to pay him extra money for this pleasure trip. I would like the minister to inform me what territory, treaty number 5 covers

Mr. OLIVER. It embraces the northern part of Manitoba and the adjacent part of the district of Keewatin. This adhesion to the treaty is for the purpose of covering by the treaty all that part of what was formerly the district of Keewatin, and is now proposed to be included in Manitoba.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does treaty number 5 extend from the northern boundary of Manitoba into the Northwest Territories? Does it go to Hudson Bay?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The adhesion to treaty number 5 taken by Mr. Semmens covers the country on each side of the Nelson as far as Hudson Bay, and westward runs to the boundary of Saskatchewan and northward to the 60th parallel.

Mr. CAMPBELL. On this $400 trip of this reverend gentleman, how many adhesions were obtained to the treaty?

Mr. OLIVER. Two bands, those at York Factory and Fort Churchill, including about 300 Indians.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister stated the distance to be about 480 miles, so this would be about $1 for every mile. Does the minister not think that an abnormal price to ask the people of Canada to pay a man who is already paid for his services?

Mr. OLIVER. No; if I had thought so I would not ask the House to vote the amount. I think it is fair remuneration and consideration for the services rendered and the time occupied.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, does it not seem ridiculous to you that a man who is employed by the year as an officer of a department of this government, the whole of whose time is paid for by the people of Canada, should be paid $400 for a couple or three months' service given, not in his own time, but in the people's time? I absolutely object to this.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no way of overruling my hon. friend's objection, nor have I any way of persuading him differently from the way he takes. I can only reiterate what I have stated, that, in my judgment, while Mr. Semmens' time was engaged and paid for by the country, still he was not paid for such duties or responsibilities as were placed upon him in the negotiation of these adhesions. We thought it was in the interest of economy that we should employ Mr. Semmens and make him a comparatively small allowance for extra duty rather than to employ some other person who probably would not do the work so well, and whose employment would cost the country a great deal more. That is one side of the question. The other is that we do not think it would be fair to hire Mr. Semmens for $2,200 a year to act as inspector for a certain number of Indian agencies, and then demand entirely different duties and responsibilities at his hands, and under circumstances entirely different from those which he had reason to expect would surround the duties which he was paid to discharge.

Mr. BRADBURY. The objection I made in the beginning, I think, holds good. It was emphasized by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) who, probably, knows more about the Indians than I do. But I think it is wrong to have an official, to whom the country is paying a very large salary, and then give him this additional work, when that work might have been performed by somebody else. The hon. minister knows how many people we have connected with the branch of the Indian Department at Winnipeg. The inspectors there draw a total of about $9,000, and some do nothing more than walk down to the office and get their cheques—do not leave Winnipeg and have no office work. I do not think there is anything to justify the sending out of these men at an extra $5 a day to perform duties that the country has already paid for. As to my hon. friend's (Mr. Campbell's) reference to my criticism of Mr. Semmens the other night, I hold that my criticism was justified, but that does not mean that I am going to carry it through my life and persecute or follow up this man. I have stated that his knowledge was sufficient to enable him to perform the work in connection with this extra work, and, that being so, I think he should have performed it as part of the duties of the position he holds. But I have nothing to take back of my criticism of the other night. There were extenuating circumstances, perhaps which I stated on that occasion. But nothing that I said would show that he is unfit for the duty he is said to have performed in this case. My objection is that he should not be paid a double salary.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think the minister's explanation is plausible, but it does not explain. I did not understand the minister to answer the question asked a moment ago: Was Mr. Semmens engaged for 79 days in getting these adhesions to the treaty, or does that 79 days include the time going and coming? I understood the minister to say that, on his way to where he received these adhesions and on the way back, he performed his regular duties as inspector of the department. Then, certainly, that needs explaining. If he was the best qualified man to get these adhesions, I have no objection to make, but I think it is a fair criticism to say that Mr. Semmens should not be paid extra for the time engaged in making inspections on his way to obtain these adhesions and on his way back.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Semmens' inspectorate extends to Norway House. There are several bands in the inspectorate between Selkirk and Norway House, and on his way between Selkirk and Norway House, either going or coming, he made the necessary inspections. The 79 days mentioned in the estimate was the time occupied from Norway House to Churchill and return to Norway House, and does not include the time he spent in going to Norway House.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. And no inspections were made after leaving Norway House?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there were none to make, but the territory had to be travelled over in order to reach York Factory and Churchill. We wish to pay him the allowance from the time he left Norway House until he returned to Norway House, that being the time when he was employed in securing these adhesions at York Factory

and Churchill; and we consider, as I have said, that it was economical to employ him, starting from Norway House and returning to that point, rather than send another commissioner, paying him his whole time, starting him from Winnipeg or Selkirk and paying him both ways.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How many persons accompanied this inspector?

Mr. OLIVER. Himself, a clerk, a physician, a cook, and five canoe men.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many places after leaving Norway House did this reverend gentleman call to obtain these adhesions with regard to Treaty No. 5.

Mr. OLIVER. The only two places at which he took adhesions were York Factory and Fort Churchill. The adhesions necessary in the intervening territory had been taken during the previous year. It would be necessary that he should make his trip from Norway House to York Factory and Fort Churchill in order to meet the Indians there at the time set for the meeting.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Taking the minister's figures, 480 miles, and knowing the conditions in the country as I do, I think the minister should hardly ask us to believe that in making that trip, this party travelled only ten miles a day. He could easily travel 100 miles a day down the river and 40 miles a day up the river.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend knows enough about travel in the west to understand that you cannot measure distances in such a country as this by miles, but by days.

Mr. CAMPBELL That was travelling by ox-cart.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a matter of days, not of miles. I have not travelled over this route, but if he travelled down stream 480 miles he would have to travel up stream the same distance, and making portages in either direction occupies time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. About one-third of the time.

Mr. OLIVER. Whether Mr. Semmens was slow or fast, he might have started sooner than he required to do in order to be sure he would meet the Indians at the time set, owing to the uncertainty of travel in that country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have never heard the minister more laboured in his effort to defend his department and justify a payment. While the amount is not large there is involved the principle that a man who receives a good salary should not be paid twice for the same time. I cannot conscientiously vote for this payment and if a motion was made to strike the item out of the estimates I would support it cordially.

Mr. OLIVER. I am at one with the hon. member in his principle that we should not pay a man two salaries for the same time, but I do not think we should require a man to do two kinds of work for the same salary. It is the same time, but it is not the same work, and we have no right to hire a man on the pay of a crossing sweeper and expect him to do the work of a railway superintendent. The principle I stand for is that the government has no right to impose upon its officials, and that when it asks men to do special work outside of the duties for which they are engaged it should give special consideration for those special duties.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did I understand that our reverend friend went from Norway House down the river by Split lake to the mouth of the river at York Factory?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no information at hand, but I imagine that Mr. Semmens followed the ordinary boat route between Norway House and York Factory which, of course, is not the Nelson river, but the Hayes river, and then went by the waters of Hudson Bay from York Factory to Churchill. I do not know by what route he returned.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think this committee should be seized of the facts, because, while $400 is a great big sum if it is to be paid unjustly, the expenses are something that this committee ought to consider in conjunction with the amount that is being paid to the Rev. Mr. Semmens. If he took the trip down the Nelson river in the usual course it would cost very little, comparatively speaking, but if he went around by Beren's river, Island lake, God's lake, Cross lake and Split lake, and from there to York factory and Churchill, the expense would run up very high. I think the minister ought to give us all this information while we are considering the question of this gentleman's salary.

Mr. OLIVER. I can assure my hon. friend that Mr. Semmens did not go by way of Berens river, Island lake and God's lake. Mr. Semmens passed by way of Beren's river to Norway House. That part of his trip is not considered in this expenditure, but from Norway House he went direct to York Factory by way of Nelson river or Hayes river. I take it for granted that he went by way of Hayes river because that is the ordinary boat route, and is considered to be a better route than by way of the Nelson river. I assume that he went that way because it was his business to go from Norway House direct to York Factory, from York Factory direct to

Churchill and come back to Norway House. I cannot say definitely whether he went by Hayes river or Nelson river. He could go either way. The result in time would be much the same, but it is generally considered that the Hayes river route is the better one. He did not go by the roundabout route that my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. CAMPBELL. My information is that he did actually take the route which I suggest, that he only touched at Norway House on his way back, that he went from Berens river to Island lake, then to God's lake, to Cross lake, to Split lake, thence to York Factory and naturally on to Churchill. The minister is asking us to pass a certain vote and he tells us the reason why he asks that. A statement which I make, on what I believe is good authority, the minister says is absolutely wrong. If the minister is absolutely wrong and I happen to be right, what reason has this committee to judge that the minister is right? I take the same stand as my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) does, that when a man is paid to work for 365 days in the year, or when he is paid a salary, not as a crossing sweeper as compared with other higher occupations referred to by the minister, he should not be paid for a greater length of time. This man Semmens is paid by the Indian Department for doing all the work that the department requires with regard to Indians. This is only part of his work, and why he should be paid for 444 days while employees in the buildings attached to this House working in the same service can only be paid for 365 days is something beyond my comprehension, and I therefore move that this item, No. 370, amounting to $395, be struck out.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the minister the information as to the cost of this expedition?

Mr. OLIVER. The total cost of the trip, including the work of inspection and treaty payment on the way, was $4,000. In regard to the route followed, I find I was in error, and that Mr. Semmens, on his way out, went by way of Berens river, Deer lake, Island lake, Oxford House, God's lake, Nelson House and Split lake——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Just as I said.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is correct—then further to York Factory and Churchill. The whole trip occupied 106 days, but we deduct from the 106 days 27 days which was the time occupied in the actual inspection work, and we charged for the additional 79 days which were occupied outside of the ordinary inspection work.

Item voted: Yeas 40, nays 30.

To provide an amount to pay Dr. J. D. Lafferty for special services and expenses rendered in visiting the Blood and Peigan Indian boarding schools, $174.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is Dr. Lafferty's salary, and what are his duties?

Mr. OLIVER. His salary is $1,800. His duties are medical attendance on the Black Foot reserve, Stoney reserve, Sarcee reserve and Indian school at High river.

Mr. HERRON. I cannot understand why Dr. Lafferty who lives in Calgary quite a distance from the reserve should be employed. There must be competent physicians in the vicinity of the reserve, whose travelling expenses would be less than half and who would be nearer to the Indians in case of illness. What is the explanation?

Mr. OLIVER. There are two sides to this as to every question. The question is: Shall we pay a man of high standing in his profession a salary for giving a portion of his time or shall we pay a man of less high standing for giving the whole of his time. My own impression is that when it comes to medical advice the best is the cheapest, and the higher salary a man can command the better his services are. In my humble judgment it is more in the interest of the Indians that when medical advice is required by them they should have it from a man of the high standing of Dr. Lafferty rather than from a man of less high standing in the medical profession. Possibly the view of my hon. friend is the better one, but the other is the view I would take in the matter of personal concern, and it is a fair proposition that I should apply the same rule to the Indians.

Mr. ROCHE. Is Dr. Lafferty engaged in private practice in the city of Calgary?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course we could not secure the whole of Dr. Lafferty's services for $1,800 a year.

Mr. ROCHE. Is it not the fact that on the two reserves there is a medical man besides Dr. Lafferty? Does not Dr. O. C. Edwards get a salary of $1,850 a year for attending to these two reserves? Was Dr. Lafferty paid for attending the reserves during the absence of Dr. Edwards?

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. Edwards is in charge of these reserves but this expense was incurred in connection with a special investigation into tuberculosis upon the Indian reserves, and in the Indian schools, which was carried on by Dr. Bryce of the department at Ottawa and Dr. Lafferty. These two gentlemen are considered to be specially eminent in that branch of their profession and it was thought wise to engage them as a sort of commission to inquire into tuberculosis among the Indians. Their report is published and this vote is to pay Dr. Lafferty for the special work he did in that matter.

Mr. ROCHE. According to the Auditor General's Report Dr. Lafferty was allowed $166.60 for attending a tuberculosis convention at Hamilton. Is he the only physician in the employ of the government who attended that convention and whose expenses were paid by the government?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed he was the only medical officer in connection with the Indian Department who was present at that convention and whose expenses were paid.

Immigration contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, $50,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. What is this vote for?

Mr. OLIVER. The immigration movement is considerably larger during the current year than it was the previous year, and the expenditure we provided for has consequently been overrun. We estimated for British bonuses for the current year $70,000 and we expect we will need $20,000 more; for advertising in the United States we estimated $210,000, and we expect that $10,000 extra will be needed; for locating settlers in the west we estimated $65,000, and we believe we will want $10,000 more; for boundary inspection we estimated $60,000 and $10,000 more will be required.

Seed grain advances, further amount required, $220,000.

Mr. OLIVER. I regret very much to say that our anticipations in regard to the need of seed grain by homesteaders this year have been short of the mark. We knew that there was a crop shortage in some parts of the west last fall, and we made investigation during the winter, so that at the time the extra supplementary estimates were brought before the House about a month ago, we expected that our total requirements would be about $100,000. We asked for $50,000 then, and intended to ask for a further $50,000 in the estimates for next year; but as spring approached and people began to get near the need of grain, applications came in to such a degree that we were compelled to revise our estimates entirely. It is a great disappointment to the department that this is the case; but I feel confident that the House will be willing to face the conditions. We find that our total requirements, instead of being about $100,000, will run, according to our last estimates, to about $320 000. We have already been granted $50,000 and we are asking now for $220,000 and we shall have to ask parliament for another $50,000 in the supplementary estimates for the coming year. We require this amount of money now, very urgently, in order to pay for the grain, because the people are already preparing to go on to the land, and if we are to do any good, it is necessary that the grain should be furnished in good time.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why should there be such a necessity? There were pretty good crops last year.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry to say that the crops were not so good all over the country. In one part of the western country the rain fall was very light, and homesteaders did not get seed out of their crop. We are asking for a vote that will supply these people with seed for their crop of 1911, and it is urgently necessary that they should get the seed without delay.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the cost of this seed grain paid back to the department?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. There are some cases in which it is not, but it is a perfectly businesslike transaction, and in the vast majority of cases the money is paid back in due course with interest. The area principally affected is south of the Canadian Pacific railway line and west of the Sault line, where the season was exceptionally dry last year. The outlook is favourable for a good season this year, and we believe it is in the interest of the country that the people should be given an opportunity to get seed enough for a fair crop this year.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is in southern Alberta?

Mr. OLIVER. In south-western Alberta the crop was fairly satisfactory, but it is in south-eastern Alberta, adjoining the Saskatchewan line, and in south-western Saskatchewan where the rainfall last year was the lowest, and a large number of people went in there who did not get their land into such a condition as to stand the dry weather. The combination of a light rainfall and new settlement resulted in a very light crop last year.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the minister give the House some information as to the plan adopted for the distribution of this seed grain and the price of it per bushel?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to give my hon. friend the details at the moment as I would wish. Conditions have to be met as they arise. First, there is an inspection of the country by officers of the department to ascertain whether there is a general loss of crop. We do not propose to supply seed grain to every individual loser, but only where there is a general loss. Having ascertained that, we furnish forms of application at the post offices, the Mounted Police posts, the land offices and other official places in the territory affected. These applications, when received, are dealt with. Sufficient seed for 30 acres is the most that we allow to any individual; we think that will give him a fair start for another year. The grain is purchased and handled by our Immigration Branch in

Winnipeg, of which Mr. Bruce Walker is the chief. The actual work is entirely under his direction. Through the medium of his staff, he deals with the applications, purchases the grain, and attends to its delivery. A lien is taken upon the homesteader's land for the value of the grain. At present a number of the officials of the Land Department are assisting the Immigration Department in the transaction of this work.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. A few years ago the government of Canada paid a large sum of money for seed grain because of a great failure of crop in the west. If in order, I would ask the minister to give a short explanation of the condition of that at present. How much has been paid back, and how much is still unpaid?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry I have not got the figures here, but some time ago in answer to a question, I did give the exact figures. Out of all the advances we have made in all these years, there is only something like $100,000 outstanding, which is a very small fraction of the total amount.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I quite agree that if only $100,000 is outstanding, that is a very satisfactory showing.

Canadian national parks, further amount required, $8,000.

Mr. DANIEL. How many national parks have we?

Mr. OLIVER. We are arranging that there shall be a Rocky Mountain park which will include what are now three parks. This relates especially to the purchase of buffalo. Some years ago arrangements were made to purchase the herd owned by a man named Pablo in Montana. We have now acquired nearly the whole of this herd. There is a small herd owned by Mrs. Conrad, of Montana, which we have acquired as well. We have purchased 30 head, of which 15 have been delivered and the other 15 are to be delivered in the spring.

Mr. DANIEL. How much does each herd cost delivered in the park?

Mr. OLIVER. We paid $250 per head for Mrs. Conrad's herd delivered on board the train. These buffaloes are crated so that they are transported under more favourable conditions than the herd we bought from Mr. Pablo which were put into the cars without any special arrangement. We paid $200 per head to Mr. Pablo and the cost of transportation, which made the cost about $250 per head.

Mr. DANIEL. How many buffalo all told, have you got?

Mr. OLIVER. About 950 head. We received our first shipment in June, 1907, 199; October, 1907, 211; July, 1909, 109; October, 1909, 28; June, 1910, 46; October, 1910, 28. There are still about 70 head to be delivered from the Pablo herd. We have already received 15 from Mrs. Conrad and expect 15 more in the spring. Then we shall have the only buffalo herd of any account on the continent.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they increasing by natural increase?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but they have been at very considerable disadvantage so far on account of the very rough character of the trip, the rounding of them up, and shipping on the train. We located the first two shipments in a temporary park and had to reship them again, so that the main herd has only been in quiet condition on their present location for about a year and a half.

Mr. DANIEL. Did not some of them stampede?

Mr. OLIVER. No. I read in the paper that a prairie fire had burnt away part of the fence and that the buffalo had escaped and were lost on the prairie. That was exaggerated. There was a fire but it did not burn the fence and the buffalo did not escape.

Mr. HERRON. Do you propose to put any buffalo on any part of the reserve at Kootenay lakes? That would be a very suitable portion of country and the people are anxious to have them there.

Mr. OLIVER. We are not prepared to decide until we have secured all we expect to get from the United States. One of our objects is that they shall form an attraction in the different pleasure resorts we hope to establish from time to time. We have not yet taken up the question of establishing the Kootenay lakes park as a pleasure resort, but we hope to be able to do so before long, and no doubt will be able to add the attraction of a small band of buffalo. Of course it would be useless to establish a herd there before we are prepared to take very good care of them. That park is very close to the boundary, and I would not like to risk many of these animals there unless they were very carefully looked after.

Mr. HERRON. Does the last purchase that was made take in about the last of the herds that were in the United States?

Mr. OLIVER. There may be some small bands in other places, but we are informed that the buffalo we purchased were the only bands of any considerable size in the United States.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the special purpose of gathering up these buffalo? Is it merely to add an attraction to the park?

Mr. OLIVER. Partly, it is a matter of sentiment; it is considered desirable to preserve from extinction this animal which was such a very remarkable feature of the continent. Partly, of course, it is to add an attraction to certain parts of the country. Partly, it is with a view to the possibly commercial production of the buffalo. There is no doubt that there are certain commercial advantages in this animal, and it may be possible that they can be turned to account. It seemed reasonable that, at any rate, this government should go to some expense and secure such a number of buffalo as would enable that experiment to be tried out to a finish. The buffalo robe, as my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) knows is very valuable.

Mr. HENDERSON. A rare bird.

Mr. OLIVER. Rare and very valuable. It has intrinsic values that probably no other fur has. It is a question whether it would not be profitable to rear buffalo for the sake of their products, just as cattle are reared. At any rate, we are in a position to try that experiment while carrying out these other ideas.

Mr. HERRON. At the time of the loading of the buffalo of the Pablo herd in Montana, it was stated, a number were running at large outside their location, and that the owner killed the ones that escaped. Is there any truth in that statement?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no doubt that great difficulties were experienced in corralling the buffalo and loading them. There were many stampedes and some losses, that is some of the buffalo were killed either accidentally or designedly. I did see it stated in the newspapers that it was the owner's intention to slaughter such of these animals as he found he would be unable to ship. That, however, does not affect the bargain made by the government with Mr. Pablo. We only pay for the buffalo actually delivered at the railroad station nearest to the park in Canada, at Wainwright, Banff or Elk Park, as the case may be. We pay him $200 per head, and cost and charges of transportation, but we only pay for those he hands over to us.

Mr. HERRON. I have had applications which, I think, I showed to the minister, from people in my locality who are anxious to buy a pair or more of young buffalo. I would recommend to the minister the following out of a policy of that kind. Where a farmer has a desire, as a matter of curiosity for wild animals, and you know he is going to take the very best care of them, it would be a good idea to encourage him by giving him, at a reasonable rate, a pair of buffalo calves to see how they would grow and increase.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as we have framed a policy in regard to the matter, that is part of our intention. But we do not think it wise to enter upon any policy until we have cleared up the transaction with the owner in the United States. As soon as we have done that, as we hope to do in the spring, we shall be prepared to deal with the buffalo on a settled line of policy, and will look to the utilization of the herd, and, if possible, a profit on the expenditure.

Mr. HERRON. I have something to say on the park reserves, but I understand that that is not the question that is before you now, Mr. Chairman.

Amount required for Banff water works and sewerage, including $9,741.63 payable to Breckenridge & Lund as extras in connection with unforeseen difficulties met in the carrying out of their contract for the construction of sewer works at Banff, Alberta.—Revote, $12,500.

Mr. DANIEL. Was this under contract?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The contract was completed in 1909. A claim was made by the contractor for extra payment on account of difficulties encountered that had not been provided for under the specifications. The engineer reported favourably on the claim. We asked for the amount last year and it was covered by one of the estimates voted. But inasmuch as it had not been specifically voted, the Auditor General declined to pass it, and we are asking a direct revote of the amount.

Mr. DANIEL. You are asking for something more than the revote, for the claim is only something over $9,700.

Mr. OLIVER. The total amount was $12,500, but it included the $9,741.65 mentioned here.

To provide for the expenses of the Dominion Forestry Convention held at Quebec in January, 1911, $3,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this the whole amount?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Is not this a new item? We have not had a vote of this kind before?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will remember that, when the forestry convention was held in Ottawa about four years ago, there was such an item.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I understand this was to pay the expenses of people who went to the convention, not salaries. The

Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Ontario delivered an address at that convention which has been printed in French and is being extensively distributed in the province of Quebec. I think it would be a good thing if that lecture, which has been distributed in French in the province of Quebec, were printed in English so that it might be distributed in Ontario. The lecturer is a very capable man who came from my town and his addresses are very much appreciated.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall take the matter up.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. This meeting was in connection with the Conservation Commission was it not?

Mr. OLIVER. No, this was a forestry convention held at Quebec just before the meeting of the Conservation Commission, It is a part of the same general movement, but relates only to forestry.

Militia and Defence, required to complete payment of a rifle range at Winnipeg, $72,482.19.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). This is to pay the difference between the amount received from the sale of a rifle range at Winnipeg and the amount paid for a larger range with ground sufficient for drill and camp purposes, outside of Winnipeg. We sold our 200 acres at Winnipeg for something over $600 an acre, and bought 1,120 acres further out on the line, but still on the street cars and quite convenient for our purpose for $175 an acre so that we have to pay a difference of $72,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the length of the range?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 1,000 yards.

Mr. DANIEL. Will you put up permanent buildings like those at the Sussex camp?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The same kind of thing.

Mr. ROCHE. In connection with the selection of sites, which officer is sent out to make the selections in the west?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Colonel Steel in the first instance would go over the ground and select a place or places that would be suitable. Then we usually send a board of officers to select the sites and report.

Mr. ROCHE. I wish the minister would facilitate the selection of a site in my town as soon as possible because I understand the town is willing to donate a site and has options on a certain number of lots for a certain time.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will see that an officer is sent to select a site.

Militia and Defence, customs duties, further amount required, $100,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is a vote which we take each year, for payment of duties on ordnance which is being delivered from England having been purchased through the War Office. It is really a cross entry and a formal vote.

Royal Military College, furnish amount required, $17,134.69.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is required to meet the regular expenses of the college. Last year arrangements were made to accommodate 20 additional students bringing the average attendance up to 115. $10,000 of the 1909-10 expenses were taken out of the vote for the current year, so that there remains as the amount necessary on account of the extra 20 students $7,000.

Mr. DANIEL. That would be a permanent addition to the cost of the college?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, except that a certain amount of it comes back. The pupils pay in about $300 per year. We are asking for $135,000 in the main estimates this year.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to ask the minister if he has thought of putting up a drill hall in Aylmer, Ont? When his estimates were up last year he said that he would consider it. We have a part of the 25th battalion there. We have no place for them to meet, and they are getting scattered all over. They have mentioned that they would like to have some accommodation, even if it were only a small building.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At what place?

Mr. MARSHALL. Aylmer, Ont. I do not know that you remember it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do remember it, but I would suggest to my hon. friend that when the main estimates come up, which I hope will be next week, I expect to be questioned upon matters of this kind, and I will be prepared I hope to give full information.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). As all these different items apparently run into each other, perhaps the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence would welcome the opportunity of giving us an explanation as to military matters in Winnipeg. Fort Osborne adjoins the government grounds. There have been negotiations between the government here and the government of Manitoba with reference to acquiring the Fort Osborne grounds to give a sufficient site for the government buildings there. I see by the papers that another deputation is coming from Winnipeg to interview the government with reference to the acquisi-

tion of these grounds. The minister told us the other day that he had offered to take a million dollars, but the Manitoba government say that this figure is about four or five times the real value of the property. The minister told us also that they were quite well satisfied with the premises there now. I do not think he has a very accurate photograph of the property in his mind. It is rather a blot upon the city. There are a lot of old buildings, including a wooden drill shed built 25 or 30 years ago and totally inadequate for military purposes. I have no doubt that representations to the minister have been made with regard to it from time to time. Then, there is an old custom house, and they have some other buildings situated in other parts of the town. There has been a desire for better accommodation. I have been told that offers have been made to the government of grounds 30 acres in extent, inside the city boundary at a place called Happyland. They have the rifle range at St. Charles. I would like if the minister would give us in a few words the situation which exists at Winnipeg with regard to military matters.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not expect the matter to come up, but still I appreciate my hon. friend's motive, which is a good one, I know, and I will be very glad to tell him what I can offhand. In the valuation which we put upon this property we were quite sincere and had no desire whatever to place a valuation upon it which was unreasonable or which would in any way interfere with the praiseworthy object which the government of Manitoba have in view, namely, the increasing of their accommodation in the city of Winnipeg. As I said in the House in answer to my hon. friend a few days ago, we sent an officer to Winnipeg to inquire into the value of this and other properties which we own, including the rifle range to which I referred a moment ago. That officer reported that this property was worth $800,000, and adding to that the value of the buildings, we thought that in order to put ourselves in as good a position as we are to-day, that is to procure land elsewhere and to construct new buildings, it would cost more than $1,000,000, but we would be willing to accept that amount. As to our buildings, my hon. friend suggests that many of them are old. I dare say that is true, but I know that several are new. For instance, we have constructed a stores building and a house, or houses, in connection with it at an expense of $50,000 or $60,000, or more. We also altered the building in which the commandant of the station lives, at a very considerable expense. We have constructed other buildings there and with the exception perhaps of the drill shed, which is old and which must be rebuilt, I admit, in the near future, we are fairly comfortably situated, except that we do require more buildings than we have to-day. We are obliged to rent houses for the sergeants, although it would be better if we could have a building of our own. On the whole, we are getting along comfortably enough, and we had no intention of changing our position at the present at any rate. Now, with regard to the whole matter, I see by the papers that a deputation is coming here from Manitoba composed of representatives of the government to discuss this matter with this government. I am very glad indeed that it is, and I hope the result may be that the wrong impression which the government of Manitoba has received may be removed, and that some agreement advantageous to the government of Manitoba and fair to this government may be reached. I wish to say that in so far as I am concerned and, I am sure, the whole government is actuated by the same desire, I will do everything in my power to meet the government of Manitoba in this matter more than half-way.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I think I have a little better knowledge of the property and the values of property than the minister.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have none except what I get from other people.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Except what you get from your officers. I would like to know in what way the officer who was sent there arrived at a valuation of $800,000 for that property. It seems to me to be three times the actual value of the property.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have no intention, no desire whatever to ask more for the property than it is actually worth. Of course, not forgetting that we have to find a home for the military depot somewhere else. We must always keep that in mind. We cannot agree to turn ourselves out of doors without knowing how we are going to get a new home.

Mr. STAPLES. From whom did the government first obtain the Fort Osborne property and what was the original cost?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Hudson Bay Company for the purpose of promoting the establishment of a government and a military depot, gave the lands, and so long as we choose to remain there they are ours.

Mr. ROCHE. And there is no stipulation binding the government not to part with the lands?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not that I know of.

Mr. STAPLES. In a letter received from some of my constituents they complain that young men are not allowed to join

the rifle associations until they are 21 years old.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The age is from 18 to 48.

Mr. STAPLES. They must have been wrongly informed.

Mr. JAMESON. Some days ago the minister stated that the return ordered by the House respecting the Bear River rifle range would be brought down immediately, but it has not yet been tabled.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My deputy tells me that the return is complete with the exception of some letters which are at Halifax and which have been telegraphed for.

Mr. JAMESON. How long would it take to get them?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It ought not take more than two or three days.

Mr. STAPLES. When a rifle club secures a range does the department pay any part of the purchase price; where a range is rented does the department pay the rent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The regulations provide for one dollar per year for each member of a rifle association. Where there are regular military corps we construct the range ourselves and rifle associations have the right to use them free of all expense.

Conciliation and Labour Act—further amount, $8,000.

Mr. KING. Most of this amount is required for the cost of printing the special report on wholesale prices in Canada compiled by Mr. Coates, associate editor of the 'Labour Gazette,' which shows by means of statistical tables and charts the movement of prices in Canada of 230 articles for the last twenty years. The report has been circulated to members of the House and they know how valuable it is.

Mr. DANIEL. How many copies were printed?

Mr. KING. Seven thousand. We have reserved some of the copies as it is a report that is likely to be called for in years to come. It is one of the most comprehensive works that has been published by any department of the government.

Mr. LAKE. Has the work been distributed?

Mr. KING. Copies have been sent to every member of the House and a number of members have written for additional copies. If my hon. friend has not got one I shall send it to him.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I do not see why this was not provided for in the main estimates.

Mr. KING. The report is larger than we had expected at the outset and it cost more than we anticipated. I commenced with an idea that it was best to take an inside estimate, but experience has taught me that it may be the better plan to make an estimate large enough at the outset so as not to have to come back for a supplementary.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). There are altogether too many supplementary estimates and more care should be taken in preparing the main estimates. The experience of the past should be a guide as to the cost.

Mr. KING. This is the first special report that has been published and we had no past experience to guide us.

Mail service between Canada and Cuba, $8,333.32.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The contractor for this service at first employed Norweigan steamers and the government compelled the contractor to use ships of British or Canadian register in the service. During the time negotiations were pending as to this, four trips were made and the vote lapsed meanwhile. This is to pay for the four trips.

Mr. DANIEL. This vote is for the use of the Norweigan vessels?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose so.

Mr. DANIEL. I asked in the House the other day whether subsidies were paid to vessels flying the Norwegian or other foreign flags when British or Canadian vessels were available, and the reply was that they were not. This item would appear to show that the government had changed its mind in that respect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. In the case of one subsidy, a company started on the business, and two or three trips were made with Norwegian vessels; but we protested and compelled the company to substitute British vessels. We would not pay them until they complied with our terms. After they did so, we thought it well that they should be paid for the two or three trips that they had made with Norwegian ships.

Mr. DANIEL. That means that for the future Norwegian vessels will not be paid for?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Administration of Chinese Immigration Act, further amount required, $12,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is required in consequence of the great increase which has taken place in the immigration from China. As the members of the committee are aware, Chinese immigrants are

subjected to a poll tax of $500 a head. Notwithstanding this, the immigration from China during the last year has almost doubled, 1,600 having come in. This necessarily increases the charges on the department, and it is to provide for these additional charges and also for the investigation into Chinese immigration, which is now going on, that this amount is asked for.

Trade commissioners and commercial agents, including expenses in connection with negotiation of treaties or the extension of commercial relations, further amount required, $7,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This additional amount is necessitated by reason of the transfer of several trade commissioners and the furnishing of new offices, and also by a considerable increase in the work of the various offices. At present the salaries paid amount to $48,254.54, and contingencies to $40,376.90, a total of $88,631.44. We have trade commissioners at Bristol, England; Belfast, Ireland; Auckland, New Zealand; Capetown, South Africa; Mexico, Berlin, Bermuda, Yokohama, Shanghai, Havana, Glasgow, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and Hull; Paris (France), Durban (South Africa), Holland, St. John's (Newfoundland), Sydney and Melbourne, Australia. In addition to these, we have commercial agents at several points, who are simply residents of their respective localities, and are paid a small salary for attending to our business.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this item include any expense in connection with the negotiation of the reciprocity agreement now before the House?

Mr. FIELDING. This is the form in which the vote has stood for some years. I think that in one or two instances such charges have been made against it. It covers expenses of trade commissioners, so that it is available for the other service if needed.

Salaries of chief inspectors, deputy inspectors and other employees, rents, day wages and other contingencies under the Inspection and Sale and Manitoba Grain Acts, further amount required, $25,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The amount voted in the main estimates for this service is $190,000, but it is found that this further amount is required. The service is increasing, and is almost self-supporting.

Mr. ROCHE. How much has been paid to the officers appointed by the government during the past year in connection with the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give this information to-day, but perhaps will be able to give it on the main estimates.

Removal of foreign and uncurrent coin from circulation, further amount required, $7,500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The House is aware that we have been engaged several years in exporting foreign silver, practically all American silver, and substituting for it Canadian currency. We exported a considerable amount in 1910, and did not think we would have to export much this year. However the amount has proved much larger than we expected, and we need this additional sum. We pay the bank for exporting this silver three-eighths of one per cent in addition to express charges. Of course as this foreign silver is removed, it is replaced by the silver of Canada, in the coining of which there is a considerable profit.

Mr. PERLEY. Is there any law in the United States forbidding the passing of Canadian currency there?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not, but custom, I regret to say, largely prevents the taking of our Canadian money except in the border towns where, for the convenience of trade, it is very generally accepted. It will also be taken in the large departmental stores of the principal cities; but for general purposes it is not accepted in the United States, not as a matter of law, but of custom.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is the same in the case of our bills.

Mr. FIELDING. In many cases our bills will not be taken, although there is sometimes a distinction drawn between our national bills and our bank bills. I know that in one instance when I tendered a Canadian bank bill it was refused, and when I remonstrated the party said: 'We will take your national notes, but we do not know anything about your banks.' There is no universal rule, but the big hotels and departmental stores in New York will take both our bank bills and our national bills. But in the ordinary avenues of trade, I think our notes, both bank and national, would be refused and certainly our silver.

Mr. PERLEY. I have been told that there is a law preventing the banks from accepting Canadian currency on deposit, and that is one reason why people on the other side of the line do not like to take it.

Mr. FIELDING. The point is new to me, but it is a very interesting point, and in view of what my hon. friend has said, it will be my duty to look it up.

Mr. PERLEY. It seems to me that when the hon. minister was talking over the reciprocity question in Washington, this is a subject which might have been taken up in one shape or another. He has told us about Canadian bank notes being refused, and all of us have had experiences of the

same kind. I had a letter the other day from a friend of mine who was going through the States from Ontario to Vancouver, and they charged 2 per cent discount on a Canadian bank note which he tendered in payment of Pullman car accommodation going out of Chicago. That is an outrage especially on the part of a company like the Pullman which does such a large business in this country and receives so much consideration from us. Of course it is only reasonable that we should accept American currency and bills, and I would not like to see that stopped, but there ought to be some reciprocity in a matter of that kind. It is a personal every-day matter which affects us all; and certainly when our bills are refused, particularly by a company like the Pullman, that gives a shock to our national pride, and we should try to find some way of avoiding it. I think the minister might have taken up that question in discussing reciprocity.

Mr. FIELDING. We had a good many things to think of in Washington, and that particular one did not occupy our attention. I quite agree with my hon. friend that a company like the Pullman company, which does such a profitable business in Canada, ought not to refuse Canadian money at par. One can make allowance when a small business establishment does that, but in the case of a great corporation there can be no excuse. I shall take the matter up and am glad that my hon. friend drew my attention to it.

Mr. BARKER. I heard the other day that a Canadian travelling in the United States offered a $20 Bank of Montreal bill, and it was refused, but when he offered a $20 bill of the Dominion Bank it was accepted.

Mr. FIELDING. That shows the value of a name.

Mr. JAMESON. Have any steps been taken to export Newfoundland 20 cent pieces? In the maritime provinces we have a good many in circulation, and they are a source of great inconvenience, especially to a good housewife when she finds she is short in change because one of these 20 cent pieces had been given to her for a 25 cent piece. Some of our boards of trade some time ago passed strong resolutions with regard to this.

Mr. FIELDING. Undoubtedly this currency creates annoyance in the maritime provinces, but I did not think it large enough or broad enough to require us to take special steps to export the silver. There is a common impression that these pieces are Canadian and I have been often asked why we issue them. But on examination, the parties were astonished to find that they were not Canadian but Newfoundland. Several years ago I communicated with the government of Newfoundland to ascertain whether they might not find it convenient to cease the coining of these 20 cent pieces, but they assured me that it was a very great convenience to them and they were not prepared to act on our suggestion. If the thing became too great a trouble, we would have to consider the question of exporting the coin.

Mr. PERLEY. Are any Canadian 20 cent pieces still out?

Mr. FIELDING. Hardly any. None have been issued in my day at all.

Mr. JAMESON. I think the subject is of sufficient importance to warrant the minister dealing with it. I do not know whether he has ever seen the resolutions of the boards of trade, but at the time there was considerable discussion on the matter.

Mr. FIELDING. There is the barest possibility that our friends in Newfoundland do not quite like to be treated as foreigners in the matter of their coin.

Mr. JAMESON. I quite understand the delicacy of the position.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the minister any idea of the amount of foreign coin exported during the year?

Mr. FIELDING. During the year 1909-10 we exported of this American coin $918,000. In the year now closing, up to a very recent date, we exported $1,482,000. The people on the borders are passing backwards and forward all the time, and those from our side going over to the United States are pretty sure to bring back American silver with them. Consequently, there must be a certain amount current. It would seriously embarrass trade if we were to make any legal provision that this money should not pass in Canada, so, we think it better to arrange with the banks that, when they receive it they will not pay it out but will export it, and for this we pay them a small commission.

Mr. DANIEL. Does that apply to silver only or to gold also?

Mr. FIELDING. This applies to silver only; gold would be accepted without question.

Mr. HERRON. Is the percentage paid to the banks sufficiently large to induce them to encourage the importation of American silver into our country?

Mr. FIELDING. It is three-eighths of one per cent, besides we pay the express. I do not think any of the banks would do what my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) suggests.

Post Office Department—Contingencies—Clerical assistance—Further amount required $3,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is owing to the fact that the Civil Service Commission has been unable to send us the number of people required to fill our permanent staff, and so it is necessary to employ temporary clerks. As hon. members are aware, under the Civil Service Act these temporary clerks can be employed for only four months—They are not employed 'temporarily' for the whole year. At the end of the four months which is the limit of their employment, we apply to the commission to find if there are enough qualified applicants for the department.

Mr. JAMESON. I desire to call the Postmaster General's attention to a communication I received from the Canadian Postmasters' Association.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I met them yesterday.

Mr. JAMESON. I have also a number of letters from local postmasters containing synopsis of requests submitted by the association. I will not read these letters; as the minister says he has the petition of the postmasters', the requests are for increase of allowances in certain cases and for increase of salaries and rents in such cases as may be thought proper. The communications I have received are from Miss A. Potter, Saulnierville; A. F. Outhouse, Freeport; R. W. Ruggles, Westport; E. F. Comeau, Meteghan River; and Milton Outhouse, Tinerton. These letters are all in the same terms, and, as the minister says he is familiar with the subject matter, I will not refer to them further. But I hope they will receive his consideration, and that the result of that consideration will be favourable. Perhaps he is able to say now what answer he returned to those who waited upon him or whether he has arrived at a conclusion and whether the committee will be informed of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As I stated a moment ago, I received a large delegation of the Postmasters' Association, and some members of the House who accompanied that delegation. I listened very attentively to the various requests made. I may say that the question raised in the memorandum of the association have been before the department for a few weeks. We have had some pourparlers with members of the association, and the questions are now being sifted, so to speak, by the officers of the department. Speaking in broad terms, some of the requests are quite agreeable to the department. A number of the requests will probably be solved during the present session. Some others will require a little more consideration. And, finally, there are a few requests to which, as I stated yesterday, to the postmasters themselves, I am unalterably opposed. I may mention one. I am asked, for instance, to give every postmaster of the Dominion a copy of the Postmaster General's full report. I think the postmasters themselves understood that the request should not be granted. It is not necessary that all the 15,000 postmasters of the Dominion, many of them having very little work to do, should receive this bulky report. It would involve the department in very large expenditure. I informed the postmasters that the larger post offices and the principal post offce masters of the Dominion could always apply to the minister, the department or their members, and I certainly would be only too pleased to give the report where it is really needed. But every one will understand that it is impossible to send copies of this bulky report to the 15,000 postmasters of the Dominion.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think I am right in believing that the postmasters of the west receive no higher remuneration than those in other parts of Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is right.

Mr. KNOWLES. I called the attention of the Postmaster General and the committee to this matter four or five years ago. The rural postmasters in the west are subject to a great deal larger expense than are the rural postmasters in the east. The delivery of mail at their houses is a great deal more irregular, because of the physical conditions of the country, and especially because of the long distance travelled; and, for that reason, if for no other, the hours of duty are much longer than the hours of duty of the average country postmaster in the east. Their expenses for house accommodation are much larger; their living expenses are larger; their expenses for fuel are larger, for they must supply fuel to keep the post office premises in a reasonably comfortable condition for the patrons of the office. In fact, I am surprised that the department has not recognized this principle in the case of the postmasters, for it applies it in the case of those whom it employs by the month or the year. The department gives a higher rate of remuneration to its employees west of the Great Lakes than to those east of the Great Lakes; and I do not think that any person in the east will say that that is at all in the line of favouritism. I cannot see why the same principle should not be recognized with regard to country postmasters as with regard to permanent officials employed by the department. I would point out that as a rule the country postmasters in the west are among the pioneers of their district and also among the most worthy of the settlers of their localities. I should be pleased if the Postmaster General would take into his serious and favourable consideration the granting

of better compensation, more reasonable compensation, to postmasters west of the Great Lakes. This is not asking for them any better treatment than is given to the others, for, even if they be granted a large compensation, say 30 per cent or 50 per cent of an increase they will not be any further ahead of the game than those east of the Great Lakes, assuming that their remuneration is continued on the present scale.

With regard to the Postmaster General's department—and I think my hon. friends opposite who are from the west will agree with me in this—it has been exceptionally generous and reasonable in dealing with the needs of the settlers in the west. I think my hon. friends of the Conservative party will agree with me that this department is kept free from political influence, so far as it is possible, has granted to the settlers in the west, the very best service, and has made an exceptional success under the Postmaster General in granting facilities to the newer settlements. I do think the request I have made is a reasonable one and that the remuneration of the western postmasters should be on a higher scale than that of the eastern postmasters.

Mr. PERLEY. Did the deputation the other day ask that that difference be made between the east and the west?

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not think so, but that would not influence my opinion at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. While the hon. gentleman was speaking, I thought it strange that the deputation had not mentioned this.

Mr. GOODEVE. I wish to endorse the statements made by the hon. member for Digby, as I have also had a very large number of similar petitions. To some of the petitioners I have written, stating that generally I endorsed the requests that have been made by the postmasters, and was therefore very much pleased with the answer of the Postmaster General that he would take this into consideration. I notice that the postmasters ask for an increase in rent allowance and that the officers be classified with a system of promotion. The increase in rent allowance would cover the point raised by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles). Rentals in the west are admittedly higher than in the east, and therefore the request for an additional rental in the west would seem to be justified. The promotion principle undoubtedly seems the correct system for the management of the whole civil service, and it would be a great advantage to that service if it was generally understood that merit meant promotion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have stated, yesterday and this afternoon, the policy of the department as regards the requests of the postmasters. I could not say now what particular items will be dealt with, as I would not like to give out something which has not yet been decided upon, but I expect to deal with these various questions raised by the postmasters this session. As a hint to my hon. friend, I may say that when I took office in 1906, I raised the minimum salaries of the rural postmasters from $12 to $26, with an increase in the rental allowance and in the light and fuel allowance, and a year or two afterwards I again raised the salaries to the present minimum of $35, with a further increase in the rent, fuel and light allowances. Therefore, whilst I cannot state what will be my final decision in the present instance, my hon. friend can draw his own conclusions. Although the postmasters in their memorandum did not request the 15 per cent extra allowance granted to our mail clerks, stampers and sorters in the west, I have received that request from members of the House and from individual postmasters on several occasions. This is one of the things being considered by the department at present.

Mr. PERLEY. I do not want it to be understood that I was objecting to the argument of my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles). If the conditions in the west warrant larger salaries being paid postmasters, I, for one, would not object to it. I hope the minister will take into consideration the very moderate increase asked by the minimum postmasters. They seem to me to be the ones above all others to be entitled to a better allowance than they now receive. The quantity of mail matter is increasing all the time, they have more and more work to do, and the cost of living in this part of Canada has increased as much as in the west. I hope the minister will see his way to meet the moderate requests made.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Western Central Railway Company.—Mr. Rankin.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 142) for the relief of Lorne Forbes Robertson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 143) for the relief of Cecil Ernest Freeman.—Mr. Blain.

Bill (No. 144) for the relief of Ethel May Hornell.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 148) respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Molloy.

Bill (No. 149) respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 145) for the relief of Pauline Verena Meyer.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 151) to incorporate the Canadian Surety Company.—Mr. McCraney.

The hour for private Bills having expired the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. With the view of taking up a matter which I understand is by consent, I move that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Motion agreed to and the committee rose.

CANADA MEDICAL ACT.

Mr. FIELDING. There is on the Public Bills and Orders, Order No. 33 for the House go into committee on Bill (No. 15) to amend the Canada Medical Act which is in the hands of the hon. member for Hants. I am informed that by something like a general understanding this Bill may be called this evening so as to accord the hon. member (Mr. Black), an opportunity of advancing it. If there be no objection I would move that Order 33 be now called.

Motion agreed to, and order called.

House in committee on Bill (No. 15) to amend the Canada Medical Act.

Mr. BLACK. The object of this Bill is to make a general and uniform registration of medical men throughout Canada. Under its provisions any regular graduate in medicine regularly qualified to practise in any of the provinces of the Dominion may, by passing an examination before a central council can be qualified in any province in Canada. The Bill provides for a central council for examinations all over Canada. By passing the examination of this council a medical man shall be entitled to practise in any part of Canada. The Bill also provides that any man who has been a qualified physician for ten years in any one province may have the privilege of practising in any province in Canada without examination, providing that no province objects to the ten years stipulation. This Bill cannot become law until qualifying legislation has been adopted by every province in Canada. Five of the nine provinces have already passed that legislation, and four remain yet to pass it; one is considering it now. After this Bill got its first reading it was referred to a special committee composed of 14 medical members of the House of Commons and one legal gentleman to keep us straight. The medical councils of all the provinces in Canada were represented before that committee. There was a perfect agreement on every clause of the Bill by every province of Canada except as to one minor clause which dealt with the central medical council to which the province of Saskatchewan made objection, but this difference after some correspondence has been settled. I am perfectly safe in saying that every medical council in every province in Canada has agreed to the principle, and to all the clauses in this Bill and that there is no opposition anywhere that I am aware of. The principle of the Bill has been long sought for by the medical men of Canada and very much interest has been manifested in it by the medical profession. I have letters from every province in Canada, from the United States, from Germany, from France, and from Newfoundland in regard to this Bill, and I think there will be uniform satisfaction among the medical profession in Canada at its passage. I think that is all it is necessary to say.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Post Office Department—contingencies—clerical assistance—further amount required, $3,500.

Mr. GOODEVE. I would like to ask the Postmaster General what has been done in regard to the petition from the people of Nelson, B.C., in regard to postal delivery, sent to him on December 12?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend was good enough to give me the names of the officers. I cannot from memory say whether I have received the report from the inspector, or whether the request has been granted. I will let my hon. friend know to-morrow or on Monday. With regard to the question put to me with reference to the rural postmasters, I cannot at present speak openly as to the decision of the government; but I can say that during the present session I shall be in a position to tell the House exactly what I will do.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister anything to report in reference to the railway mail clerks?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We are just preparing the schedule. All these things will be included in one Bill.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he has any report from his inspector regarding the changing of a mail route in the Beaconsfield settle-

ment in Manitoba from the town of Somerset. The people want it to go by way of Treherne. They have also asked for a rural mail delivery. I sent a petition to the minister some time ago. The minister replied that he had referred this to the inspector and would act upon his report. Has he had any report?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have a faint recollection of a petition being sent by the hon. gentleman. The reason I could not answer at once was that we were short of boxes. We are, however, now having them manufactured in Toronto, and they can be got very easily, so that all requests concerning mail delivery can be attended to. I shall look into the matter.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the policy of the government with regard to rural mail delivery? The district I speak of is one of the oldest in Manitoba, and I find that in newer districts, for instance, in the district of Swan River, there is rural mail delivery quite generally. I, therefore, suppose the minister will have no hesitation in granting that system to the old portion I have referred to?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The policy of the government has not changed. We have established rural mail delivery on the existing mail routes at the request of 50 per cent of the patrons. The boxes are sold at $3 to the patrons. I might say, however, that we are disposed in the future to be a little more liberal in the establishment of rural mail delivery. When the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) is here, I propose to make a general statement.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the hon. minister any objection to placing postal boxes at other stations or towns throughout the constituency I have the honour to represent? I have had recently a number of letters from different towns asking for this. The minister two years ago placed postal boxes in two or three towns in which I asked him to place them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will my hon. friend send me his request in writing and it will be favourably considered?

Mr. BEST. Did the hon. minister take any action on the request of the people in the town of Shelbourne, Dufferin county asking for rural mail delivery?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That petition is before the department. I do not know if it has yet been reported on by the inspector. I shall look into the matter.

Mr. BRADBURY. Has the request made by the town of Selkirk for a post office box in the centre of the town been granted? The population is 2,500, and the post office was built a little bit out of the way.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend will send me a written application I shall look into it.

Mr. BRADBURY. All we want is a place to drop letters into down town. I want to draw attention to another fact. I have a petition from the Federated Letter Carriers' Association, who have asked me to bring it before the House and the minister. They are asking to be placed in a better position so that they may enjoy the benefits of superannuation. I do not think there is any class of men in the Civil Service, or in connection with the postal service, who deserve more consideration; and I might add that they labour in the west under difficulties greater than are experienced in other provinces, their expenses being much higher and the distances much greater. Would the minister kindly give favourable consideration to their request?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend will send the petition to me, I will see what I can do in the matter.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to inquire with regard to the forwarding of mails from Montreal to western Nova Scotia, whether they go by way of St. John and Digby for the western part of Nova Scotia, or by way of Moncton and Halifax and around through the Annapolis Valley by the Dominion Atlantic railway. I have here a clipping from the Digby 'Courier' of the 17th instant, dated Ottawa, March 14, 1911:

A. E. Wall, M.P.P.,
House of Assembly,
Halifax.

You will be glad to know that instructions have been given to carry out your wishes with reference to the forwarding of mails for points in the Annapolis valley by a Canadian Pacific railway train from Montreal and west to St. John and Digby on Saturdays instead of via Intercolonial railway to Halifax as heretofore, thus saving 24 hours.

F. W. BORDEN.

I do not know who the signer of this telegram may be, but the initials are those of the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am the man.

Mr. JAMESON. What I would like to ask is whether the mails have heretofore been forwarded in that way, or whether this is a new departure?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I received information from the Minister of Militia that this was a proper thing for that section of the maritime provinces, and I acceded to his request. I think my hon. friend will approve of that. Instructions have been given to that effect.

Mr. JAMESON. I just wish to point out in that connection that on February

18, 1910, I communicated with the Post Office Department, and made that request myself, and to this request I received the following reply:

Ottawa, February 22, 1910.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 18th instant, in regard to delay to mails for western Nova Scotia when forwarded via the Intercolonial railway to Halifax as compared with the route via the Canadian Pacific railway to St. John and thence across the Bay to Digby, and in reply would say that this matter will be immediately inquired into.

Yours truly
R. M. COULTER,
Deputy Postmaster General.

C. Jameson, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

On the 19th March, 1910, I received a further communication with respect to this matter in which he said that:

The mails whether forwarded by the Intercolonial or Canadian Pacific railway were forwarded through to St. John and made the same connection with the boat for Digby.

I afterwards learned from the gentleman who had brought this matter of delays in these mails, owing to their going via Halifax, to my attention that there had been no delay thereafter, and that, in consequence of my taking the matter up with the department, and of the department having acted along the line I have suggested, the delay which had theretofore existed was no longer occasioned. So, I was somewhat surprised when I saw this notification in the press that Mr. Wall and the Minister of Militia and Defence had been the means of bringing about this reform. I may point out that, as this correspondence proves, this reform has been in existence for a year, and there could have been no very special necessity for these congratulatory telegrams, because they were sent to the wrong person. If my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence had desired to commend any person for activity in this respect he might have waved his hand or nodded his head at me across the floor of this House; and I think if he had done so he would have recognized the person who had been instrumental in bringing about this reform with which he is so pleased, and which I suggested and, of course, very heartily approve.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) that there was no ill-will on the part of the Postmaster General in regard to this reform. The hon. gentleman, from his experience of life and political and public matters, will know that a reform always takes time before evolving into a reality. Last year, he chose to address himself to the Deputy Postmaster General. If he had come straight to me, perhaps it would have been more easy to obtain the reform. At all events I may say to my hon. friend that, during the year we had gathered the necessary information, so that when the Minister of Militia came with his request, matters were ripe and we could accomplish this reform which is so grateful to Nova Scotia and so much approved by my hon. friend.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I have no desire whatever to detract in any way from the work that my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) is doing, or is trying to do, for western Nova Scotia. I did not know that he had written the letter to which he refers. He does not often hide his light under a bushel, but in this particular case it happened to be that way. My connection with the matter is this: I am interested to some extent, but not, perhaps, so much as the representative of the county of Digby, in the matter. My attention was called by the provincial member for Digby, Mr. Wall, to an undesirable condition of things existing in the western part of Nova Scotia with reference to the mails. I did not fully understand or apprehend what Mr. Wall meant, and I asked him to put the matter in writing. This he did, and sent his letter some time, I think, in early February, or perhaps in January. The moment I received this letter I forwarded it to my colleague the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), and after a certain time, I received a letter from the Postmaster General to the effect that the idea mentioned in Mr. Wall's letter was being carried out. So, I sent a telegram to let Mr. Wall know. That is my connection with the matter as I have said, I had no desire to detract from anything my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) has done.

Mr. JAMESON. The Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has said that, if I had applied direct to him, instead of to his deputy the matter would have been expedited, and he would have attended to it. I did not read my letter of February 18, 1910, to the committee when I brought this matter up, because I did not think it necessary to go to that length. But I may say that the letter, a copy of which I have in my hand, was directed to the Postmaster General himself. I, of course, addressed him as head of the department. The reply came, in course of time, from his deputy. If the minister likes, I can read the letter I wrote. Perhaps it is as well that I should put it on 'Hansard,' and then the minister will have it at hand. The reason I make mention of this is that I am constantly meeting with things of this kind in my own county. The Minister of Militia and Defence says it is not customary to hide one's light under a bushel. Perhaps his suggestion is a good one, and as he is an experienced politician,

it may be well for me to follow his example. I think that in this case I will embalm this letter in 'Hansard,' because it is an instructive document, and it is well it should be there:

Ottawa, 18th February, 1910.

Sir,—I desire to draw attention to the fact that mail matter for western Nova Scotia which is carried from Montreal by the Intercolonial railway to Halifax, takes over a day longer to reach its destination than if it were sent to St. John and thence across the bay to Digby.

I do not know where the delay occurs, but a letter mailed out by the Intercolonial railway leaving Montreal at noon will reach Digby a day and two or three hours later than one sent out the same evening by the Canadian Pacific railway which is forwarded from St. John to Digby across the Bay of Fundy by the daily packet steamer.

In view of this delay I shall be glad if either arrangements could be made to send all mail for the western part of the province of Nova Scotia via St. John and Digby, or that the present hitch between Moncton, Halifax and Digby be overcome.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. JAMESON.

The Honourable
The Postmaster General.

This I think will make the matter clear to the hon. minister.

Post office, outside mail service, further amount required $210,000.

Mr. MADDIN. I would call the attention of the Postmaster General to a petition from some of the electors and residents of a place called Birch Grove, in the south riding of Cape Breton. The petition is signed by some 60 persons now living there, and I do not know that I can better describe the locality than by reading a letter which accompanied the petition to the minister:

Birch Grove is a small village two miles west of the railway station at Morien. The Dominion Coal Company are opening up a coal mine here and at present employ thirty-six men and will in a short time be in a position to employ quite a number of miners.

They have now one mail a week. This mail is taken from the train of the Sydney and Louisburg Railway Company, at Port Morien, and is carried to the Village of Port Morien, a distance of about a mile along the coast. There the mail is sorted and distributed to different points and, after travelling 21 miles, it finally reaches Birch Grove. There were the very best reasons for that, and I am not finding fault with the course pursued except for the fact that now, under the changed conditions, a large settlement is springing up there. Judging from past experience in the opening up of mines by this same company, there will spring into existence this year a village of the size of Broughton, where the Postmaster General opened a post office two years ago; there is little doubt that next summer will see at least 150 to 200 men employed there. These men, with their families, will constitute a population of 500 or 600, and the petitioners here pray for a daily mail. This place is really only about three miles from the station, but owing to the route followed, the mail travels 21 miles before reaching Birch Grove. I hope the Postmaster General will see his way to grant this petition. I would also refer to a letter which I received in connection with the same mail route:

Mr, J. W. Maddin.

Dear Sir,—I write you respecting our mail service and hope you will intercede for us so we will have a more satisfactory service established at Homeville.

The mail leaves Port Morien once a week, goes to Homeville post office a distance of 5 miles thence to Round Island 3 miles, thence to Cochran's Lake 5 miles, thence to Birch Grove. Returns to Morien, lies in Port Morien post office 24 hours before departure. Now we would suggest a better way. Let the mail be made up in Sydney post office carried in the train to Homeville station, taken to Homeville post office sorted there and taken to the various post offices. Mail to be delivered twice a week. Round Island post office is only 2 miles from Mira post office and as they have a daily mail there it would be more convenient for them to have their mail go there. Cochran's Lake which is 1½ miles from Broughton post office most all the mail matter goes to Broughton. It could be taken in the Broughton contract. Birch Grove is a growing place, it will soon need a daily mail and that could be carried from Port Morien post office.

Now we would like to have the mail at Homeville 2 times per week as described.

Trusting this information will be satisfactory,

I remain, Yours truly,
WM. HOLMES.

Another gentleman at Homeville, writes asking that there be a by-weekly mail service, and I submit that as these people are near the coast, small farmers and fishermen living from 2 to 4 miles from the railway, at a point within 25 miles of the city of Sydney, in a well settled district they should surely have a better mail service. Would the Postmaster General also bear in mind that these people are living on a rugged coast where they have to work hard and long hours. The soil is not very good in that part of the county, the fishing is hazardous and not too remunerative. It adds greatly to the enjoyment of the lives of the people in a place of that kind to have a mail service more frequently than once a week. I urge it on the further ground that the growing families of these people are moving into industrial centres as industrial development goes on. As the Dominion Coal Company and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company ex-

pand their works there is a demand for labour, and young men are leaving the fishing and farming and going into the mining and industrial centres. In the event of sickness these people at home cannot get word by mail, they cannot send a letter and get a reply in less than two weeks. They are living within two or three miles, some of them within a few hundred yards, of the railway. Of course, they could go in on the train or they could hazard handing a letter to a conductor or a baggage-master, but with a stretch of country extending forty miles, such as there is from Sydney to Louisburg, it seems to me that they should have better facilities than they have at the present moment. I do appreciate the fact that the revenue from the postal service in this part of the county is not as great as it might be, but there are many post offices in Canada which are maintained at a loss and with a deficit. I had occasion to call the attention of the Postmaster General two years ago to this part of the country between Mira and Louisburg at which time I directed my remarks in this House especially to Bateston, Catalone, Main-a-dieu, Bauline, Little Lorraine and Big Lorraine. These places that I have mentioned lie between Mira bay and Louisburg. The places referred to in the correspondence and the petition which I have read to the committee lie on the Sydney side of Mira bay but they were all closely adjoining the Sydney and Louisburg railway. I think it would not be asking the Post Office Department to undertake too much, it would not be making an unusual request of the Postmaster General, to urge him to institute a mail service amongst these people, who, I venture to say, apart from those who are employed in the county represented by my hon. friend the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), the fishermen of the northern part of the county of Victoria and Inverness, are especially deserving of consideration. They are in an isolated position on account of their bad roads, and they have but one mail a week and notwithstanding the fact that the railway reaches within five or six miles as the crow flies they probably occupy the most remote settlement along the coast. Twenty years ago, or fifty years ago, when railway facilities were not as good as they are now, when the revenues of the Post Office Department were not as great as they are now, there may have been some justification for such a condition, but I submit that under present conditions these people should have some compensation. They are contributors to the revenue of the country by the indirect system of taxation by which we all contribute. Isolated as they are on that rocky coast and employed in their hazardous undertaking, there being only six months in the year in which they can travel and these being the six months in which they have to work early and late, I think it would add much to their comfort and peace of mind, it would make them better settlers, it would have a tendency to keep them at their farming and fishing employments, if they had a better mail service by which they could get their daily or weekly papers, including the Upper Canadian dailies, and by which they could have return communication with their relatives and friends ten or fifteen miles away. It would add much to the comfort and enjoyment of these people, isolated as they are from a postal point of view, and yet settlers living in the most thickly settled county in Nova Scotia. I commend the case of these people along the south coast of Cape Breton to the favourable consideration of the hon. Postmaster General, feeling quite assured that he will meet it in a fair and generous manner. I have this to say that in approaching the minister in connection with other matters I have found him inclined to do the equitable thing, and I think that if he makes inquiry into the conditions that exist along the south coast of Cape Breton in regard to mail facilities, he will come to the conclusion that a better service should be effected along the whole coast and especially that at Birch Grove, a place within two miles of a railway station, a daily mail should be inaugurated.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Maddin) to send me both the petition and the letters which he has read to the committee. He need not write about the petition or letters as his explanation would serve my purpose, and then I will take into serious consideration the request which he has just made to me.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was calling the attention of the Postmaster General to an important statement made by the Minister of Railways yesterday. The statement is worthy of the consideration of the Postmaster General, and it is one which I think must have been exaggerated because I believe the officials in the Post Office of the House of Commons are most efficient. At page 6103 the Minister of Railways made the following statement:

> I have had a letter take four days going from the House of Commons to Brockville. I do not know whether the fault is slowness in getting out of the House of Commons but I never mail a letter in the House if it is urgent but put it in a letter box. If my hon. friend has any further complaint and will let me have it I shall investigate it.

These are the words of the Minister of Railways and Canals in answer to a statement made by the hon. member for Digby

(Mr. Jameson) who also complained of delays in the mail. I might also remind the minister that I have a number of complaints with reference to mail going out of this city, to Brockville, Kingston and nearby points, the delay being almost greater than that which occurred in sending mail to distant places. The minister can possibly give some explanation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am very glad that my hon. friend brings this matter before the committee. As he is aware the post office in this building is not under my control; it is under the control of the Speaker and the Committee on Internal Economy. However, I myself have been a sufferer from the postal service of the House of Commons. I have found that letters mailed by me from my desk here and given to a messenger at eleven o'clock in the evening were delivered to me at one o'clock next day at my office on Wellington street. I could not stand for such a service as that and I sent for Mr. Mills not more than three days ago. I spoke to the Speaker of the House, and he was quite ready to remedy all grievances. I found the system to be in existence, that if the House should adjourn at ten or eleven o'clock the post office closed automatically also, and that the letters which were mailed afterwards or even at that exact moment were not delivered to the city post office.

Letters for Montreal and Toronto can be mailed at the city post office until a late hour, and be delivered early next morning, but the fault lies with the post office in the House of Commons. A few days ago, however, Mr. Mills, the postmaster of the House of Commons made an arrangement with Mr. Speaker by which two messengers are added to the staff, and in future letters posted by members for a certain period after the adjournment of the House will be taken to the city post office, and sent direct to the Toronto and Montreal trains. However, this discussion will be a warning to the post office authorities of the House who are not under my control, but under the Internal Economy Commission. Mr. Mills says that in future the mail service from the House of Commons will be on a more modern footing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am glad there has been an improvement, and I may add that the post office officials of the House of Commons have been most obliging. Has the minister made any change so as to place the weekly papers on the same footing with regard to entry into the United States as the daily papers are? The proprietors of the weekly papers complain of the present regulations.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There has been no change. If the change asked for by the weekly newspaper editors a few years ago were made we would have to alter the convention between the United States and Canada. The following memorandum will, however, explain the present position of the matter:

The interchange of second class matter between Canada and the United States is effected at the rate and regulations herein stated.

Under the postal convention between Canada and the United States, legitimate daily newspapers published in either country and addressed to bona fide subscribers in the other may be mailed by the publisher in the post office at the place where they are published upon prepayment of postage in cash at the rate of one cent per pound or fraction thereof.

Newspapers and periodicals published less frequently than daily, when posted in either country for despatch to the other, are liable to postage at the rate of one cent for each four ounces or fraction thereof calculated on the weight of the package for each post office of destination, and when thus mailed direct, prepaid by stamp, the country of destination is under obligation to effect distribution of whatever may have been accepted by the country of origin.

United States legitimate newspapers and periodicals, other than dailies, which have been accepted by the post office department of Canada, may, under the mailing-in-Canada privilege upon payment of postage at the rate of one cent per pound, be posted by United States publishers at the following Canadian post offices, viz., St. John, N.B., Montreal, Que., Toronto, Ont., Winnipeg, Man., Calgary, Alta., and Vancouver, B.C. Copies to be so tendered for mailing must be despatched to Canada by express and be restricted to bona fide subscribers. Publications admitted under the mailing-in-Canada privilege must comply with the provisions of the postal law of Canada, that is, in their subject matter they must 'consist wholly or in great part of political or other news or of articles relating thereto, or to other current topics.'

Canadian newspapers and periodicals issued less frequently than daily may be posted in the United States upon prepayment of postage at the one cent per pound rate. United States regulations governing the mailing in that country of a newspaper or periodical published in another country expressly stipulate that copies of a publication so mailed, in order to be accepted at the one cent per pound rate of postage, must be posted by the publisher's authorized agent, and in accordance with this regulation it would be necessary that the Canadian publisher have an authorized agent in the place at which he desired that this publication should receive entry into the United States mails as second class matter. However, this regulation was modified to the extent that eleven United States post offices are exempted from requiring that the postage should be performed through a publisher's agent. The Canadian publisher may therefore assign his mailings by express direct to the postmasters of the following offices:—

Boston, Mass.; St. Albans, Vt.; Ogdensburg, N.Y.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Detroit, Mich.; Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; St. Paul, Minn.; Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Helena, Mont.;

Spokane, Wash.; Seattle, Wash.; from which offices they will be distributed through the United States on prepayment of postage at the rate of one cent per pound, provided, of course, that application for second class privileges has been made by the publisher at the United States post office at which he desires to secure entry, and that such application has been accepted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the Postmaster General taken any action in reference to the cheap and dangerous literature which has of late been coming into Canada from the old country as well as from the United States?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Anybody is at liberty to make complaint before a justice of the peace if the reading matter in these magazines is against the postal laws. I was much surprised to notice of late that some of the old country magazines which have taken advantage of the new postal system are not of a class we would expect to see published in the mother land. Many of them I am sorry to say are immoral. Last winter when it was my privilege to meet the right Hon. Mr. Samuel and Sir Mathew Nathan the permanent secretary of the post office in England I expressed my surprise to them, and stated that the Canadian authorities had received many complaints as to the character of the magazines sent to Canada. I was promised that the list of magazines authorized by the Post Office Department in England would be revised, and that a close inspection of such magazines would take place, so that in the future no more complaints would come from Canada on that score. As regards the British-Canadian magazine post, it is most gratifying that whereas four or five years ago, before the arrangement was made between the two departments by which the rate of postage on magazines and newspapers was materially reduced, we counted 50 or 60 bags and baskets of British magazines and newspapers which come through the British mails, we now count from 400 to 500 bags and baskets. I was the other day the recipient of a letter from Mr. R. Bickersteth, the Canadian agent of Dawson & Sons, of London, England, who, writing under date of January 3, says:

After three years' experience of the actual working of the 'Canadian Magazine Post,' I desire to approach you with a representation of the actual position, and some suggestions as to its development. I have myself paid three prolonged visits to the Dominion, and have opened up branches there under Canadian management, both at Toronto and at Montreal, with a view to exploiting this great reform that your department inaugurated, and have devoted my best ability to understanding the great difficulties that still in part handicap its progress.

You will, I think, be interested to hear that, while three years ago my companies were selling less than $10,000 worth of British papers in a year to Canada, our trade in these papers with the Dominion now exceeds $200,000 worth a year. At the time of my first visit, three years ago, I found that even the titles of our magazines were unknown. The admirably produced American magazine was 'pushed' from one end of the Dominion to the other, and held the market. Now, at least, our British magazines are beginning to profit by the opening, which for the first time the 'Canadian Magazine Post' has rendered practical to them. The reform, in short, which you set on foot, is beginning to be justified by results.

This shows that this arrangement has been quite fruitful, and I hope that the relations which exist between the mother country and Canada in this respect will result not only in an increase in numbers, but also in an improvement in the class of magazines and newspapers sent out to Canada. I told the Postmaster General in England that I was somewhat disappointed in the class of magazines which were sold in Canada, having obtained from the British Postmaster General the privilege of being listed, and he promised me faithfully that no immoral magazines would be given this privilege.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sure that we are all glad to see the increase of the English literature coming into Canada; but a great deal of the literature still coming from Great Britain is of a kind not fit to be distributed in this country, and no effort is apparently being made to stop it. If the minister will look in yesterday's 'Globe,' he will find that protests against this literature are being made even by people in the old land. It is said that there is a campaign against demoralizing novels, very prominent men urging legislation on the subject. A very different kind of literature is distributed in the old land from what we have in Canada, and the minister cannot at too early a date see that this improper literature is prevented from coming into this country. Many of us have no doubt received a communication from the American monthly 'Review of Reviews,' in which it is stated on the corner:

Thanks to the Post Office Department at Ottawa, we have just secured the privilege of Canadian entry, the only American magazine which has received such entry, which means no extra postage on the 'Review of Reviews' into Canada.

If this is a fact, how is it that some of the most estimable magazines in the United States are not allowed to come in under the same privilege?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend will put his question on the Order Paper, I shall be able to give him the answer.

Mr. BLACK. If the American 'Review of Reviews' has not changed its tone with regard to the British nation, the fewer numbers of it that come to Canada the better.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We had a discussion some weeks ago regarding the fraudulent use of the mails, and the right hon. the Prime Minister gave us to understand that the department was not in a position to prosecute, but that such matters come within the jurisdiction of the provincial governments. I need not call the attention of the Postmaster General to the position taken by the Post Office Department in the United States, and the number of prosecutions intended by the post office authorities there. Would the minister give us some idea of the number of people prosecuted during the past year for fraudulent use of the mails?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know that any have been, but as soon as the attention of the department is called to a fraudulent use of the mails we set the machinery of the law in motion to put a stop to it. For my own part, in spite of many solicitations made to me by friends and foes, I have stopped many lottery and other schemes which were making use of the mails. It is the first duty of the Post Office Department to stop the fraudulent use of the mails, and in that respect we are all powerful; but as regards prosecutions, they belong to the provincial authorities. When complaint is made through a magistrate, it is the provincial crown attorney who deals with it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What action was taken with reference to one Samuel Gray, of Montreal. I understand that the Montreal newspapers attempted to show him up, but that some of the Ottawa officials took the position that there was no necessity to investigate.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was he a broker?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know, but I understand he was dealing in get rich quick schemes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My attention was called to his operations in Montreal some time last year, and I referred the case to the Department of Justice. That department advised me that his operations were unlawful, and at once we took the necessary steps to stop his use of the mails. Gray was denounced to the Post Office Department by two of his typewriters.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No prosecution?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not remember that any was taken. I think the man left the country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There are so many such cases occurring in different parts of the country that I think the department ought to take more definite action. I have here an article in the Montreal 'Herald' to the effect that one Mr. Barker advertises that he makes from 10 per cent to 32 per cent monthly, and every now and then similar advertisements appear in different papers, and you would naturally think that the inspectors would take notice of these. In the Montreal 'Herald' there is an article stating that another financial wizard has been discovered in that city who brings an easy fortune within the reach of his customers. He says he can make from 10 per cent to 60 per cent on the stock market every month. Has any action been taken with regard to that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I dare say our postmaster at Montreal read that and took the necessary action. Of course these get rich quick operators generally make use of ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, and disappear in time, but I can assure my hon. friend that we have no intention of letting the public be exploited when we can prevent it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the hon. minister whether he will not revise the statement which he made with reference to the post office clerks some days ago coming under the Civil Service Commission. A year ago he gave the House to understand that they would likely be brought under that commission and said he rather favoured that view, and I should like to know what his reasons are for not favouring it now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Speaking personally I must say that I would rather favour the amending of the Civil Service Act in such a way as to include in the service the staffs of the larger offices, such as the Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Quebec and Halifax post offices. I would prefer that the clerks in such offices should be submitted to the same examinations and the same rules and regulations as our own Civil Service clerks in Ottawa; but as I explained a short time ago, there is serious difficulty in getting for the Post Office Department here at Ottawa the number of clerks necessary to carry out the business of the department.

My hon. friend will remember that the first item of my estimates that was passed this evening was a vote for clerical assistance. This is called 'temporary clerical assistance.' The Civil Service Commission cannot give us quickly enough the number of officers required for the Post Office Department here at Ottawa, and we are obliged, under the law, of course, to accept temporary assistance; that is, we take clerks under the authority of the commission for four months, and during the four months we may be able to get from the commission the permanent clerks that are needed. But sometimes we have to wait for four months longer before making up the number of clerks we require. This

will show the House how difficult it is to secure clerks under the Civil Service Commission for the work of the department here. How much more difficult it will be, unless the Act is amended, to provide the clerks for the larger post offices. This is a question that is quite worthy of being studied. I repeat, and I am not afraid to say it, I would rather see the larger post offices come under the control of the Civil Service Commission than remain as at present. But, under the present system our clerks in the city post offices are subject to examination. These examinations are not so severe as those under the Civil Service Commission, but besides passing a qualifying examination, these officers must pass promotion examinations after three months in order to get their increase. I realize every day that it would give the service much more prestige and give us, on the whole, a better service, if the Civil Service Commission had control also of the outside service. But, as I have explained to my hon. friend, it is quite a difficult task at present to get clerks for the department here at Ottawa, and it would be much more difficult to get them for the outside service. However, the question is being examined and studied, and I hope that, some day, later on, we may be able to bring the outside service, at least the larger offices, under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am glad to hear the Postmaster General make that statement. I understood from a statement he made some weeks ago, that he had definitely decided not to take it into consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the hon. gentleman refers to our discussion on the railway mail clerks. I said that the railway mail service was so large and was increasing so rapidly that it was impossible to think of bringing it under the Civil Service Commission. There was some misapprehension on the part of the newspapers of what I said. It was suggested that I had decided to do away with examination of the railway mail clerks. I said nothing of the kind. I said that the present system would continue to exist, but I could not agree to bring the railway mail clerks under the Civil Service Commission, because the commission could not provide enough men for the service of the country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At the same time, he led us to believe that the examinations required by the railway mail clerks under the Civil Service Commission would be very high. But if he will examine the Act, I think he will find that it is not required of them that they should undertake an examination as for the higher grades.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is not necessary that the railway mail clerks should undergo the examination required by the Civil Service Commission. The examination they have to undergo is quite high, and that explains why they are obliged to take so many men on under the title of labourers in the railway mail service. The railway system of the country is expanding so much and the railway mail service is growing so rapidly that we cannot get the number of people needed as railway mail clerks to pass the examination. I never thought of abolishing the examination for railway mail clerks, but I want to make the examination such as will give us the proper class of people.

Mr. FRASER. When this vote was up some time ago, I asked the Postmaster General for some information with regard to offices that had been closed after having been in existence for forty or fifty years. He promised to get me the information.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the name of the post office?

Mr. FRASER. New Harmony.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will get the information for my hon. friend to-morrow.

Mr. FRASER. Another matter I referred to was the daily mail, concerning which he was awaiting a report from Bay Fortune, in Kings county.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The information is at the office. I will look into the case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that the minister has led hon. members to believe that he is going to institute a parcels post system this session. Will he be good enough to tell us about it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have received within the last two or three months several representations on the proposed establishment of a parcels post, and I am at present engaged in finding a solution of the existing difficulty. I am not at liberty to say what I intend to do in the matter. If my hon. friend will wait until later in the session I may be able to be more communicative in my statement. At present, nothing is decided. The trouble is, I may say, that there is a prejudice in the rural sections of the country against a parcels post. The country merchants are opposed to the parcels post system. When I took office some years ago, I thought that the Post Office Department should really do the business of a parcels post, instead of leaving that altogether to the express company; but the moment I expressed the view that we should establish something like the perfect systems of parcels post that they have in England, France, Germany and Italy, I found that there was a strong prejudice against the system in the minds of the country merchants, who feared that such a system would work exclusively to the ad-

vantage of such establishments as Eatons, in Toronto and Winnipeg, and Morgan's and Carsley's, in Montreal. I was deluged with petitions some four or five years ago when I thought I should do some progressive work in that field of operation. I think we should carry on a campaign of education among country merchants to show that such a system would not be against their advantage and that they would be the first to benefit by it. We are studying the question now and later on I may have a statement to make.

Mr. PERLEY. Some time ago I brought to the notice of the minister a fraudulent use of the mail different from that referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong). Has he looked into that matter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understood that the Minister of Agriculture admitted that the document had been sent under his hand?

Mr. PERLEY. No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At all events I ordered an investigation to be made, and I think I have a report. The inspector found that the document had been sent under the frank of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. PERLEY. I did not understand the Minister of Agriculture to say that. This envelope shows that it was not properly franked, the supposed frank was put on with pencil. My idea is that the frank with the initials of the Minister of Agriculture was put on by somebody totally unauthorized, and that a great deal of mail matter of the same description was franked in the same way. My impression is that the revenue of the post office is defrauded by some one in that way very often, particularly before an election. I simply want to have the minister look into the matter, and see whether my idea about it is correct.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall send the report to my hon. friend.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like the minister to promise that no matter shall be received at the Ottawa post office unless it is either stamped or franked in accordance with the regulations.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will see that the regulations are followed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have a copy of a circular that has been franked out in large numbers, which I would be sorry to expose to the House. I certainly think the franking system should be more carefully looked into.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was it sent lately?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Within the last few weeks.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If it is sent during the session by a member of the House, no objection can be taken to it. Mr. Perley's complaint is that this pamphlet was circulated during the recess.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is understood that a member can advertise his own business or solicit subscriptions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, no. I thought it was political. If any circular of a business character or any advertisement is sent under the frank of a member of the House or of the government it is a grave offence against the Post Office Act.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. One of these is a circular soliciting subscriptions, and at the same time advertising material. I think the minister should to some extent investigate this, because he will find matter being franked through the mail that has on the envelope sufficient to condemn it without going any further. I read recently in the press that the Post Office Department in the United States were making an investigation into the carriage of second-class mail matter, and that the Post Office Department of Canada were able to furnish them with definite information apparently with regard to the carriage of second-class mail matter in Canada. I asked for information some time ago with reference to the carriage of second-class matter. Can the minister tell me anything in regard to that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The question which came up in Washington on the last day of the session of Congress was in regard to the carriage of second-class mail matter in the United States. As my hon. friend is aware, he having paid a good deal of attention to post office matters in the United States, there has been a movement on foot for the last five or six years in the United States to put a stop to what was considered as a scandal. Originally in the United States the privilege of a cheap rate of postage was given to legitimate magazines and newspapers, but no clear definition was made of what was a newspaper or a magazine, so that a system grew up through which purely advertising sheets were dumped into the mails and carried by the railways and steamers for the carriage of which the United States government paid millions and millions of dollars. As year after year went on the account of the railways and steamers against the Post Office Department grew tremendously until it became a perfect scandal. A long investigation took place in the city of New York, ordered by the ex-President, Mr. Roosevelt, and continued under the administration of Mr. Taft. The new Postmaster General, Mr. Hitchcock, a young man, decided to take the bull by the horns and to increase the rate of postage on second-class matter. You are aware that Canada is a country which makes a low charge less for second-class matter. Newspapers in Canada pay only one

quarter of a cent a lb. whilst in other countries in England for instance, they pay as much as four cents a lb. In the United States they have decided to charge a much higher rate than that which has been charged heretofore. They asked our advice, they asked us how we had succeeded in avoiding a deficit notwithstanding that we gave the newspapers such a low rate. We answered the United States postal department and the Postmaster General by saying that we succeeded by making a proper discrimination between a real newspaper and a purely advertising sheet. We were able thus to give the Post Office Department of the United States very valuable information and we were thanked by the Postmaster General for such information. I think that between department and department, even from the international point of view, we owe to each other such courtesies. We were able to furnish them information, and as a result of such the United States Post Office Department decided to increase the rate of postage on illegitimate newspapers and magazines. At the same time they instituted a commission in order to classify in future magazines and newspapers. The president of that commission is one of the judges of the supreme court of the United States and the ex-Governor of New York state—Mr. Hughes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to lay on the table a copy of the information sent to the United States?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. BLACK. I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether he intends to pay any salary to the letter carrier at Windsor, Nova Scotia.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I received a letter from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Black) the other day, and I found that, as regards the payment of a certain letter carrier who carries the mail to the post office from the three boxes in the city of Windsor. When Sir William Mulock was Postmaster General an arrangement was made with the mail carrier that he should make the collection of the mail from the boxes without expecting any indemnity. I understand that he was the caretaker of the public building, and as this was considered a favour for the town of Windsor the gentleman agreed to make that collection without receiving any compensation. But that was ten years ago.

Mr. BLACK. Thirteen years ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that the population of Windsor has increased and that the mails have increased, and I have been impressed with representations made by the hon. gentleman. If my hon. friend comes to my office we may make an arrangement so as to compensate the mail carrier for the service which he renders to the department.

Post Office—outside service—miscellaneous—To compensate the following railway mail clerks for medical and other expenses and loss of personal effects: G. Paradis, $66; T. J. Duguay, $121; Chas. Audet, $27.25; D. O'Sullivan, $238.66; J. T. Keith, $162.09; A. K. Melick, $322; A. S. Belyea, $125; J. P. Hipwell, $85; W. W. P. Starratt, $42.37—$1,189.37.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Several of our railway mail clerks were injured during the year. this is the usual vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not know that this is the proper place, but I want to refer to two or three matters in my constituency connected with the Post Office Department. The first one is with regard to a post office south of Austin. A very largely signed petition for the opening of a post office south of Austin was presented to the minister considerably over a year ago. I understood the minister to say to me that the post office would be opened. I believe it is at a point very close to Agincourt.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has it not been done?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understood for some time that it had been opened, but not long ago I had a letter from one of the petitioners stating that it had not, that nothing had been done. I was very much surprised to get the letter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What are the other cases?

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is another request for the altering of the mail route and providing for a more frequent service through a very large section of country north of Neepawa. Last 16th of December two delegates from there, Mr. Baker and Mr. Drayson, were in Ottawa on behalf of the residents of that district and called on the then acting Postmaster General and being referred by him to one of the deputies whose name I cannot recall, were assured that a very strong case had been made out and that by some alteration in the system by which the mail would be diverted from Franklin instead of Neepawa or vice versa, with little or no expense to the department they could get a more frequent mail service. These gentlemen were promised an early reply, but I had word from one of them very recently that nothing at all had been done. I wrote the department but still without success. I am quite aware that in the Post Office Department there would be a flood of applications of a similar kind, but the objects to be served are so great that it would seem to me that some expense would be quite warranted in meeting these demands with greater facility and more frequently. I must say that personally I have not had

very great success in getting actual results from the Post Office Department particularly in this regard.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The number of letters to the department daily is something fabulous, and there is always some little red tape because in the routine of the department the matter first goes to the deputy, then to the secretary of the minister, then to the minister, then back again to the deputy, and sometimes to the inspector, all of which causes delay. However, during the session of the House I would invite hon. members to come directly to me either in the chamber or in my office in the building here, when I will give their request personal attention and expedite matters as much as possible.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I am glad to notice that the minister is giving a good deal of attention to rural mail delivery, and I commend him for it. I would remind him however, that there are a great many places even in some of the older settled parts of the country where we have still very poor mail accommodation. In some places there is a mail only three times a week and in others twice a week. What is the intention of the minister in regard to improving these mail services?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must say that a weekly or a semi-weekly service is out of date at the present day, and my intention is to improve the service wherever it is possible. I consider each case on its merits and I try to make improvements especially in the older provinces.

Steamer 'Arctic,' $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount voted in the estimates last year covered only one years service of the 'Arctic' but she was sent to the northern waters on what possibly may be a two years cruise, and this is to provision her for the extra year.

Mr. ROCHE. Is it the intention of the government to send another boat or boats to the Hudson Bay to make further inquiry prior to the completion of the Hudson Bay railroad? I understand that within the last year or two there has been a steamer engaged on that service.

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year the department of the naval service sent a party from the hydrographic survey to Fort Churchill and another to Nelson. The Fort Churchill party was able to almost complete the survey and the plans are being prepared and will be brought down. The Fort Nelson party was not able to complete its work and a new party will be sent out this year.

Special compensation for Major J. D. Moodie for his services as commander of the expedition to the northern waters in 1904-1905, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Commander Moodie of the Northwest Mounted Police in addition to his regular duties, rendered valuable service to the Department of Marine and Fisheries during his stay in the north and this is given him as a sort of honorarium. The same amount has been voted for a similar expedition by Mr. Lowe.

Mr. DANIEL. Did Major Moodie spend the winter up there?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, at Fullerton.

Mr. DANIEL. He was, I presume, in command of the Northwest Mounted Police post up there?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. This is in addition to his regular salary?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, an honorarium.

Life-boat stations and rewards for saving life $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been found advisable to increase the number of our life-saving stations, and I am asking this sum for the purpose. Some $15,000 was expended last year.

Mr. DANIEL. At what places and in what ways has the expenditure been made?

Mr. BRODEUR. One of the places was at Little Wood island in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. DANIEL. How much has been expended there altogether?

Mr. BRODEUR. $5,200.

Mr. DANIEL. What does that pay for besides the boat?

Mr. BRODEUR. Building the station and the slipway and training the crew.

Mr. DANIEL. I believe the new life-boat is an open boat with a gasoline motor. I think it cost about $2,600. When loaded, it will be so nearly level with the water that in anything of a sea I should think it would not be of much service as a life-boat. The waters of the Bay of Fundy, in that part of it, are practically the same as the open ocean, and it would appear to me that when the government were providing a new life-boat for that station, they should have provided one better adapted to the rough weather and rough water which it would be likely to meet. It occurred to me, and I think I mentioned it to Captain Thompson, that the best sort of life-boat for that locality would be something in the nature of a small schooner with a motor, something like the fishermen use, one that would stand a heavy sea and would carry a much larger number of persons than this small boat is calculated to do. If there were an accident

in the winter to one of the large passenger steamers carrying immigrants, this little boat would be of very little service. I should imagine that when loaded she would not have more than 6 or 8 inches of free board at the lowest part. That a boat of a different kind would be more suitable is not only my opinion, but that of others who live in that vicinity and who know the character of the storms that are likely to occur there in the winter time.

Mr. BRODEUR. This boat is put there only temporarily. In view of the representations made to the department, as we had no other boat available at the time, it was thought advisable to send this boat there in the meantime. The department fully appreciates the interest which my hon. friend takes in the matter, and we are now designing plans for a bigger boat and one better adapted to the requirements of the station.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister know how much free board this boat has when she is loaded?

Mr. BRODEUR. 6 or 7 inches. She was tried by Commander Thompson, and she carried 22 men.

Lighthouse and coast service—amount required to pay pensions, $1,050.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are several pilots in the Quebec district to whom we are obliged to pay pensions. These pilots have particular privileges which had been granted to them by the Canadian parliament, and in order to get these privileges reduced, an agreement was made with them, one of the conditions of which was that the government would pay them a pension of $300 a year each. Five pilots were put on the pension list last year, and this is to provide for the payment of their pensions. The Quebec Corporation of Pilots was incorporated, I think, before confederation.

Compassionate allowance to Mrs. Elizabeth L. Kerr, wife of the late James Kerr, in his life time engineer at the Parry Sound depot, who was killed November 25, 1909, by an explosion of the gas generator, $4,100.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that the usual amount?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; it is paid because of an accident. By the negligence of one of the employees of the department, an explosion of gas occurred at Parry Sound and this man was killed. His wife was the head of a large family, and she asked the department for compensation, and after a great deal of negotiation it was decided to offer her this amount, subject to ratification by parliament.

Amount required to pay the services of Mr. M. Barret for lifting buoys at Amherstburg during the season of 1910-11, $400.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Barrett has been looking after the lifting of our buoys at Amherstburg. The services he rendered are certainly worth the amount we are paying him. We could not pay him out of the general vote because he is already in the employ of the government, and according to the Act has to be paid by a special vote.

Amount required to compensate Mr. Thomas Harling for his report on the facilities afforded by the principal ports in the far east for the handling of steamers and their cargoes, $500.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Harling is one of the important shippers of Montreal. He has given a great deal of attention to all questions connected with navigation.

Mr. DANIEL. Is he in the employ of the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; last year he made a trip around the world. Before he left, I gave him instructions to make a report on the different ports he would visit.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the report published?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; we have just received it. It is a very valuable report, containing lots of information hon. members will appreciate and it will be laid on the table and printed.

For the encouragement of better transportation and the conservation of fresh fish—further amount required, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This amount is for the purpose of paying a part of the cost of the transportation of fresh fish from the maritime provinces to the interior of our country. Some years ago fish caught in the maritime provinces were shipped to the United States, and the fish consumed in Quebec and Ontario came from Gloucester and Boston. I thought that by paying a certain part of the transportation charges to Montreal, we would likely succeed in diverting that trade from the United States markets to our own. The arrangement we made with the railway companies is this: We get a car which is leaving Mulgrave and Halifax once a week, and we agree to guarantee the freight charges. We also made an arrangement with the express companies at St. John and Halifax by which we pay one-third of the express charges.

Mr. DANIEL. Are those refrigerated cars?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was in order to induce the express and railway companies to carry the fish on ice that we made this arrangement and the result has been absolutely satisfactory. In 1906 we imported from the United States into Montreal 2,000,000 pounds, and that importation has been reduced to 800,000 pounds, although the consumption of fish has increased very

largely. Instead of importing from the United States, we now get our fish from the maritime provinces. Our cod, haddock, halibut and salmon come almost entirely from the maritime provinces into Montreal and the west. This policy has produced very good results, and I am asking for $20,000 for the purpose of paying the indebtedness incurred as the result of these arrangements.

Mr. JAMESON. There is a rumour in the press that we are about to lose the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from our midst, and that he is likely to be translated from the somewhat troubled waters of the Marine and Fisheries Department and the Department of Naval Affairs into the more serene atmosphere of the Supreme Court. I do not know what ground there may be for that rumour, but in case it should prove well founded, there are a few remarks I wish to make with regard to the fisheries generally which I would like to make in the presence of the minister himself because he has in the past taken very great interest in the work of his department.

He has referred to the assistance his department has given towards bringing fresh and smoke cured fish from the maritime provinces to Ontario and Quebec, and further west. I think that the assistance given meets with the commendation of every one who understands the situation. Before that aid was given there can be no doubt that Boston, Portland and Gloucester were practically supplying the upper Canadian market with fresh fish and light cured fish, and as the hon. minister has pointed out the importation into Canada from the United States has, since the inauguration of this policy, dropped from 2,000,000 to something like 800,000 pounds. That, of course, does not indicate in any way the growth of the trade in fish between the maritime provinces and upper Canada. The trade is growing and has developed wonderfully in the last two years. And I believe it is capable of still greater expansion, and that as the west develops and the people become more accustomed to the use of fish, the most profitable market we can find will be the Upper Canadian market. The hon. minister will know that what contributed to bringing about this satisfactory condition was the raising of the duty from one-half cent per pound to one cent per pound upon fish coming from the United States into Canada. This enabled our maritime province people to secure the trade of these provinces.

The minister may remember that last year I drew his attention to the matter of better fishery intelligence. The department last year asked for a vote of $500 for the purposes of that branch of the department's work, but this year I see the minister is going to ask $10,000. I think the increased vote is amply justified, and I hope the minister will go a little further than is indicated by the way in which the vote is framed; I hope he will not only give better intelligence with regard to the movements of fish, but will also couple with that a plan of notifying all the fishermen as far as possible of weather probabilities. Take the province of Nova Scotia —and I dare say the same conditions exist in New Brunswick—and you will find that the sea coast is very largely connected by telephone. Thus, the weather forecasts, telegraphed in the morning to Nova Scotia can be telephoned to almost every fishing station, or, at least, to a great number of them. In the case of the county of Digby which I may cite as an illustration, every morning the weather forecast is telephoned down to Digby Neck to the station on Briar island, at the extreme end of the Neck. All along that Neck are a large number of fishing villages, each one with its telephone connection. So, there will be no difficulty, and but very little expense, in the department taking off the weather intelligence every morning at the different stations and posting a bulletin. The same may be said of the mainland opposite. The information may, in many cases, deter men from going out and will thus enable them to escape a storm which would not be indicated by the appearance of the day at their ordinary time of sailing.

I see that the minister is going to have some instructions given to the fishermen in the way of leaflets issued from time to time dealing with different matters connected with the fisheries. And I understood that Mr. J. J. Cowie was to be appointed for that purpose. I do not know that I am correct in that or not, but that is the information that has come to me. Whether Mr. Cowie would be a suitable man for the position is a matter which may be open to some question. I believe he has been connected for some years with one branch of the fisheries, giving instructions with regard to curing. So far as I have been able to gather from the report he makes, the result has been, not quite encouraging. Whether that is due to the fact that Mr. Cowie, is, a native of the old country, and not familiar with our ways as a Canadian would be, or to other circumstances, I cannot say. But there is one thing sure and that is that in the report which Mr. Cowie made to the department a year ago referring to beam trawling, he expressed himself as in favour of beam trawling, or said that it had come to stay. I think the fishermen of the maritime provinces pretty generally are opposed to that, and I do not know that the position taken by him would strengthen

his influence. I think perhaps it would not, and therefore that a more suitable man might be found for this proposed service.

The question of increased bounties is another one that I raised last year. The hon. minister knows that the payment of fishing bounties began under the Macdonald government in 1882. Last year it was paid on a basis of $1 per ton on vessels up to 80 tons, and the men received $7.50 each, while boats received $1 each and $4.25 per man. The payment of the bounty to the vessel, which is a substantial sum, has brought about a change with regard to the quality of the vessels which are used. The vessels used to-day are of a much better class than those used when bounties were first paid. But the payment of $1 to a boat is a very trivial matter. A change has come about within the last few years with regard to these fishing boats. Many of them are equipped with a gasoline engine. The man who has not a gasoline engine is at a great disadvantage as compared with his neighbour who has. The modern boat supplied with power is much more expensive than the old style of sailboat. The former cost from $25 to $150, while the modern boat costs from $150 to $500, and the cost of operation, of course, is quite an item. I am told that the yearly cost of running the ordinary power boat used in fishing is from $50 to $100 according to the number of days during which they fish. I do not notice that this year the minister has made provision in the estimates to increase the bounty to boat fishermen. But I think it would be well if some additional bounty could be paid. I know that in many instances it would be of great assistance to them. They think also that there is a discrepancy between what is paid to the vessel fishermen, and what is paid to them. I do not think vessel fishermen should be paid less, but I think that the boat fishermen should be placed upon the same basis, and an allowance made upon consideration of the more expensive boats the men are now obliged to use. Some people think that these power boats are used as a matter of luxury for the fisherman, but it is not so. The fishing to-day is carried on further offshore than it used to be ten or fifteen years ago, and the power-boat is almost a necessity. Also, there is more fresh fishing done than formerly—that is, fish are sold fresh, and the power-boat enables the fisherman to reach the market, so that he can dispose of his fish either on the same day or within a day or two of their being taken.

Another subject of importance is lobster hatching. I believe that lobster hatcheries have been of great benefit, if we can judge by the evidence taken by Commissioner Wakeham in 1909. I notice from the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there are eight of these hatcheries in operation, two in Nova Scotia, two in New Brunswick, two in Prince Edward Island and two in Quebec. The last year the number of young lobsters hatched and planted was 558,000,000. The amount which the minister is asking in his main estimates this year for fish breeding is $322,000 and in all 34 hatcheries are in operation in Canada. None of these hatcheries are in the Bay of Fundy, a most important sheet of water from a fishing standpoint. There are some 5,500 fishermen engaged there from counties bordering on the bay, and the lobster fishery there is very important. I trust the minister will be able to establish one or two hatcheries on the bay. The evidence before the committee last session, and the year before was to the effect that hatcheries had been beneficial, and we know it is necessary to do something to keep up the lobster fishery, because without some assistance in that way every one is obliged to admit that the fishery cannot be sustained as a profitable business.

In the evidence taken by Commander Wakeham in 1909 reference was made to the operation by American fishermen of smacks to purchase lobsters, and take lobsters outside the three-mile limit. At page 352 of the minister's report I see reference to this. The report reads:

> The 'Curlew' was employed for the whole of the season in the Bay of Fundy. In August brought the captain of the 'Pride of the Port' United States fishing vessel before Inspector Robertson for having live lobsters on board in close season. Matter referred to the department. The departmental instructions regarding the case was the means of stopping several Canadian and American fishermen who were preparing to fish outside the 3-mile limit.

I do not know what steps were taken with regard to that, but it seems to me it would be a serious thing if lobster fishing were to be permitted to be carried on by the United States fishermen outside the three-mile limit during the close season. Lobsters are taken 5, 6 or 8 miles from the shore. For instance, at the lower end of Digby county, and near the county of Yarmouth, they fish on what is called the Trinity, 7 or 8 miles off the coast, and as the large lobsters are found out in the deep water, if the fishing of lobsters is carried on outside the three-mile limit in the close season by Americans, it will be a great disadvantage to our own fishermen. I presume it would not be possible for a Canadian to fish for lobsters outside the three-mile limit during the close season, but I would like to know whether or not it is possible for American fishermen to prosecute the lobster fishery outside the three-mile limit along our

coasts during our close season. This would be a great hardship to our fishermen, it would tend to deplete the fishery, and I would like the minister to give some information in regard to it.

At page 354 of the report there is another reference to this:

It was also found that a number of men living on the Turkish islands were carrying on this illegal fishing and then selling the fish to the American smacks which stay outside the three-mile limit.

That is all that is said with regard to that particular feature, and so I do not know from the report whether or not any action was taken in that case.

I have here several resolutions from the Fishermens' Union of Nova Scotia which I understand have been transmitted to the department.

The first is with regard to appointing a committee of officials to meet the fishermen at the General Council of Fishermen's Union which is held in Halifax each year, at which delegates from the different stations discuss matters relating to the fisheries in their districts and take concerted action. The delegates thought it would be a great advantage to have officials of the department meet the delegates face to face and discuss matters which could not be so satisfactorily dealt with by correspondence with the department, some hundreds of miles away from the maritime provinces, which seems to be very remote from the fishermen. This would be appreciated by the fishermen and would establish a community of interests which would tend to improve the conditions and benefit both the fishermen and the fisheries.

Another resolution refers to the weight of a legal quintal of dried fish. The present law requires that the quintal shall contain 112 pounds and they ask that this should be changed to 100 pounds. I am informed that in some counties the standard quintal is 100 pounds, and that some dealers when arranging shipments for certain foreign countries repack them and make the quintals 100 pounds each. Possibly the minister or the department would be informed as to that. If a uniform standard could be secured, it would be a benefit to the fishermen, and would be a means of giving them a proper return for their fish. That would not give the advantage of the extra 12 pounds to the dealer who purchases and then repacks the fish.

There is another resolution with regard to the size of number one, sea-packed herring. They want a legal size fixed. The size which they suggest for sea-packed herring is 11 inches and upwards, measured from the nose to the fork of the tail. That is the way the resolution is worded. I shall be very glad to furnish copies of these resolutions to the department, although I understand that they already have them. The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Desbarats, wrote to the grand secretary of the Fishermen's Union on April 6, 1910, acknowledging receipt of some of these resolutions to which I have alluded, and he stated that the question of the inspection of food fishes was under consideration. I trust that whatever action the department decides to take in the matter will be taken in view of the facts which the department have before them and in the interest of the fisheries.

Another resolution to which I wish to refer, and it is a very important one, because it deals with one of the essentials of the fishing business, namely, the question of bait. The fishermen want a legal measure for the buying and selling of bait fish, such as herring, squid, &c. As matters are at present they say there is no legal measure and that it is bought and sold by weight. As, of course, fishermen do not carry weighing machines in their boats, they think that they would get better satisfaction if they bought by measure instead of weight. The department, in dealing with this matter, stated that bait was largely sold by weight, which would seem to be the most satisfactory method to be adopted all round, both for the purchaser and seller, although they said the department was looking into the question. That letter was written on April 6, 1910, and so far as I understand from the latest information I have had, the department had not communicated further in regard to the matter. These matters, of course, may seem trifling to members of the committee, but I am sure that the minister himself, from his intimate knowledge of the complexities of the fishing business, gained by some years in the department, will understand that it means a great deal to the fishermen themselves, and that it is only by working out matters of detail to a satisfactory conclusion that the fishery can be prosecuted to the best advantage and with the greatest profit in them.

Another request which the fishermen made was contained in a lengthy resolution which I need not read, but the gist of which was that they asked that gasoline engines, used in their boats, be placed on the free list. That resolution was communicated, I see, from the copy of the letter which has been handed, to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and on March 31, 1910, the minister wrote to Mr. Bernard Cummings, grand secretary of the Fishermen's Union of Nova Scotia:

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 28th inst., containing certain resolutions passed by the convention of Fishermen's Union in Halifax, which will have all due consideration.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) W. S. FIELDING.

This is another very important matter to the fishermen. As I have said, they are very largely using these engines in their boats, and every person who can possibly afford to do so is adopting them. A number consider that the most satisfactory engine can be purchased from the American large number of these engines manufactured large number of these engine manufactured in Canada, and many fishermen use Canadian engines, but a great many prefer the American engine, and as the duty is very heavy they are anxious to be relieved of the burden.

Another subject to which I want to refer is with reference to the matter of reporting of fishing vessels at the custom house Under the system which has existed for some years it has been necessary for the fishermen, in order to comply with the law, to report at the customs house when their vessels come into port. That at times causes a great deal of loss of time. A great many vessels, more to-day than five years ago, and more next year than this year, are and will be engaged in the fresh fishing business. A vessel that is engaged in the fresh fish trade arrives at port perhaps at night and the men throw out the fish. There is always some person to take the fish. If a vessel arrives at night the fish are perhaps thrown out immediately, and the vessel may in a few hours be ready to sail again for the fishing grounds. But the regulation which requires that a vessel shall report at the customs house will entail hours of delay if the vessel arrives at night, because she will probably have to wait until the customs house opens next day. I must say that in some cases the customs house officers have been very obliging and some have been on hand night or day to take their reports. But the expediting of the movements of the vessels engaged in the fresh fish business is very important, and consequently the fishermen would like very much to be relieved of the necessity of reporting, and it was for that purpose that I introduced a Bill last session. It aimed at the issuing of licenses, operating on the same principle as the licenses which are issued by the United States to American fishing vessels. These licenses are issued to American fishing vessels annually, and for a year it is not, as I am informed, necessary for such vessels to report at the United States customs house. The same privilege would be very much appreciated by the Canadian fishermen, although there may be some difficulty with regard to it in respect to the question of the fishing bounty. It may be necessary that they should from time to time report at the customs house in order that a record may be made of the trips which they are making, and so that the department may be in a position to keep in touch with them in connection with the fishing bounty license. But, at all events, after this matter had been brought up by me last year, a memorandum was sent by the Commissioner of Customs which relaxed this regulation and made it possible for the fishermen to report less frequently without incurring any penalty. I will read the regulation:

> Canadian registered vessels, owned and fitted out of Canada, of ten tons and upwards up to eighty tons, holding a fishing bounty license and engaging in deep sea fishing, are required to report outwards and obtain clearance of the customs house at the beginning of the fishing season each year.
>
> The masters of such fishing vessels on subsequently returning to a Canadian port should report to a Canadian customs officer at least once a month, so that the customs officer may make a notation accordingly on the back of the fishing bounty license and sign same.
>
> Fishing vessels, after touching at a port outside of Canada, and also 'bankers' are required to report at a customs house on arrival at a Canadian port from sea.
>
> The master of every fishing vessel is required to make a full report inwards to the customs officer at the Canadian home port on returning from the fisheries for the season.

I do not know whether that memorandum from the Department of Customs is founded on a regulation framed under an order in council, but I presume it would be perfectly safe for the fishermen to act upon it. I understand it has been sent to Customs outposts and stations but I have no doubt there are a very large number of fishermen—in fact I am sure that up to very recently at least there were—who were not informed as to do it. In view of the fact that this relaxation has been made I think it would be well that a copy should be furnished to the skipper of each of the Canadian fishing vessels which are taking out bounty licenses, the names of which can be found in the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It would be a good thing for them to know the regulations, to understand them fully, and to have a copy of them under their hand in order that they may live up to them. I am sure the relaxation will be appreciated and that it will very much facilitate the movement of vessels. At the same time I do think that the system I suggested in the first place, and of which this is the result as arranged by the department, might be the better one. I think the system of yearly license would be perfectly safe in the case of the Canadian fishermen. I made special inquiry in the United States with regard to the difficulty which might arise as respects the customs entries. I asked whether there were any frauds against the treasury of the United States by reason of the operation of their fishing vessels under license without having to report to the custom house, and the commissioner at Washington stated in re-

ply that no complaints had been received in that respect, and he did not think that any frauds were committed on the customs or that any loss to the treasury resulted from smuggling by the fishing vessels. I am sure that Canadian fishermen are equally honourable and upright, and can be trusted equally with the American fishermen. However, there may be some difficulty with respect to the Canadian fishermen on account of the fishing bounty license, so that this relaxation may possibly work out all right. I should like the minister to have copies of this regulation forwarded to our Canadian fishing vessels in order that they may be informed as to it.

I have referred to the matter of providing instruction for our fishermen, and I may point out that there is at present in Scotland and Ireland a system of instruction. In Ireland the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction provides, for instance, practical demonstrations in the working of motors in fishing boats and also in the mending of nets. In Scotland they go even further and representative fishermen from important centres attend lectures and practical demonstrations which are given at some selected centre. There are also fishermen's libraries at many of the fishing stations. The establishment of fishermen's libraries and such practical instruction as I have referred to, as also with regard to the improvement of the pack and package, would be very beneficial in Canada. I think this could be worked out with very good results, and I trust the minister will be able to see his way clear to make some provision in that direction. Our fishermen are a very intelligent class and many of them are well educated. They sometimes have a good deal of leisure on their hands and would, I am sure, make excellent use of opportunities afforded them by the establishment of libraries. Information of that character would tend to develop in the fishermen a better spirit towards assisting the department in the working out of measures calculated to advance the interests of our fisheries.

Mr. SINCLAIR. As to the question of providing instruction for our fishermen I notice that there is a vote in the estimates to inaugurate work in that line, and as it marks the first start in that direction I must compliment the minister on his action. At the same time it is important that no false step should be made. I would not favour the idea of a lecturer starting out along the coast to deliver lectures to the fishermen, because I think some better and more practical method could be adopted to begin with. Bulletins might be sent out as to the market, various information of interest to the fishermen might be given and experiments might be made to ascertain whether we have been successful or not in our attempts at the propagation of lobsters. My hon. friend (Mr. Jameson), has drawn attention to the fact that many millions of lobsters spawn has been placed in the waters of Canada during the past year, and so far as I am aware none of the officers of the department know whether this spawn has lived or not. Experiments would be useful to show whether our efforts have been successful in that direction and whether the propagation of lobsters results in increased production for the market. I do not know how that could be done, but I think it is quite possible that when the spawn is put in the water experts might continue their examination as to whether it has lived through the season or not. I would especially draw the attention of the minister to the fact that we have in Nova Scotia a technical school, the principal of which is I am aware most anxious to do something for our fishing industry. It occurs to me that the minister might work through that school and that an agreement could be arrived at by which the technical college of Nova Scotia would be in charge of what instruction would be given to the fishermen along the coast, and also in working out such suggestions as my hon. friend has made as to the motor boats and nets. These are things that might well be dealt with by that technical college. I do not know now in what way assistance could be given but I think some such arrangement would be practical and would work out well. The royal commission dealing with technical education will report shortly, and it is hoped by a good many members of this House that not only in Nova Scotia but in other parts of Canada something will be done by this government to aid technical education, and that a certain portion of the expense of running technical colleges in the provinces of Canada will be borne by the federal government. That is of course a larger question, but in the meantime if any instruction is attempted in the direction indicated I believe it could better be done through the technical college than in any other way.

Mr. BRODEUR. The item under discussion is for the encouragement of better transportation and the conservation of fresh fish, and I am glad to find that it meets with the approval of my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson). He has referred to the information which we are going to collect in regard to the fisheries. We have instructed one of our officers, who is

a very capable officer to look after this phase of the work. My hon. friend has referred to many other questions, but I do not know that it would be advisable for me to attempt to discuss them all at this moment. He stated that there was nothing in the estimates providing for an increased expenditure for bounties. That is true, because the amount expended in the way of bounties is expended in accordance with a statute passed many years ago, and a specific change in that statute would be necessary before we could put any amount in the estimates for that purpose. With regard to lobster hatcheries, I may say that we are taking steps to increase the number. We have not done so in the last two years, because the question of lobster hatcheries was being investigated by the Committee of Marine and Fisheries, which has made some recommendations on the subject. Immediately after their report was brought down, the department set to work to establish some hatcheries and also to provide for the establishment of lobster ponds. Then, we have introduced a resolution, upon which a Bill may be founded, providing for the sale of live lobsters during the close season. To-day nobody is permitted to sell lobsters in the close season, even if they have been caught in the open season. It was thought, however, in view of the extensive market which might be obtained in the United States, that any lobsters caught in the open season might be put in ponds and sold in the close season. Anything that the department can do to encourage this live lobster trade we will certainly do. We think this change will benefit the lobster fishermen, and it is expected that when the Bill is introduced, it will meet with the general approval of the members of this House.

Mr. JAMESON. Will the ponds be specially constructed for the purpose by the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not by the government, by private individuals. We will license them, and some of our officers will look after them in order to see that they are legally carried on. My hon. friend has also referred to the fishing for lobsters outside of the three-mile limit by American vessels, also to the fact that these vessels obtain shelter within the three-mile limit. This question of fishing for lobsters outside of the three-mile limit is, as my hon. friend knows, beyond our control. It might, however, be made the subject of negotiation or agreement between the countries interested. By virtue of the treaty of 1818, American fishermen have the right to come into our seaports for shelter, amongst other purposes. It is true that our own fishermen could not, during the close season, fish for lobsters outside of the three-mile limit, and then sell their catch within the three-mile limit or on Canadian territory. That would be contrary to the law. They will not be allowed under our regulations to sell or be in possession of lobsters within the three-mile limit or in Canadian territory. However, the matter to which my hon. friend has referred is engaging the most serious attention of the government, and it may be that some representations will be made through the ordinary channels to the American authorities on the subject.

Mr. JAMESON. Do I understand the minister to say that it would be permitted to Canadian vessels to clear for the fishing grounds, and prosecute lobster fishing in the close season, sell the catch in the United States, and then return to Canadian ports and clear again for the lobster fishing grounds?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not for my part see any serious objection to Canadian fishermen fishing outside the three-mile limit, provided they do not sell their catch in Canada. It may be contrary to the spirit of our regulations, but I do not see how it can be prevented. It is a matter over which we have no absolute control. My hon. friend referred to the Bill introduced last year concerning fishing vessels reporting and taking out licenses. All fishing vessels are obliged to take out licenses, and they are licensed if they have the fishing bounty. I am not aware that any fishing vessels do not take advantage of the bounty, as in all cases they have to take out a license.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the minister distinguish between the license necessary for a vessel to qualify for the bounty and the license required for the purpose of giving permission to American vessels to enter and leave a harbour without reporting to the customs?

Mr. BRODEUR. The licenses which our vessels have to take under the fishing bounty Act are almost equivalent to the license the American vessels have to take. What my hon. friend wants is that these fishing vessels should not be obliged to report to the customs at any time they come into port. My hon. friend has quoted some regulations or instructions to the customs authorities on the matter, and I remember that it was brought to the attention of the department last year. I think that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Pickup) brought it especially to my attention, and my hon. friend also drew my attention to it; and as a result of those representations it was decided by the customs authorities to relax the regulations in that respect, and I am informed that the relaxation of those regulations has proved of great benefit to the fishermen.

My hon. friend has referred to the resolu-

tions passed by the Fishermen's Union and specially to the fact that the department could be represented at the meetings of those unions. I do not see any objection to that. I would have been glad in the past to have had the opportunity of attending those meetings; and as the resolution read by my hon. friend may be considered as a sort of standing invitation, I think that the department, after considering the situation, will conclude to accept it, and be represented at those meetings in order to confer with the fishermen on matters of interest to both.

My hon. friend also mentioned the question of inspection which falls mostly under the control of the Department of Trade and Commerce. It might, however, be well that this question of inspection should be taken up by our department, and that we should take necessary steps to have a more rigid inspection made of the fish sold. That, I think, would prove to the benefit of the trade.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I notice that this item provides an amount of $20,000 for the purpose of assisting in the transportation west of fish from the maritime provinces while at the same time we are asked to pass a reciprocity treaty which has for its object the transportation of the same fish entirely to the United States. How does the hon. minister reconcile the two items? The object of the reciprocity agreement is to send our fish to the United States, and if that arrangement accomplishes its object, our fish will go there, yet at the same time he is incurring this expenditure in order to have our fish brought to our western provinces.

Mr. BRODEUR. No doubt reciprocity will increase the quantity of fish exported to the United States but at the same time the local market, in consequence of what we have done for the encouragement of the shipment of our fresh fish from the maritime provinces, will continue to increase.

To provide for the amount required to compensate Fishery Overseer Wm. Robichaud, of Inkerman, Gloucester county, for destruction of his property by fire, $2,400.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not hesitate to ask the committee to vote this sum. The facts are these. This man Robichaud was informed that illegal fishing was being carried on in his district, and instructed to put a stop to it. He immediately seized some nets. He put those nets in his barn, and they were stolen. That did not discourage him. He started again on a second errand and again succeeded in seizing some nets which were being used illegally. These nets he again put into his barn, and on that same evening the barn was destroyed by fire. It was found by some tracks in the snow that the fire was certainly the work of an incendiary. Some two or three men were arrested after investigation and committed for trial, but when the case came before the grand jury they were acquitted. Twelve of the jurymen were in favour of their acquittal and eleven against. However, there was no doubt that the building was destroyed through revenge on account of the seizing of these nets. I think, therefore, that the department should come to the assistance of this man, and compensate him for the loss he sustained. This will show that the arm of parliament is behind our fishery officials, and be an incentive to them to carry out their duty faithfully and at the same time will act as a deterrent to parties violating the law.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. minister seems to assume that the parties who were accused of having committed this crime were really guilty although acquitted by the grand jury. He says that eleven of the jury were for conviction and twelve against. I do not know how it is in Nova Scotia but in Ontario we do not have that many on a grand jury.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the report I have.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The objection I take is this. If it had been proved that the barn was burnt by these men, there might be some reason for giving this vote, but when the case came before the grand jury—and we know that only the evidence against the accused comes before that jury—and when upon that one-sided evidence these men were discharged, we have a right to assume that they were not guilty, and that the fire was not the work of an incendiary. To take any other position would be to presume that there was a complete miscarriage of justice.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not attach a great deal of importance to the fact that these men were not convicted. But there is one fact very clear that these buildings were destroyed because this man had fulfilled his duty. It was the work of an incendiary. The judge who instructed the jury charged very strongly against these men. I say it does not make any difference whether the real culprits were or were not before the court. We must presume that these men were innocent, they having been acquitted by the grand jury. But if we read the evidence as I have read it and learn the facts as I have learned them, it appears plain that the buildings were destroyed by a criminal hand. I think that under the circumstances it is the duty of parliament to compensate an officer for losses incurred in this way, as it will strengthen the hands of our officers in doing their duty.

Mr. PERLEY. Was there no insurance on the building?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, $1,500. The loss was $3.900. And we are asking for $2,400.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was it a barn that was destroyed?

Mr. BRODEUR. A barn and residence.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. minister says that the judge made some remarks about this case. But, as I understand, the case was dismissed by the grand jury and the case never reached the judge.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the hon. gentleman knows that before the matter is submitted to the grand jury the judge makes his address.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But he has no evidence then.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the evidence at the criminal investigation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But the judge does not make remarks as to a man's guilt or innocence, but simply says the charge is so and so, and that it is the duty of the grand jury to consider it. The grand jury hear only one side of the case before retiring. And after hearing only one side of the case the grand jury dismisses the case against these men. Now, we have to pay some respect to the law, and if we do so, we must presume these men were innocent, and, apparently no other person has been prosecuted. It does seem to me that for a loss, even a total loss, on a barn, $3,900 is a very large amount. The man had insured his place for $1,500, no doubt he had put on it all he could insure it for.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was a house as well as a barn and their contents. There was a crop in the barn which was worth a considerable sum. Of course, the claim will be investigated. As to the judge and the grand jury, the hon. member knows that the judge, in his presentment to the grand jury gives expression to views which may determine how each case should be considered, and his expression of views may be such as to indicate his opinion of the guilt of persons to be brought before him.

Mr. LENNOX. I cannot agree with the hon. minister. When a case goes before a grand jury, all the judge should do is to outline the nature of the offence—not anything about the evidence as to whether it is strong or otherwise—but simply point out that it is a certain class of case and indicate the law to be applied to it and what will be sufficient evidence to justify them in bringing in a true bill. I understand the minister to say that the judge commented on this case, and the minister's statement was that there was practically no doubt about the guilt of these parties. If the minister is correct in that, although the judge had no right to speak in that way, yet what is the result? In the face of the fact that the judge lays it down to the jury that there is strong evidence of guilt, the men are acquitted, and that, although only one side of the case has been heard. I do not see how, after a prosecution has been brought against men who were alleged to have been criminals and the grand jury declared that they were not criminals, we can come to the conclusion which the minister states that the barn must have been burned down by incendiaries. I do not want to go up against this man getting compensation if he ought to get it, but this seems to me to be opening a pretty wide door. I think there are cases much stronger than this, but I do not know that it is safe to argue the matter, because, as we go on, more and more items of loss seem to come to the recollection of the minister. It looks to me like an ordinary case in which the country would not be safe in taking the position of compensating the officer in the face of the verdict of the grand jury. The minister probably has the comments of the judge in his charge. If so, it would be interesting to read what the judge had to say.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be glad to communicate it to the House. I do not know the exact words used, but they convey the impression that I have stated. The judge may have gone a little outside his duties in that respect, but the crime attracted a great deal of attention in the community, and that was probably the reason the judge took the opportunity of expressing his views as he did.

Mr. GOODEVE. I desire to call special attention to the last point made by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). It seems to me that we establish a very dangerous precedent if, because a government employee has property destroyed by fire, and has not sufficient insurance, the government is held to the duty of compensating him for the loss. As I understand the minister his man carried $1,500 insurance, but is claiming a further amount of loss, and for that reason the government undertakes to pay him that difference between the insurance carried and the amount he claimed to be his loss. It is a large order for the government to undertake to recompense every employee in this way, and, therefore, it would be well before passing the item for the minister to secure further information for the House.

Mr. BARNARD. I would contrast the minister's very generous conduct in this matter with his conduct in the case of the Provincial Fishery Inspector, Mr. Babcock, who was engaged last summer in association with his own fisheries inspector on a commission to allot to the canners in the northern part of British Columbia the num-

ber of boats which they were to be allowed to fish in the Skeena river. Mr. Babcock had $50 deducted from his account for services, because he had worked five Sundays and included them in his account. A government tug was used in that work, and I would ask if the minister paid the wages of the crew and the supplies of coal, &c., used?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend understands that we are not in a position to pay for Sunday work. The commission received no instructions from us to do work on Sundays, and if they did it, it was to suit their own convenience. My hon. friend is familiar with the Lord's Day Act, and all the officials of the government have to observe that law. The work could quite well have been done outside of Sundays, and it has always been the practice of the government not to allow payment to commissioners who worked on Sundays, and we could not pay Mr. Babcock an allowance which was not given to others.

Mr. BARNARD. If Mr. Babcock had not worked on Sundays, but had taken five days longer to do the work and had sent in his bill would the minister have paid him?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. Did he pay his employees on his tug-boats for their work on Sundays?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are paid a monthly salary.

Mr. BARNARD. Does the minister think it fair to take advantage of the five days' work that these people have done on Sunday?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows that we passed a law some years ago declaring that no man should work on Sunday, and if I presented to parliament an account for Sunday work I would undoubtedly be criticised by some members.

Mr. DANIEL. Is not the law that a man shall not be allowed to work seven days in the week?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is in some countries, in France, for instance; but our law is for the observance of the sabbath.

Mr. BARNARD. The government were careful in passing that Act not to take the onus of enforcing it, and my friend would find small sympathy in his province if he set up a defence of this kind.

Mr. BRODEUR. I should not be ruled by feelings which exist in my province or in any particular province. This is the law of Canada, and I have to observe it.

Mr. BARNARD. The matter is a very small one, but I think the action of the department is nothing less than actually contemptible.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In connection with this the minister promised to give us further information. He said that he did not attach very much importance to the question of whether or not the parties who had been accused had been found guilty. I take the opposite view. I take the view that if there had been no trial, if nobody had been charged and nobody found not guilty there would have been a stronger case, but when you have laid a charge against some persons and are unable to support it and the charge was dismissed, it seems to lead to the conclusion that there was no incendiarism, and, therefore, you are in a weaker position than if there had not been a trial and dismissal. I would like to ask the minister if he has any affidavit from this man proving his actual loss?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we have a statutory declaration.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the minister that declaration here?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but there is a declaration before the department.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As I understand it, when a man insures his property he insures it usually from two-thirds to three-quarters of its full value, and very often insures it up to its full value if he can. This man would have to make an affidavit to the insurance company stating the value of the property and giving a list of the articles burned. I think I could point to cases in my own riding where fishery inspectors suffered loss by having their boats stolen as a result of the animosity of some person that they were prosecuting under the law. They would have a stronger right than there is in this case because there had been no trial to prove that the persons who were suspected were not guilty. If we establish a precedent of this kind there is no end to the claims that the minister will have to pay, and for this reason I ask that the item stand over until we get further evidence of the loss.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be very glad to bring down all the information.

Mr. LENNOX. It is after twelve o'clock now, it is as late as we usually sit, and there is certain information which we ought to have in reference to this matter. I would suggest that the committee rise. Does the minister understand that the insurance money was paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that $1,200 has been paid.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The minister said $1,500.

Mr. LENNOX. He mentioned $1,500 before, so that it is either $1,200 or $1,500. I think it is a usual provision of the insurance policy that if a fire results from an incendiary cause we do not get insurance.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, at all events if it is found on examination that you have reason to dread incendiarism and you insure your buildings you cannot recover. This is established as a matter of law. I am inclined to think that there are some companies that do not insure against loss resulting from incendiary causes; I am not positive as to that. However, I think this is one of those cases which requires a great deal of investigation. The minister said some time ago that before payment was made he would ascertain definitely as to the extent of the loss. The time we ought to ascertain definitely is before we vote the money. That would be giving the committee a certain amount of control that it ought to have. Therefore, I would suggest that the committee rise now.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be very glad to bring before the House all the evidence that we have in the department as to the claim.

Mr. GOODEVE. I understood the minister to say a moment ago that the insurance amounted to $1,500. He now says that the insurance company only paid $1,200. That is very remarkable in view of the statement of the minister that this man suffered a loss of $3,900, and I think, therefore, that it would be well to look into the matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. The insurance was on the barn and the house, but this fire occurred in the fall at a time when the crop, the cattle and the horses were in the barn. The amount which we asked the committee to vote will be to compensate this man not only for the loss of the barn, but also of the contents.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If it was insured for $1,500 and the property was worth $3,900, why did the insurance company not pay him $1,500 instead of cutting him down to $1,200? It looks as if they came to the conclusion that the loss was not as great as $1,500, and they, therefore, cut him down to $1,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. The contents of the barn would be worth very much more than the barn itself, the crop being in it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. My point is that if the property destroyed by fire was worth $3,900 and that same property was insured for $1,500, why did the company only pay $1,200?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know exactly the reason it was done, but there may be some reason for it. The insurance was only on the barn and the house, not on the contents. The crop was not insured, and there was absolutely nothing to compensate him as far as the insurance was concerned in case the crop was destroyed. The crop, the cattle and the horses were destroyed by fire; these were not insured, and that may explain the payment by the insurance company.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That would make the contents worth $2,700.

Mr. BRODEUR. That may be. The contents of the barn after the crop is all in would be worth very much more than the barn itself.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister know whether the man was a regular farmer or merely a fishery inspector residing on the shore?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was a farmer at the same time.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think we should have all these papers down.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.17 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 27, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENTS.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 155) to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: The House will remember that a couple of years ago we passed legislation providing that all vessels, including government vessels, or His Majesty's vessels, should be registered in Canada; by His Majesty's vessels I mean ships belonging to the Canadian government. We took power to include all those ships. We were following in that respect, the rule that had been introduced in England a year or two before; it was found, however, that in England they do not include vessels belonging to the navy. We decided then to amend our legislation, and to bring it into the same shape as the imperial legislation. Therefore, power is sought by this Act to make it unnecessary for the vessels of the naval service, with the exception of those engaged in the hydro-

graphic surveys and the fisheries protection service, to be registered.

We are also seeking an amendment concerning sick mariners. As the House is aware, sick mariners' dues have been administered under an Act passed many years ago, which has not been amended very frequently. Heretofore we have often paid the cost of the transportation of sick mariners, and have also contributed to their funeral expenses. We are not certain, however, that we have the power to do this under the Act; and I intend to propose an amendment making it clear that those expenses shall be paid out of sick mariners' fund. We provide also that the collectors of customs who are charged with the duty of collecting sick mariners' dues, shall be obliged to report more frequently than they are required to do by the existing legislation.

An important change is made concerning pilotage in the St. Lawrence. It has been found that owing to the numerous and important improvements which have been made in the St. Lawrence channel the rates for insurance have decreased considerably during the past years. We have taken all necessary steps to improve the aids to navigation. We have done something also with reference to pilotage. We have taken under the control of the department the pilotage jurisdiction which has been exercised by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, and by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners. I may add, par parenthese, that since these changes have been made we have been in receipt of communications from the shipping interests lauding the work that has been performed by the department in this respect. It is found, however, that another improvement is necessary, and I am proposing by this Bill that pilotage in the St. Lawrence should be made compulsory. Heretofore there has been no rule requiring vessels to take pilots, but they have been simply obliged to pay pilotage dues; in other words, pilotage is not compulsory but the payment of pilotage dues is compulsory. Now, the shipping interests of the St. Lawrence are strongly in favour of the idea that not only should the payment of pilotage dues be compulsory, but that pilotage should also be compulsory.

This feature of the proposed legislation regarding pilotage in the St. Lawrence is the result of conferences which have taken place between the department and various shipping interests. There were represented at those conferences the Dominion Marine Association of Ontario which includes nearly all the companies navigating on the Great Lakes; there were represented also the shipping federation, the pilots, and some private companies. I may add that the provisions which are now being sought have been agreed to by these various interests. We are going to require that all vessels having a draught of 10 feet shall be obliged to take pilots in the St. Lawrence; if they do not take pilots, then they are required to be provided with masters and mates who have passed the necessary examinations to qualify them to run a vessel in the St. Lawrence channel. I may say, however, that with regard to sea-going vessels, it is provided that in all cases they shall be required to take a pilot. As regards vessels engaged in the coasting trade, I mean those which to-day are not obliged to pay pilotage dues, most of them are taking on pilots. In the St. Lawrence for example all the colliers coming from Cape Breton to Montreal are not obliged by law to pay pilotage dues, but they, however, take pilots. It is now proposed that all the sea-going vessels shall be obliged to take pilots, while vessels engaged in the coasting trade will either have to take pilots, or to be provided with masters and first mates who have passed the necessary examinations to show that they are qualified to run a vessel in the St. Lawrence.

The object of this legislation will be apparent to the House. It is to provide and assure the safety of the St. Lawrence route by all possible means. I think that when it is known that all vessels must take pilots, that no vessel can enter the St. Lawrence channel without being provided with a pilot, or with masters and mates who are compulsorily qualified to run a vessel, we shall see at once a disappearance of the discrimination which exists to-day in favour of the United States ports against Canadian ports. It is also proposed to include the St. John pilotage authority, and the Minas Basin pilotage authority, amongst those which are to-day allowed, under existing legislation, to force all vessels engaged in the coasting trade to take pilots. We also make a change in the provisions with regard to investigations into wrecks. The law now requires that in some cases investigations must take place within one month; it is found that this period is too short and our intention is to ask parliament to give the longer period of one year.

We find also difficulty in the administration of the department owing to the prohibition by the legislation of the holding of the positions of inspector of boilers and inspector of hulls by one person. We find it advisable in some cases when men are qualified for both positions that they should be held by only one person.

By an Act passed several years ago the wreck commissioner was granted the right to cancel the certificate not only of a captain or mate on the inland or minor waters, but for sea-going vessels, and even certificates given by the Board of Trade in England. The English legislation provides that in case a certificate has

been cancelled by a wreck commissioner there is an appeal to the House of Lords or the Privy Council, I forget which. The imperial authorities drew my attention to this when I was in England a couple of years ago and since that time a despatch has been sent asking us to restore the old clause with regard to sea-going certificates. I am embodying such a provision in this legislation.

A Bill was reported by the Marine and Fisheries Committee two years ago dispensing with the inspection of boilers and hulls the vessels which have been certificated by English or foreign authorities. The same legislation exists in England and we are now proposing that the Governor General in Council may dispense with the inspection of boilers and hulls in these cases. I refer to such foreign bodies as the Board of Trade and Lloyds in England and the Bureau Veritas.

Mr. FOSTER. To what foreign countries does that apply?

Mr. BRODEUR. No name is specifically mentioned in the Bill. It simply gives to the Governor General in Council the right to declare that a certificate issued by some foreign authority would be accepted in Canada. For instance, the certificates of the Bureau Veritas are accepted in England and I think it would be only fair for us to do the same in Canada.

We are asking for power to regulate the use of channels in the St. Lawrence. We have what we call the St. Lawrence channel which is being deepened for the use of sea-going ships, but that channel is used also by smaller vessels which may at any time seriously obstruct the channel and imperil the safety of the St. Lawrence route. We take power to regulate the channels in which vessels may ply.

We also ask power to remedy what I consider a very serious situation. Our shipping legislation since 1867 has been passed sometimes with the approval of His Majesty in Council in England and sometimes it has not been done in that way. By the legislation of 1894 the Imperial authorities revised their statutes and passed a general shipping Act called the Imperial Shipping Act of 1894. By that legislation it is declared that the self-governing dominions may pass legislation provided that this legislation should be approved by His Majesty in Council and it may be contended that their legislation might affect the legislation passed in Canada prior to that. Thus we would be in a position that we had legislation on our statute-books which was considered absolutely illegal. However, the imperial authorities have found it advisable to legislate on the same matter, and it may be that our legislation may conflict in words, if not in principle, with the imperial legislation. I thought of putting a clause in this Bill for the purpose of avoiding any difficulty with regard to the legality of our legislation and of course that power which is sought will have to be submitted to His Majesty in Council as provided by the Imperial Act.

There are some minor amendments which are not of very great importance. I have given the most important features of the legislation now proposed.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the legislation in reference to sick seamen refer to mercantile seamen or only naval seamen?

Mr. BRODEUR. To mercantile seamen, the sick mariners' dues in the Shipping Act apply only to mercantile seamen.

Mr. LEWIS. Inland as well as foreign vessels?

Mr. BRODEUR. Inland and foreign.

Mr. LEWIS. In reference to the pilotage on the St. Lawrence, will those holding certificates on the inland waters who now trade from the upper lakes down below Quebec be entitled to receive certificates as pilots?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. The Dominion Marine Association which was present at those conferences, agreed to the provision in the Bill now introduced that masters and mates of those vessels could pass under section 484 of the Merchants Shipping Act and get their certificates as pilots.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 137) for the relief of Maggie Florence Sadler.—Mr. Reid (Grenville).

UNITED STATES WARSHIPS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask whether the attention of the government has been directed to the plans for naval manœuvres by United States war vessels on the Great Lakes. I have here a description of these plans found in the public press of the United States:

CHICAGO'S NAVAL STATION IS READY.

Plans for Big Manœuvres at Lake Bluff in June include Bombardment.

Called Best in the World.

Secretary Von L. Meyer Expects Thousands of Recruits at $3,000,000 Base.

Plans for the dedication of the new naval training station at Lake Bluff, Ill., three and one-half miles from North Chicago, have been completed by the War Department. The new station is to be opened between June 1 and June 10 with a celebration of naval manœuvres on the lake.

Nine war vessels, smaller craft of the navy, now being used at various places for the training of the naval militia, are to assemble in Lake Michigan off the Chicago coast for the manœuvres. They will participate in a celebration that will last during the greater part of the summer.

The new station, which has been constructed at a cost of approximately $3,000,000 will accommodate 2,000 men. Work on it was begun two years ago.

Bombardment Part of the Celebration.

The bombardment of Chicago by a hostile fleet will be part of the celebration. The fleet is to be composed of the nine regular vessels used by the naval militia for training purposes. These will be reinforced for the occasion by a cruiser from the regular navy.

Some morning in August the citizens of Chicago will see a fleet in battle formation manœuvring off the coast of North Chicago. A moment later and the battle of Chicago will be begun.

Whether the city will be stormed and taken and the forces on land forced to abandon their fortifications and retire is a matter that will be decided according to the rules governing military war games.

Plans for Manœuvres Complete.

Arrangements for the carrying out of the bombardment here have been virtually completed by the War Department.

What follows is the part to which I would like especially to draw the attention of the government:

It will be necessary to obtain permission from Canada before one of the armed vessels of the regular navy can be sent through the Great Lakes, but this matter, it is said, already has been discussed by the two governments.

The new naval training station which is fortified will be the objective point for the fleet to capture.

The fortifications have been pronounced perfect by the secretary of the navy, George Von L. Meyer, who inspected it last October, when he made a special trip to Chicago for that purpose.

Calls it Best in the World.

'This will be the finest naval training station in the world,' said the secretary.

'We expect the Chicago station to bring us thousands of recruits from the middle west and to prove one of the best investments the navy ever has made.'

The Chicago station represents an outlay of $3,250,000. Work was started in the fall of 1906. The formal opening of the new educational school was set for October 1. Several months ago it was evident that the work had not progressed far enough to permit this.

I would like to ask whether it is true that permission has been asked, as stated in this report, and whether it be correct that the convention of 1817 provides that on Lake Ontario each nation shall be entitled to keep one vessel, of 100 tons burden, armed with one 18-pound cannon, and on the upper lakes, two vessels, not exceeding like burden, and armed with like force, and on Lake Champlain, one such vessel armed with like force; and that all other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled and no other vessels shall be built or armed on these lakes.

If we are to have the naval manœuvres described in the article I have read, we ought to have information from the government with regard to the course which it has taken in the matter, or proposes to take.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has correctly stated the tenor of the convention of 1817. That convention, as is well known, limits the armed war vessels to be maintained on the Great Lakes to one on Lake Ontario and to one on the Upper Lakes. The United States obtained permission to pass through our canals some training ships, the condition being, I think, that they should not be armed. Whether or not the manœuvres mentioned come within the treaty or not is a question as to which I would not be prepared to offer any answer at the moment. The matter is engaging our attention and if necessary representations will be made to Washington.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The particular question to which I desired an answer was whether or not the passage of one of the regular cruisers of the United States through the Great Lakes for the purposes of these manœuvres has been discussed between the two governments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The United States, if I remember rightly, made application to be allowed to pass a cruiser. My impression is that this application was not entertained. Another application has been made to take one of the training ships down and substitute another.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to the fact that an order on this matter which passed the House a year and a half ago, and which I have since asked for over and over again, has not yet been brought down. I do not think an order of the House should be treated in that way. I would like to know whether we may expect it down in a short time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is true that an order of the House was passed long ago which my hon. friend mentions, but when we came to sift the order we found that it involved so much of what was secret matter, such as secret despatches, that it was most difficult to discriminate and bring down what really we would be justified in making public. It was my intention, I will say candidly to my hon. friend, to show to His Excellency the Governor General, confidentially the whole correspondence, and until then none of it can be brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that none of it can be brought down?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None at present.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like also to ask whether the right hon. gentleman has not the additional information we require with regard to the secretariat.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think this is on my desk. I will look into it tomorrow.

UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call special attention to a cutting from the papers this morning. It has reference to a lady who was crossing from Canada to the United States to visit her relatives and was held up at Black Rock by an American agent. According to the statements made in the newspapers she was subjected to all kinds of questions which were not only impertinent but went much further and which were of a nature that I would not care to characterize by any adjective at this moment. Now we have over and over again brought to the attention of this House incidents of this kind in which bona fide Canadian passengers and travellers have been subjected to questions of this character and other annoyances at the border. On every occasion the government promised that the matter should be looked into, but I have never heard whether any results came from that inquiry or not. I shall send this clipping over to the right hon. gentleman and, I think he will agree with me that if the allegations in it are well founded, either Mr. Bryce or somebody else ought to see that the agent at fault is properly dealt with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is quite true that, several times, offences of this kind—for they are really offences—have been brought to our attention; and we had, if I remember well, a sharp correspondence about the matter. I have not heard that since then anything of the kind had been repeated; but if there has been any recurrence, it is quite proper for us to make due representations at once.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MEIGHEN. In the absence of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) and at his request, I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to an order of the House calling for papers, documents and correspondence relating to a fishing lease granted to one Markey, and the assignment of it. This order was passed many months ago, and was spoken of on two occasions subsequently by the hon. member for Dauphin in my hearing. I believe the delay was accounted for by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) on the ground that there had been difficulty in procuring the return. Finally, the return—or what is alleged to be a return to this order—has been brought down. I am informed by the hon. member for Dauphin that it contains only a copy of the original lease, not, as he contends and as seems quite clear, fulfilling the order of the House. It would also appear strange that so long a time should be required for the clerks in the Department of Marine and Fisheries to copy one lease. The hon. member for Dauphin has asked me to bring this matter to the attention of the minister, and ask that the full order of the House be fully complied with.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some time ago an order of the House was passed for the lease and the correspondence and other documents relating to it. When the matter was again called attention to, I made inquiry about it and learned that the papers connected with the lease had been brought down. I showed the hon. member for Dauphin, the other day, a copy of the lease as it was amongst the papers brought down in 1909. But, even previous to that, the correspondence was laid on the table. Since that time, the matter has been transferred to the Department of Justice for adjudication, and the only correspondence not yet brought down is that between my department and the Department of Justice. If the hon. member wishes, that can be brought down also.

Mr. BURRELL. I desire to ask the Prime Minister when the House may expect the report of the proceedings of the large delegation of fruit-growers who waited on the government on February 10 last? That is about six weeks ago, and it appears only reasonable that we should have the report very shortly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That must be in the hands of the printer. I will look into it.

LA BANQUE INTERNATIONALE DU CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 123) to incorporate La Banque du Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. FIELDING. This Bill was considered in committee, but held for further consideration on account of the title. I think there were good reasons against the adoption of the title, so I asked that the Bill should be held over in the hope that the promoter would come to an understanding and agree to a title which would be free from objection. I am glad to say that the effect of the delay has been to reach what I trust will be a satisfactory arrangement. With the consent of the promoters, I move

that instead of La Banque du Canada the title be La Banque Internationale du Canada.

Amendment agreed to, and read the third time and passed.

ONTARIO AND MINNESOTA POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 109) respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Conmee.

On section 1,

Mr. BOYCE. There is a very important question to be considered in connection with this Bill, and the history of it, and the past legislation, both in the Dominion and Ontario legislature, might well be thought of before a step further is taken. This company was incorporated by letters patent of the province of Ontario, and when they first came to this parliament in 1905 they obtained an Act, chapter 139, the effect of which was to give, so far as this government could give, consent to the user of certain powers at or tributary to the town of Fort Frances. In 1906 the same company went to the Ontario legislature and by petition obtained, chapter 132, the preamble, of which reads in part:

Whereas chapter 139 of the statutes of Canada of 1905 was passed on the petition of the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited, and whereas certain provisions thereof as to the supply of power in Canada from the water-power on the Rainy river at or near the town of Fort Frances, are in the interest of the province of Ontario; and whereas notwithstanding the provisions in the said statute contained, it is contended that the company are not bound thereby, but are entitled to deal with the said water-power freed from the restrictions in respect thereof imposed by the said Act, &c.

There is no doubt that under this legislation, and under it alone, the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company entered into an agreement with the town of Fort Frances which agreement was confirmed and ratified by the Ontario Act, and that contractual relations have been created thereby between this company and the Ontario government, which contractual relations this legislation will interfere with. It is not altogether a matter of conflict of jurisdiction between the province and the Dominion, but if there were such conflict it was cleared up some years ago by my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) who declared most expressly along the line which I have just mentioned. But it is a question of interference with contractual relations between the province and the company incorporated by that province, and with respect to the exercise of powers which are at any rate to some extent within the jurisdiction of the province. I say this section ought not to be passed, and that the whole question has been settled by legislation of past years in the Ontario legislature which had jurisdiction to deal with it and which assumed that jurisdiction and which the company submitted to by entering into a contract with the province. I submit it would make confusion of jurisdiction worse confounded to pass this legislation.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What is the contract entered into with the Ontario government and in what respect does this interfere with it?

Mr. BOYCE. That contract was regulating and providing for the supply of power on the Canadian side, and providing that it should be available concurrently with that available on the American side.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. We had this matter very thoroughly discussed in the Private Bills Committee. My hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) who introduces this Bill, when he was a member of the Ontario legislature, had no doubt whatever that the matters covered by the Bill were entirely within the jurisdiction of the province. In 1904 this company entered into a contract with the provincial government which is fully set out in an agreement. Subsequently the company came to the Ontario government in 1905 and obtained what has been termed by the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) a surreptitious and clandestine agreement. The Whitney government which succeeded the Ross government, which entered into that arrangement, endeavoured so far as it could to rectify some evils of that agreement by the passage of chapter 132 of the Statutes of Ontario. It must not be lost sight of that the town of Fort Frances, believing that the Ontario government could administer its affairs with respect to the development of electricity more advantageously than they could themselves, conveyed certain lands to the province in order that the province might act as their trustee. I claim that the present government of Ontario has fully conserved all the interests of the town of Fort Frances, as it repealed the obnoxious provisions of the agreement of 1905, and by obtaining from the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company a further agreement which fully protects all the rights of the municipality. I have been unable to get any supporter of the present Bill to point out to me any provision lacking in the agreement between the province of Ontario and the company for the protection of the rights of Fort Frances. The agreement entered into on June 10 last between the power company and the provincial government is a very stringent agreement. It contains provisions which are not provided for in the present Act, namely, that for default of provisions of the agreement the company shall forfeit $50,000, and for every day they remain in default they shall pay a

penalty of $100. Then they are under contractual obligation that the government will have the right to cut the wires. We say that is a contractual obligation between the company and the province, and we claim it is a provision which may be enforced notwithstanding where the jurisdiction is, because the company entered into the contract with their eyes open, whereas under the provisions of the present Bill the most that could be done is for the railway commission to cut the wires. It is provided in the Ontario Act that if the company do not carry out the agreement, not only can we prevent them exporting any electricity, but we can enforce the penalties they have agreed to pay in case of default. There is no such provision in the present Act; and so far as power is given to the Board of Railway Commissioners to cut into that contract, just so far will the province of Ontario and the town of Fort Frances lose by that agreement. We must take either one position or the other; either this Bill will give the Railway Commission power to cut into that contract, and to that extent impair the benefit of it and interfere with private rights, or it will not have that effect and be of no use whatever. If any hon. member can show that that contract entered into in June, 1910, between the company and the government of the province of Ontario, and ratified this year by an Act of parliament, does not fully protect the town of Fort Frances, we are willing to make another amendment, but so far no hon. member has pointed that out.

Mr. FOSTER. How was the company incorporated?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. By letters patent of the province of Ontario, in the year 1903, I think; and in 1904 they entered into an agreement with the Ontario government, and all the negotiations were carried on with that government until 1905. Subsequently they came to this parliament to get the right to export electricity under the Act passed by this parliament in that year to regulate the exportation of electricity; and unless this Act can be declared retroactive it may not be operated against this company. But we claim that as the company entered into a contract with the Ontario government subsequent to the passage of that Act, they are bound by its provisions, and they must be presumed to have known the state of the law when they entered into that contract. The provisions of the Ontario Act are much more stringent and beneficial to the people of Fort Frances than the provisions of the Federal Act of 1905. The government of Ontario, acting as trustees for the people of Ontario, and Fort Frances, are carrying out that trust to the fullest advantage of the town of Fort Frances by the agreement of June 10, 1909.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) read a part of the preamble of chapter 132 of the Ontario Statutes. But I submit that it is now not in the power of the Ontario legislature to limit the operation of a Federal Act. They practically propose to veto federal legislation, as they declare that the company may go on, without regard to the obligations imposed by the federal Act of 1905. I am not going to discuss that question further, but I think it would be reasonable for hon. members to assume that the Ontario government overstepped its authority in making that declaration. Then my hon. friend referred to the agreement entered into in 1904. There was an agreement entered into on the 17th of February, 1904, with which the town of Fort Frances was satisfied. On the 1st of February last I put the preamble of that agreement on 'Hansard,' where hon. gentlemen can find it. It declares that the Ontario government are entering into the agreement at the request and for the benefit of the town of Fort Frances. My hon. friend claims that the Ontario government is acting in the capacity of a trustee. If so, they are the most curious trustees I have ever known. They act contrary to the urgent request of their principals. They were acting in part as a trustee, especially with respect to certain lands which are described in schedule A of the Act of 1906. The reason for that was that the company got a second agreement, without the knowledge of Fort Frances, on misrepresentations, this Act so declares. My hon. friend did not read all the preamble. It goes on to say:

And whereas the lands described in schedule 'A' hereto, form a part of the water front of the town of Fort Frances, and were hitherto vested in the corporation thereof, and were by them conveyed to the Crown in the interest of the province of Ontario.

I do not agree with that declaration. They are vested in the Crown as a trustee in the interest of the town, as it was thought that they might be safer in the hands of the provincial authorities than in the hands of the council. The preamble goes on:

To enable the Crown to deal therewith as the needs of the vicinity might require in assisting the establishment and operation of such industries at the said town of Fort Frances, requiring the use of power as would be for the public benefit, and whereas by a certain agreement dated the 9th day of January, 1905.

That is the agreement which I claim was got without the knowledge of Fort Frances—

Made between His Majesty of the first part and Edward Wellington Backus, of the City of Minneapolis, lumberman, and those as-

sociated with him of the second part, acting on behalf of a company then to be incorporated.

—the company was not then incorporated —the preamble further states:

The Crown representing the province of Ontario agreed in certain events and subject to certain conditions to convey the said lands to the said parties of the second part, but no provision was made for the protection of the interests of the said town of Fort Frances in respect of the purposes for which the said town conveyed the lands to the Crown; and whereas it is claimed the said agreement was entered into without the consent of the corporation of the town of Fort Frances and without any notice to them although the same interferes most seriously with the rights of the said town; and whereas the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited, have been incorporated and have taken over the rights of the said parties of the second part to the said agreement; and whereas it is desirable to make certain provisions as to some of the matters contained in the said chapter 139 of the Statutes of Canada of 1905, and to restore the said lands to the Crown to be dealt with as hereinafter provided, and to employ in this Act certain provisions already agreed upon relating to the development of industries at the town of Fort Francis aforesaid; and whereas the said company is desirous of securing an extension of the time fixed by said agreement for the full and final completion of the works therein referred to.

I want to read section 1 to show that that agreement, although referred to here, was wiped out by subsequent legislation, and the first enacting clause says:

Notwithstanding the provisions to the contrary, if any, contained in the said agreement, dated January 9, 1905, made between His Majesty of the first part and the said Wellington Edward Backus and his associates with him of the second part, the company shall through the water-power now or hereafter existing on the Rainy river at or near the town of Fort Frances, in the district of Rainy River, including any increase thereof from time to time provide power and electrical energy on the Canadian side of the international boundary line, concurrently, &c.

I want to point out that this annuls the Act, or rather the difference between the two agreements, which was that the first provided as a security to Canadian interests that any profits they could make out of the Canadian half of the power must be made by its utilization in Canada and elsewhere, whereas the second agreement provided that 4,000 horse-power was to be kept permanently available in Canada and that a portion of the balance or the whole of the balance might under order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council be exempt.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee), contend that the company obtained their rights and powers from this government under the legislation of 1905, or from the provincial government under their charter and contract, and the legislation of 1906?

Mr. CONMEE. I contend that any legal powers that company had or any powers it could exercise were obtained by the Act of this parliament of 1905, but that was not the Act they asked for. The hon. gentleman says they asked for chapter 139, but they did not ask for anything of the kind. They ask for Bill 86 which I placed on 'Hansard' on the first of February last, and if any hon. gentleman will read and does not consider that an imposition on Canadian interests had it became law, I will be very much surprised.

Mr. BOYCE. Then the federal legislation of 1905 was not in the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee), the giving of consent by this government to the utilization of power.

Mr. CONMEE. The legislation of 1905 was an enabling Act which enabled this company to construct its works on that navigable and international stream, and as a protection to Canadian interests in regard to the use and price of power and the means by which power could be used on the Canadian side, it placed them under the Board of Railway Commissioners. The only reason we are here to-day is because of the confusion or doubt that has arisen in connection with the language of the Act not being as specific as it should be and because of the legislation passed by the province. These are works extending into a foreign country upon an international river and surely hon. gentlemen will not seriously argue that the provincial government could control such works.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman contends that this company derived its enabling power from the federal legislation of 1905?

Mr. CONMEE. I say that all the powers they have are under that Act.

Mr. BOYCE. And that it obtained those powers from this government, because according to his contention this was the only government that could give these powers on an international and navigable stream. Have I stated correctly the position of my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee)?

Mr. CONMEE. I see what the hon. gentleman is going to say and I have answered it three or four times in the House already. There was a time before I had legal advice, some 25 or 30 years ago, before I inquired into the question, that I had no doubts but that the Ontario government had power because I built the power canal at Sault Ste. Marie under a provincial charter, but that company had

afterwards to come to the federal parliament to get legislation so that their works might be legalized and their plans approved.

Mr. BOYCE. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee), goes back 30 years to excuse him for making a different contention from that which he has presented to the House now. But I may tell you, Mr. Chairman, that after this Bill was passed in 1905 and after it had served its purpose, and in order that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee), might bolster up another argument in this House, he propounded in this House on the 30th of June, 1906, an argument diametrically opposed to that which he has now presented in support of his present contention.

Mr. CONMEE. There is always time to get light you know.

Mr. BOYCE. There is, but let me refer to the speech which the hon. gentleman made in this House on the 30th of June, 1906, at page 6697 of the 'Hansard' of that year, and I shall read from the revised edition so that there may be no mistake about it. This is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee), said in reply to a speech of mine:

Now it is a fact that the water-power at the Sault has been dealt with by the International Water-powers Commission, and I understand they agree that 50,000 horse-power might be utilized on either side of the river. Then it is a question for the Ontario government, now, as it has always been in the past, to decide whether they would grant an application from the town of Sault Ste. Marie, or any other corporation, to take a portion of that 50,000 horse-power. For my purpose, and for the purpose of this discussion, it does not matter whether 50,000 is the unit or not. Whatever power is available for the Canadian side is a question entirely within the jurisdiction, as I understand it, first of the Ontario government as regards the use of the bed of the river for that purpose, and second, of this government as regards the use of the water, because it is an international stream, and I assume they would have to get the consent of this government to that effect.

A propos of the question, to ask which I interrupted my hon. friend he said that this was the initial legislation and from this legislation in this House this company got its power. Let us see what he says further on. I interrupted my hon. friend at page 6698 and he said:

Then if there be a water-power on Whitefish island—he states now that it is not covered or needed by this railway company.

Mr. CONMEE. Certainly not, My statement goes further, this government could not give a water-power, they have no power to do so. They do not control the land which is covered by the water either below or above the rapids. All they can do is to give their consent, as they did last year at Fort Frances, to the utilization of the power.

An absolutely opposite contention to that which my hon. friend made this afternoon.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not think there is any inconsistency.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I commend it to the committee to see whether they can square one assertion with the other. But, Sir, this is not the only menace. My hon. friend now as then has very ingeniously brought in a Bill in order to add certain other rights which is now before the parliament of Canada. We had last year an important canal Bill of the hon. gentleman affecting very seriously the water-power at Fort Frances?

Mr. CONMEE. I had no canal Bill last year or at any other time. That Bill was the Bill of a Company just as this Bill is the Bill of the corporation of Fort Frances.

Mr. BOYCE. I hope my hon. friend did not think I was personal. I meant that he as a member of the House was promoting a Bill. That Bill was defeated in the House because it was thought to be altogether too large a canal scheme for this House or the Railway Committee to entertain in a private Bill and the chairman of the Conservation Commission expressed himself as very strongly against that Bill. What have we to-day? We have a Bill introduced in the Senate which so far as it affects the locality and the water at Fort Frances interferes with the rights of the people of Fort Frances and of the Minnesota and Ontario Power Company, exactly the same condition of things as on a larger scale was sought to be promoted and secured by the legislation of last year. Here is a Bill of the Senate, an Act to incorporate the Western Canal Company. At least two of the incorporators in that Bill were incorporators of the Bill last year for the larger scheme. The object of that Bill I would commend to the consideration of this committee. Sections 8 and 9 of that Bill provide:

8. The company may—

(a) construct, maintain and operate a ship canal and navigable connecting channels from a point five miles east of Fort Frances on Rainy lake, by way of the Rainy river, to a point five miles west of the foot of the Long Sault rapids on the said river;

(b) construct, maintain and operate all channels, locks, dams, diversions, works and connections necessary for the efficient operation of a ship canal and for the maintenance of a navigable channel between the said points;

(c) construct, maintain and operate all locks, dams, reservoirs, channels and works necessary in connection with the supply and regulation of water in the said canal and channels;

(d) construct, maintain and operate any pas-

sage over, under or through the said canal and channels, or over, under or through any river, watercourse, water or land, when necessary for the purposes of the undertaking;

(e) construct, maintain and operate, use or lease or otherwise dispose of, terminals, wharfs, and harbour works;

(f) create hydraulic and electrical power from or by water brought into or contained in any canal, dam, lock or channel, and use the same for lighting and operating the canals, locks, gates, channels, shops, and other works of the company; and also, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council as to rates and conditions, use, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any hydraulic, electrical or other kind of power developed by or made available by or in connection with the canal system of the company, when and to the extent the same may not be required for the purposes of navigation or for the works of the company;

(g) build or acquire, and use or dispose of, steamers, tugs, boats, barges and other vessels, for the purpose of the said canal; and propel vessels of all kinds in and through the said canal by any kind of power or force; and, for such purposes, construct, erect, maintain and operate such structures, machinery, and appliances as are necessary to produce or operate the said force or power;

(h) manufacture and produce any commodity for affording traffic on the said canal and channels.

9. The company may open, cut, excavate and erect such ponds and basins for the laying up and turning of vessels, boats or craft using the said canal as it deems expedient; and at such portions thereof as it deems expedient; and may also build and erect dry docks and slips and all necessary machinery connected therewith for the operation of such dry docks and slips, and for building and repairing vessels, and may lease or hire the same on such terms as it deems expedient, or may operate them by its servants or agents.

My hon. friend's Bill for a canal——

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend must pardon me, he has repeated a wrong that he committed a moment ago after I had corrected him. He has no right to say my Bill. I have no more interest in the Bill than he has. My name may be on it, but I do not know it, I have never seen nor read the Bill. It was introduced in the Senate, and if it comes here with my name on it, it is in my riding, and so far as I think it is in the public interest I will advocate it.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend is not usually so sensitive. I speak of the Bill he is promoting.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend has persistently on former occasions, I presume unwittingly, misrepresented me in that way, and I wish it put a stop to.

Mr. BOYCE. The Senate Bill to which I have referred provides for the construction of a canal which would utilize the water above and below this power at Fort Frances, a canal which, for navigation purposes, subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission, could take, so far as the rights of the Ontario government are concerned, if not all the water-power belonging to that government, as much as they saw fit for the purposes of navigation which would be a paramount power to the powers contained in the resolution before my hon. friend to which he has referred. Therein lies the very kernel of the danger of this legislation. This parliament has power to pass laws with regard to navigation and the Senate Bill to which I have referred is subtly drawn as a Bill to promote navigation, but it interferes with and to a certain extent is mentioned in the very clause now under consideration and the effect of it would be, combined with this Bill, to destroy, or at any rate very injuriously affect the interest of the parties involved.

My hon. friend says that the agreement to which I referred in opening was obtained by misrepresentation. If it was obtained by misrepresentation why was it not set aside? Why was not this misrepresentation set forth? Why was not the misrepresentation set forth in the legislation which confirmed it, and why was legislation allowed to be passed confirming it after due notice of the introduction of a private Bill? The fact of the matter is that this legislation if allowed to pass will most seriously interfere with provincial rights.

Not only are the provincial rights which my hon. friend on the 30th June, 1906, clearly conceded to Ontario with regard to this very same legislation interfered with but the right of the province of Ontario to enforce its own contracts. The contract in question, my hon. friend admitted himself, came exclusively under the jurisdiction of the province, so that upon his own admission the power of the provincial government to legislate and control the bed of an international navigable stream is absolute, and it is only as regards the navigation of that stream that this government could interfere. In conclusion, therefore, I would ask the right hon. gentleman to consider carefully the facts, and see whether there is not in this legislation an interference with the rights of the province to make its own contracts and enforce them. Under the agreement made with the Ontario government the company is liable to a penalty of $50,000 for a breach of the agreement and $100 per day as long as that breach continues, but we have this government stepping in and passing this Bill and injecting drastic conditions into that agreement.

I trust, therefore, the right hon. gentleman will give this question his earnest consideration, and if he does he cannot but come to the conclusion that this is legislation which should not be incorporated.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Judging by the arguments of the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) he is quite ready to take one position on one occasion and turn a complete somersault the next, according as the occasion demands, so that I have not much hope of convincing him. But he has said that the Act passed by the Ontario government in 1906, and which I have before me, had the effect of cancelling the clandestine agreement of 1905. Well, one would have thought that he would have desired this to come to pass because he claims that agreement of 1905 was not approved of by the town of Fort Frances, and was of a clandestine nature. That agreement of 1905 was entered into by the late Ross government, and not by a Conservative administration, and it was for the purpose of amending an obnoxious provision of that agreement that the Act of 1906 was passed by the Ontario government.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the hon. gentleman represent me as saying that that Act annulled the agreement. I did not say anything of the kind. I pointed out the difference between the two agreements and showed that under sections 1 and 2 of the Act of 1906 that difference was eliminated in the second agreement.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I took the hon. gentleman's words down, and they were that section 1 of the Act of 1906 passed by the Ontario legislature wiped out the agreement of 1905, and he went on to read the section to prove that, but he did not read far enough. The Act of 1905 expressly says that the late Ross government, in making the agreement of 1905, made no provision for the protection of the interests of the town of Fort Frances in respect of the purposes for which the said town conveyed the land to the Crown. In other words, this Act says that no provision was made by the late Ross government of Ontario in the agreement of 1905 to protect the interests of the town of Fort Frances.

Mr. CONMEE. I never did believe, and do not now, that the second agreement is worth the paper on which it is written because it was made in such a way that it could be set aside by the courts at any time.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What then was my hon. friend's object in reading sections 1 and 2 complaining that the Act wiped the agreement out. The Act of 1905 passed by this House, as my hon. friend knows, was a compromise accepted by him after a full fight in the Senate. The parties got together and that Act, he said himself on the floor of this House, was a compromise which was entirely satisfactory to him, and which fully protected the interests of the town of Fort Frances. Then I ask my hon. friend if that was the case then and if since that date the Ontario government has pased an Act which further provides that this company, upon any default whatever, shall forfeit $50,000 and $100 per day while the default continues, and if they do not carry out the provisions of the agreement the sheriff of the county may enter their works and bring distress upon their property—if that was satisfactory to him, without those provisions, how can he say he is not satisfied with the present conditions?

Take the first section of the Act of 1905, he is trying to amend this paragraph:

> Provided further that if upon application of the town of Fort Frances or the municipality of McIrving made under this Act it shall appear that the company has heretofore constructed any works, or does hereafter construct any works, that are not in accordance with the plans approved of by the Governor in Council previous to the construction of such works, the company shall, upon notice so to do by the Governor in Council or by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, change or re-arrange any such works in such a manner as will give full effect to the plans approved and to any directions, order or ruling made in respect thereto.

Boiled down that means that if the company have not constructed their works according to the plans approved of by the Governor in Council, they may be ordered to remove or amend them.

My hon. friend knows as well as I do that the two public Acts which have been on the statute-books for years provide that if any company erects works in any navigable river—and it is only because he claims that these works may interefere with navigation that he can come to this House and ask for legislation at all—and these works are not built in accordance with plans approved by the Governor in Council, or if they interfere in any way with navigation, the government may order them to be removed entirely, and, if not removed by the company, the government themselves may remove them. What more ample provision can he want than this?

Mr. CONMEE. I do not want to destroy the works, but to improve them.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. gentleman made the contention in the Private Bills Committee that the government could order the removal of these works. The greater includes the less; and all the government would need to do would be to order that the works be made in accordance with certain plans on pain of their removal. What the hon. gentleman asked in the committee was a mere quibble. Will he rise in his place now and tell me of one single power which he acquires under this section which is not under the law now in force in the province? It is not fair to change the standing of a private company that has sold its bonds upon the strength of certain

legislation; it is not fair to bother these people and endanger their vested rights by passing legislation of this kind. If the hon. gentleman can show anything in the amendment which is not in the public Acts to which I have referred, I will agree to the amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No, not carried. Now, let me point out another thing——

Mr. CONMEE. There is no use in taking up time. This was all threshed out in the Private Bills Committee. The hon. gentleman knows the argument as well as I do.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. There was no argument, and that is the reason I am asking the hon. gentleman again. Now, another thing: Suppose that, under the powers conferred by this Act, the Railway Commissioners, on application of the company, permitted the exportation of power to the United States, and suppose that under the contract with the Ontario government that government did not think there was sufficient justification to allow them to export power to the United States. Then, the answer of the Minnesota Power Company to the Ontario government in endeavouring to enforce the penalty under the private contract would be: We have power from the Railway Commissioners of the Dominion authorizing us to export power, and we don't care a tinker's fiddle for your private contract. To that extent, I say, this legislation, if it is worth anything in interfering with and cutting in on a private contract which was entered into by the Ontario government, as trustees for the town of Fort Frances.

Mr. CONMEE. Behind their back.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No, but I will take the hon. gentleman's reasoning again. Even supposing this agreement which the Ontario government have entered into with the Minnesota Power Company was entered into behind the back of the town of Fort Frances. Will the hon. gentleman point to a single omission which should have been made for the benefit of the people of Fort Frances?

Mr. BLAIN. I think that after the very lucid explanation of my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce), and that of my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), surely the committee is entitled to a statement from the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This matter concerns not merely the promotor of the Bill, but it is a very important question that should receive careful consideration on the part of the Prime Minister and his government. This is not a new question; it was up in the House before, and was the subject of careful consideration in the Private Bills Committee. And I think that after the discussion of this afternoon, we are entitled to a statement from the right hon. gentleman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection since I have been invited to do so, to give my opinion on this Bill. I must say that my knowledge of it is not so full as I would like, but I have endeavoured to follow the discussion that has taken place this afternoon, and I think I have correctly apprehended it. As I understand the argument of hon. members on the other side, the point is that this Bill interferes with the rights of the province of Ontario, this assertion being based upon the fact that this company was originally incorporated by, and derived its power from, the province of Ontario. But it is evident that the company did not think that the rights which are given it by the province were sufficient for the purposes for which the company was created, for it came to this parliament to obtain further powers. The object of the legislation passed here can best be understood from the preamble, and first section of the Act of 1905, being chapter 139 of the statutes of that year:

Whereas the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited, has by its petition represented that it was incorporated by letters patent under the great seal of the province of Ontario, dated the thirteenth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and five, under 'The Ontario Companies' Act,' being chapter 191 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1897; and whereas the said company has prayed that it be enacted as hereinafter set forth, and it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition: Therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. The company may construct, develop, acquire, own, use and operate the water-power now or hereafter existing on the Rainy river at or near the town of Fort Frances, in the district of Rainy River, in the province of Ontario, and construct, develop, operate and maintain works, canals, raceways, watercourses, dams, piers, booms, dykes, sluices, conduits and buildings, in connection with the said power, including any increase of the said power on Rainy River by storage or other works on waters tributary to Rainy lake which the company now has or may hereafter have power to construct: Provided that no work authorized by this section shall be commenced until the plans thereof have first been submitted to and approved of by the Governor in Council.

The powers granted are very simple. They amount to this—that the company is authorized to construct certain works which it deems essential to the carrying out of its purposes in the Rainy river. The only proviso for the protection of the public is that no works of the kind are to be built and put in operation until the plans have been approved by the Governor in Council. That is the full explanation of the Bill. As

I understand it, there can be no doubt whatever that this parliament had full jurisdiction to authorize such work, and to put in a provision how such work should be constructed. That seems to be entirely clear. Therefore I do not understand how the question of jurisdiction can now be raised, nor how it can be affirmed that there is in this legislation an invasion of provincial rights. It is simply to give to this company the power which they wanted to carry on its operations, and as I understand it, the company cannot now do so under the legislation of the province of Ontario, but has to come to this parliament. But this parliament at the time did put in a proviso, that these powers sought to be obtained from the parliament of Canada could not be exercised, the works could not be put in operation, until the plans had been approved by the Governor in Council. Now what is the object of this Bill? It is simply to supplement the exercise of the power granted by parliament then, so far as regards the approval of the plans. Let me read the first section of the Bill:

Section 1 of chapter 139 of the statutes of 1905 is amended by adding thereto the following:—'Provided further that if upon application of the town of Fort Frances or the municipality of McIrving made under this Act it shall appear that the company has heretofore constructed any works, or does hereafter construct any works, that are not in accordance with the plans approved by the Governor in Council previous to the construction of such works, the company shall, upon notice so to do by the Governor in Council or by the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada, change or rearrange any such works in such manner as will give full effect to the plans approved and to any directions, order or ruling made in respect thereto.

This is a natural sequence of the power which was given to the company by the statute of 1905. That statute provides that the works which the company sought power to erect shall first receive the sanction and approval of the Department of Public Works; and this Bill now only provides that if any of such works having been first authorized by the Department of Public Works, are not constructed by the company, or have not been constructed in conformity with the order of the Department of Public Works, then in such case the Governor in Council, or the Railway Board, shall have power to interfere and require them to be constructed in conformity to the order of the Department of Public Works. I think I have properly analysed the whole legislation sought for. I do not see how it can be contended by my hon. friends opposite that there is here any invasion of the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario. I ask, is not this proper legislation? Is it not solely to confirm what we have already sought to convey to this company? No one objects that these works should be erected only after the plans have been approved by the Department of Public Works. That is quite proper, that is the statute of 1905. Now what does the Bill of 1911 provide? It provides that if any works ordered by the Department of Public Works, or approved by it, have not been executed, or are not executed hereafter in conformity with that order, then the Railway Board, or the Governor in Council may be called upon to compel the company to conform to such order. Again I repeat that this legislation, if I understand it correctly, is quite in order, and is also very proper legislation. If I had any doubt on this matter, it would be removed by the reflection that this matter has been threshed out by the Committee on Private Bills, and found to be satisfactory, found not to be an invasion of anybody's rights.

Mr. BOYCE. I have pointed out that this is private legislation, and this parliament has put it under the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario as regards the proper distribution of power. In that respect this company has entered into a contract with the province of Ontario, with which contract this Bill is unquestionably an interference. Would my right hon. friend express himself on that point?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have looked at the Bill, and at the statute before it. The contract which my hon. friend says exists betwen the company and the province of Ontario is something of which I know nothing at the present time. But I presume this contract was before the committee which passed upon it, and which came to the conclusion that this Bill does not interfere with the jurisdiction of Ontario.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Most of the Prime Minister's remarks are directed to the question as to whether this government has the right to remove or order the amendment of certain works which are not made in accordance with the plans. But the Prime Minister has entirely overlooked the point that this company is governed by an Act of the Dominion of Canada, chapter 115, section 4, which section says:

No bridge, boom or dam shall be constructed so as to interfere with navigation, unless said work has been approved by the Governor in Council, nor unless said bridge, boom or dam is built and maintained in accordance with the plans approved by the Governor in Council.

Then there is another section which says that if they are not so constructed they may be removed or destroyed. There is an amendment to be found somewhere which says that even when they are not built in accordance with the plans, and the plans are approved by the Governor in Council,

still they may be entirely removed. So that all the provisions of this section are fully covered by a public Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know. There seems to be a difference, and perhaps it is not an unwise difference. The section of the Bill I have just read. I think the general law stated a moment ago by my hon. friend provides that if the works which have been approved by the Department of Public Works are not in accordance with the order of that department, such works may be destroyed or removed. This Bill provides that instead of taking this extreme measure the company may be called upon to conform to the order. It would be perhaps an extreme remedy to destroy the works of the company; it may be that the works are beneficial, and that the changes which have been made are of a limited nature, and under such circumstances it may be wiser that the attention of the company should be called to this point, and that they should be made to conform absolutely to the order. There may be some difference, but I do not think the difference is an unwise one.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I have already pointed out that the power to order the total removal of the obstruction includes the power to ask the company to amend. But suppose you ask them to amend, and they do not amend, and they do not follow the directions contained in this Bill, what then are you going to do? You must order them to remove. You cannot take a man by the throat and say: You have to amend your works; but you can say to him, if you do not amend, we will remove the obstruction. My right hon. friend will see that the public provision fully covers the case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not dispute the point of my hon. friend. It is possible that the provision may not be necessary, but the committee came to the conclusion that it might be passed; and if it is merely an extra precaution, nobody can suffer from it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think we have come down to the conclusion that so far as this section is concerned, it is wholly unnecessary, and for that reason I would ask what object the hon. member for Rainy River has in view in introducing legislation that has no effect. When the matter first came to my attention, the hon. member contended that the word 'power' did not include hydraulic power, and if that was so I was willing to vote for the Bill; but when the company admitted in the committee, and put into an agreement the statement, that the word 'power' did include hydraulic power, that was the end of all argument on that point, and I could see no reason for passing this Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. I gave my hon. friend good reasons for this particular amendment. The water-power canal at the town of Sault Ste. Marie was built exactly as this one was built, on a provincial charter. But the company learned that they were trespassing, and they came here to get their plans approved, but they could not get them approved, because the works were already constructed, and they had to get an Act of parliament to relieve the situation. My hon. friend saw the plans, and he saw that the power-house was placed across the steamboat channel on the Canadian side, so that the power could not be used hydraulically on the Canadian side.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to; but when he introduced the Bill, he said that it was only to interpret and make clear the provisions of the Act of 1905, and now it appears that he wants to get further powers. My hon. friend must take some consistent position. I want to know why he is doing this. I have never seen or spoken to anybody connected with the Minnesota Power Company. I am acting only in the interests of the town of Fort Frances and the province of Ontario. The company has signed an agreement with the Ontario government stating that the word 'power' includes hydraulic power, and we have a telegram from the Ontario government to that effect, so that there is no dobut about it.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not think my right hon. friend the Prime Minister grasps fully the question involved. I know what his views are on the question of provincial rights. I might refer to what he laid down last session on a Bill introduced by the hon. member for Rainy River. I am not referring to the right of the province to deal with this matter; but I want to point out that this very same company has made a contract with the government of Ontario covering the application and carrying out its agreement with regard to the delivery of power, and there are penalties imposed by that contract to compel this company to comply with its provisions. Why should the company, after submitting to the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario, come and ask this parliament to override a solemn contract between themselves and the province of Ontario? I cannot conceive for one moment that my right hon. friend would give his assent to such legislation. It is not simply an interference with provincial rights: it is more than that: it is direct interference with the right of contract within the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario. Before the contract was made was the time for the company to come to this parliament.

Mr. CONMEE. What contract is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. BOYCE. They chose to go from this government to the government of the province of Ontario, and to recite in that legislature the difficulties under which they laboured with regard to jurisdiction, and subsequently to enter into a solemn agreement with the province of Ontario, which by the legislature of Ontario, at its last session, has been approved and confirmed. My right hon. friend disposes of the whole matter by saying that that legislation must have been before the Private Bills Committee. That legislation was confirmed at the session of the legislature of Ontario which has just closed, and it is not yet printed in any statute-book. But it has received the Royal assent. Therefore the contractual rights of the province of Ontario are being disturbed by this parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I can answer to the satisfaction of my hon. friend. The object of this Bill is simply to provide that the works which shall be erected by this company shall not be erected until they have been approved by the Department of Public Works. This is not a new provision; it is in conformity with our general legislation, for the protection of the public at large, that no navigable stream shall be interfered with until the plans have received the sanction of the Minister of Public Works. This Bill is simply a continuation of the powers conferred on the company by the statute of 1905. The only argument made against it by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) is that this legislation is absolutely unnecessary because there is already provision in the law that if the works which have been approved by the Minister of Public Works are not strictly carried on according to the regulations of the department, they can be removed or destroyed. Whether the legislation is necessary or not, the first condition is that the work shall conform to certain rules and regulations laid down by the Minister of Public Works in the public interest. My hon. friend says that if you compel the company to execute its works according to the rules of the Department of Public Works you may possibly subject it to the penalty of $50,000, which is stipulated in the agreement with the government of Ontario. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that the first condition of all is not that the regulations laid down by the Minister of Public Works must be observed? Certainly the rules of the Department of Public Works must be observed no matter what the consequence is; even though the penalty be $50,000 for infringement. Surely the hon. gentleman does not pretend that the rule of the Minister of Public Works is not to be observed because the company might render itself liable to a penalty. In this case the public interest must prevail, and the public interest is protected by the regulations of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BOYCE. I agree with the right hon. gentleman that as regards interference with navigation the works have got to be under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works, and if the works are not approved of by the minister they can be altered or destroyed in a summary manner. My point is that apart from the navigation question altogether, the province of Ontario has certain rights, riparian or otherwise, with regard to the use and flow of water. Having contracted with reference to these rights, obtained a locus standi as a government, and brought it under the jurisdiction of the provincial commission. I say this government should hesitate before it passes legislation which interferes with the provisions of a private contract between the company and the Ontario government, and which has nothing to do with the jurisdiction of this parliament at all.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the Prime Minister read the contract between the Ontario government and the company?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It seems to me that a great many other hon. gentlemen are in the same position, and do not understand what the effect of their vote will be.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question of the relevancy of this contract to the present legislation must have been considered by the Private Bills Committee, and without having read the contract I submit that if its stipulations come in conflict with the public interest which is protected by this legislation, then the provisions of the contract cannot prevail against the public interest. We must first provide that the work shall be done according to the regulations laid down by the Minister of Public Works, and if unfortunately the contract interferes with that, I am sorry for the contractor, but the public interest must prevail.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am not complaining so much that this clause does not accomplish anything as that it cuts in on the private contract.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). In what respect?

Section agreed to.

On section 2,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let us see about this clause. It seems to me there is something which requires explanation here. I am not familiar with the legislation, but

I am somewhat familiar with the question, and I would like to call attention to this clause:

The company shall as herein provided supply not less than one-half the total power capable of development by the said water.

That is a very wide margin. I could understand if it said all the power actually developed, but to say 'capable of being developed' is introducing a serious objection to the Bill because we do not know where that would land us.

Mr. CONMEE. That provision is contained in both the agreements referred to, and it is necessary for the reason that with the exception of a point at the Long Sault rapids where a limited amount of power can be developed, this point is the only place on the Rainy river where water-power can be developed on the water shed of the river. It would be inconsistent with the public interest or with the private interest of the citizens of Fort Frances to give this or any other company control of that water-power without compelling them to develop the total power capable of being developed. That does not impose any hardship on the company. They were obliged to do that under the early contracts, whether or not these contracts have force or effect now. To assist them in doing that the contract provides that they can make storage at Cedar Falls and at another point. They have that right to-day, and nobody has disputed it so far as I know. The main expenditure is for their water-power at Fort Frances, and this does not impose any hardship on them. They have the monopoly of the whole water shed of the Rainy river, and it would be contrary to public policy to give it to them unless they did ultimately develop it to the fullest extent. So far as I know the company has no objection to that provision. Nobody is hurrying them to do more than they have done. What Fort Frances is fighting for and asking for is what they have a right to in their agreement, and what are the natural rights of Fort Frances are what the Act of this parliament of 1905 gave them, the right to get prices and conditions for the use of power fixed in advance so that they can secure industries.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). To what agreement have you reference?

Mr. CONMEE. The agreement of 1904 and the agreement of 1905. I pay no attention to the agreement that has been made within the last few days, made for the very purpose of forestalling this legislation and assisting this company——

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. My hon. friend said that this agreement was made to forestall this legislation.

Mr. CONMEE. In my opinion, yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does he know it was made in June, 1910?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, I know all about it; more than you do.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. For the purpose of forestalling this Act now?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How did they know you were going to bring in this Act?

Mr. CONMEE. They were told by the mayor of Fort Frances that if they did not get relief they would ask it here. What is your contract? You made a contract, confirmed it by legislation and what does it amount to? To nothing more than we have had for the last two or three years. Section 4 of the existing law of this parliament provides that there may be an application for power in use or to be supplied for use these words mean power for any purpose, and yet we could never get prices under that, we were met at the Railway Board by the contention that as a municipality we could not apply for power except for municipal purposes. A ratepayer was picked out to issue an injunction and Fort Frances very naturally and prudently withdrew from being entangled in such a suit.

That section says that they shall provide power concurrently on each side of the line. That was understood by everybody, and I am sure by this parliament to mean one-half the power of the stream, to mean that if they provided 3,000 or 4,000, or 10,000 horse-power on the American side they should provide an equal amount on the Canadian side. Does my hon. friend dispute that?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No.

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Backus and Mr. Osler contended before the committee that they never disputed that point. What they did contend and sought to get ratified by this government, by the minister in charge of the Export Act, was that they had the right to one-half the Canadian power without any license for export. They did not persuade the minister to agree. Mr. Osler denied that they ever contended for that interpretation; what they did say was that the words concurrent has no reference to American power, it has reference to the Canadian power only, that you cannot legislate with regard to American power. But this development is international, the dam goes from side to side of the stream, there is no Canadian part and no American part; it is one development and they claimed they were entitled to take one-half of the Canadian portion over to the American side, leaving us with one-quarter of the total power developed. I hold here the proceedings before the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. MABEE.—Is all the plant, the power-house, the generators, the machinery, and so on, on the Canadian side of the International boundary?

Mr. GLYN OSLER.—All of that in connection with the seven thousand horse-power ready for use, that is all applicable for use in Ontario, under the word 'use' in section 5. I did not enter into the question of the construction of that Act in my opening remarks. I took the view that you expressed, Mr. Chairman, that we are entitled to export, so far as that Act is concerned, one-half of the power without an order. These questions were raised before the Minister of Inland Revenue and it was probably for that reason that instead of dealing with the matter in the first instance and giving us at least one-half the power, the Inland Revenue Department required us to come to your board in the first place. As we required in any event more than half the power it was necessary for us to come to your board so that it did not seem to me there was any use in occupying the time of your board in discussing the question of our rights; not under the present application at all events. I would refer you to this agreement of the 20th of November, 1906.

That is the argument I assume that they made before the Minister of Inland Revenue. Now they did contend, there is the evidence of it, that Canada was only entitled to one-quarter of the total power of the stream. I say that this legislation is necessary to remove any doubts upon that point. Surely there is no man in this House who would submit that such a trick as that can be played on Canadian interests? Parliament never intended it, it is contrary to natural rights and I am surprised that any gentleman in this House would advocate the cause of this company having such evidence as that before him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would call attention to the wording of the section. Actual development seems to be a very vague term which would lead to confusion in the administration of the Act.

The water-power on the Rainy river was developed by this American company. They supplied the capital, but in order to develop the power they had to obtain the consent of the Canadian side of the river. They obtained it from the Ontario legislature, and the Act of that legislature was afterwards confirmed by legislation in this parliament. That is to say that company was authorized to build works across the Rainy river at Fort Frances for the purpose of developing electrical energy. What the town of Fort Frances claimed from the first was that one-half of all the energy which might be developed should be reserved for Canadian enterprises. It was alleged last spring, when the company applied for a license, that it had developed 7,000 horse-power, and it made application to the government to be allowed to export the total amount. The Canadian government would not grant that application and would not allow the company to export to the American side more than one-half of the 7,000 horse-power which had been developed. The company represented that they had no application on the Canadian side for the use of any of that power, and consequently should be allowed to export the whole of it. Our answer was that that made no difference, that they would be allowed to use on the American side only one-half of the power they had developed, and that the other half should remain idle unless they themselves employed it on the Canadian side. And to this day they have the license to export only 3,500 horse-power. We allow them to export one-half of the power they have actually developed.

Mr. CONMEE. We can amend it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I think it should be amended in this way by providing that the company shall supply the Canadian side with not less than one-half of the total power actually developed.

Mr. CONMEE. I would not like those words, for the reason that they do not go far enough. I would suggest that the words 'are capable of developing' be struck out, and these words be inserted 'the total power.'

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). In the committee where this matter was fully discussed, it was suggested by the representative of the company that its obligation to the Canadian side should be limited by the demand for power, and that some words should be inserted providing 'if there be a demand,' or something to that effect. But the people of Fort Frances suspect that the company does not desire to furnish them with one-half the power developed; and an instance is given of an application having been made for power by a gentleman of his having been told that the company had none to dispose of. I think the opinion there is that if the company be not required to supply one-half the power to the Canadian side, they might avoid doing so because they control the whole situation. As there were other applicants for this privilege, at the time it was granted this company, I think the company should be held strictly to its agreement and conditions. If it is not required to develop all the available power, that will be detrimental to the development of industries on the Canadian side because no other company can come in. This company has the monopoly, and for that reason should be compelled to develop all the power available.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I understand the question, a certain amount of power has been developed now, some 7,000 horse-power. The company made application to be allowed to export the whole

amount to the town of International Falls on the American side. We would not consent to that, and they are only exporting one-half. In this we confirmed the original intention of the town of Fort Frances that one-half the energy should be reserved for its industries. The company replied it has no demand for this energy at Fort Frances. We said you can develop a demand yourselves by building mills on the Canadian side, and my information is that the company is actually putting up a pulp mill on our side which will consume one-half of the energy now idle.

Mr. TURRIFF. If you strip this question of its legal technicalities, you find that this company, organized by Mr. Backus, undertook that one-half of the total energy which might be developed on the river should be used in Canada. Through the intervention, however, of the Ontario government and this government, that company has been able so far to drive a coach and team through all the laws governing it, and with this result, that Mr. Backus has paid no attention whatever to them and is not endeavouring in any shape or form to build up the town on the Canadian side of the line. He is using 16,000 horse-power on the American side and then gets authority to export one-half of what has been developed on the Canadian side. He says now that he has no demand for any power on the Canadian side. But he never will have any demand so long as the government allows him to export that power. His company can balk any demand that comes from this side. It can put things in such a shape that no other company can come in and secure the power at a price which will enable it to carry on a manufacturing business on this side of the line. What I claim is that this government should put an end to that export of power from Fort Frances to the town of International Falls. By allowing this export, we are building up American institutions at the sacrifice of our own. Just so soon as we do prohibit the export, this company will be able to find a demand on the Canadian side or will build mills on this side, the right hon. the Prime Minister has suggested. But so long as we allow the company to export this power, they will use it on the American side of the line. That was not the intention in giving it this charter. If that intention had been expressed, the company would never have got any charter from us. We have allowed the company to drift away from the original intention, but it ought to be brought back, and this legislation is for the purpose of putting into the hands of our Canadian authorities, the right to decide whether this electrical energy shall be exported or not. The remarks of my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) are very much to the point. The company should be made to develop all the power available, because nobody else can. The power developed there to-day can be more than trebled by a proper system of storage; but if we do not compel the company to develop it, it will not and will prevent anybody else from doing it.

This parliament, which alone has the power, ought to give control into the hands of our Railway Commission so that this company may be dealt with by a strong hand and not be allowed to go on year after year defying the whole of the Dominion, driving right through Acts of parliament, and taking that power which should be used to build up Canadian industries alone and using it to build up towns on the other side of the line.

Mr. SIFTON. I am not able to follow the discussion as well as I would like to, but, having had something to do with this particular matter, it occurs to me that I ought to say a word or two upon the subject while it is before the committee. Some time last spring, I think, it was, the town of Fort Frances invoked the assistance of the Commission of Conservation in regard to this matter. I sent a letter to the Minister of Inland Revenue to ascertain when the subject of a license was to be considered. It appeared that the matter had not been brought before the government in such a way as to enable the government to fully understand all the facts of the case and I asked the Minister of Inland Revenue to withhold his recommendation for a license under the Act providing for the licensing of the export of electrical power until I should have an opportunity of looking into it. He did so. I read all the papers in connection with the case and, at the request of the town of Fort Frances, made a thorough and careful investigation of the whole case, examining every document and Act of parliament from the beginning to the end. The result was that I came to the conclusion that the company had got ahead of everybody it had had anything to do with in connection with the matter—it had got round the Ontario government, it had got round the federal government, it had got round the Railway Commission; it had got round everybody. And, apparently, this was because nobody was paying particular attention to it and watching its proceedings. It was not especially a case of finding fault with those who had been led into doing what has been done; it was a case in which nobody was specially charged with looking after the interests of the town of Fort Frances, and watching the different steps taken. You can understand how a corporation with a large capital and first class counsel always attending to its business could easily get round a municipal corporation with people

looking after their interests only in a spasmodic way and giving to it much less attention than it would require in order to be thoroughly attended to. The result was that it appeared that the company had got everything it wanted here except this license from the federal government under the Act respecting the export of electrical power. They had got authority from the Ontario government, they had got authority from the Board of Railway Commissioners, and they finally, at the last minute, found they had to get from the federal government this additional license under the Act to which I have referred, and that is where the occasion arose for a fresh discussion of the whole subject. We made our representations to the government on behalf of the town of Fort Frances strongly opposing the issue of any license. Representatives of the company came down here and went to the government and urged that the license should be issued. Apparently, the government told them that representations had been made by our commission and they had better see us. They asked a hearing, and the executive committee of the commission heard counsel for the company, and heard my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) on behalf of the town of Fort Frances. The matter was discussed for a whole afternoon, and I think that when we got through we understood the case pretty well. My conclusion was that no change should be made in the attitude of the commission, as to the issue of this license; and, after going into the whole case from start to finish my conclusion is that the town of Fort Frances needs the support of this parliament. I understand that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) takes the position that the Act should be passed for the protection of the town and of the public interests, and I am very much gratified that he does. I am satisfied that my hon. friends on the other side, if they look into the matter fully, will see that this is a case in which the town of Fort Frances deserves and requires the protection of parliament.

Mr. BARKER. I think we are of one mind in desiring to protect Fort Frances if it needs it. But the only point that has been brought out with perfect clearness is that raised by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Apparently, according to the argument, this company or Mr. Backus, whichever it is, has been sharp enough to get the better of the people of the town. But it seems to me that this Bill, as it has been passed in the Committee of Private Bills, goes to the other extreme, and deals with the matter in a way in which parliament ought not to deal with it. The Prime Minister has pointed out that where the town was to have fifty per cent of the developed power, the Bill proposes to give them fifty per cent of the total power capacity, an entirely different thing. It might mean that, for a whole season, the town would get all the power developed, because the amount actually delivered through accident or some other cause, may not exceed fifty per cent of the actual capacity. That I understood to be the objection raised by the Prime Minister, and I think it is perfectly good. The only trouble is that the Bill has been so drawn as to get back at the company by doing something about as outrageous as that which the company is said to have done to the town.

Mr. CONMEE. I assure the hon. member (Mr. Barker) that the Bill as it stands on the statute-book, chapter 139, does not contain any provision that could be construed to give the town any such advantage as he speaks of. The town does not seek to get any such advantage. I rise to speak because of the remarks of the Prime Minister, and I crave the privilege of reading to the House the report of what occurred in the Private Bills Committee. I have here the stenographer's notes extended of the remarks made by the different speakers in the committee on Thursday last. Mr. Backus was speaking, and he was claiming that Fort Frances had gained since he started his works, and I asked: 'Do you think you had anything to do with that?' and his answer was: 'Pretty nearly entirely.' He then went on to speak of the time when he was making application for authority to export power, and he proceeded:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier said. 'What can you do for the town of Fort Frances? You are under no obligation to do it——'

I must say, I do not think the Prime Minister ever said that, because Mr. Backus had admitted before Sir Wilfrid Laurier that he had agreed to build a flour mill, and he admitted, in answer to Mr. Fielding, who pointed out that the time was about up, and he ought to be at it if he was going to fulfill his contract, that perhaps he was a little behind and was going to get at it right off. However, he has done nothing yet. He admitted that he did not have the power concurrently on either side of the boundary as provided by chapter 139, but had 15,000 horse-power on the American side, and but only 7,000 on our side. Fort Frances has always contended that the Canadian interests should have the full half of the power, that is half the power the full flow of the stream. What the town contends is that any interpretation which would give the company the right to the half of the Canadian portion would be monstrous.

This gentleman goes on to say, speaking of what Sir Wilfrid had said to him:

But can't you do something for the town of Fort Frances? I said, 'Sir Wilfrid, what would you like to have us do that we have not done? We have not completed our first development on the Minnesota side yet. We have not started a wheel running yet. Perhaps we can do something for them during this next year.' He said, 'By another year I would like if you could construct a mill of at least fifty tons per day.' I said, 'Yes.' Sir Wilfrid said, 'I won't ask you to make a contract. I will take your word for it.' He afterwards visited Fort Frances and asked if I was going to keep my promise. In the last week of December we finished construction on the Minnesota side, and we took the same construction crew to the Canadian side. We have put in concrete floors. We have bought the draft tubes and they have been shipped. We have purchased fifteen grinders to be installed on that side, and that will grind 125 tons of pulp a day. All that is being built now. If there is any doubt it—I think it is necessary for me to prove nearly everything by affidavits, and I have one here which I will read:

It is short, and I will read it:

This is dated March 4.

We, the undersigned, Warren Curtis, junior, manager of maintenance and construction; and William T. Tamm, superintendent of construction, each in the employ and in charge of the works of the Minnesota and Ontario Power Company, located at International Falls, Minnesota, and of the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited, located at Fort Frances, Ont., do hereby solemnly swear in relation to the proposed mill on the Canadian side that the following is true to their best knowledge and belief:—First, that the building for the pulp-mill and the wood preparing room of same is now under roof; second, that during the last week of December, 1910, we started on the work of building said pulp-mill and other improvements on the Canadian side; third, that said work has been continuous and the number of men employed is increasing; fourth, that the work already done consists of putting in concrete floors for grinders, and preparing flumes to receive water-wheels, and it is proposed to push this work as rapidly as possible to complete the pulp-mill. Contracts for considerable machinery have been placed, and the water-wheels and draft tubes are already partially in transit. With the opening of the spring season, the work outside can be pushed with very much greater rapidity. Witness our hands and seals this fourth day of March, 1911, at International Falls, Minnesota. Signed, Warren Curtis, junior; W. H. Tamm.

Now I want to leave it to hon. gentlemen if they did not understand by Mr. Backus' statement, and by these affidavits, that a new pulp mill and a new building was started in December, that the roof is on it, that the concrete floors are being put in to-day, that actually a pulp mill is under construction on the Canadian side at Fort Frances? That is what all this conveys, and there is no reality in it. It is misrepresentation. It is said that the truth half told is sometimes very deceptive. Now what are they doing at Fort Frances? There are a few words in this affidavit that I think it is no credit to him to have induced men in his employ to use, an one sentence is, 'the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company located at Fort Frances.' There is no such company at Fort Frances, never had an office there, never did any business on the Canadian side. It was the Minnesota and Ontario Power Company that built the dam, a company incorporated in the State of Maine, which has no offices in Canada, is not registered in Canada, never paid out a dollar for labour or anything else on the Canadian side of Fort Frances. Then I object to the word 'pulp mill.' Now in the Private Bills Committee on Friday last, when the plans were on the wall, and when Backus was asked to point out the pulp-mill and put his hand on the power-house, and some member of the committee said, where is the power-house. Is this it? So he had to admit before that committee that he had no new building, he had no pulp-mill. That is not a pulp-mill. Besides under his contract I was talking about he should have done this work long ago. Under the Act of 1905 he should have had at least 15,000 horse-power developed in this power-house; he should have had a roof on the power-house and the hydraulic wheels installed there more than a year ago, and he should have the concrete floors in as well. He has not done that yet. That is all he is doing now, nothing more. Then let me point out that a pulp-mill is a different institution from that altogether. You have to have the pulp, after it is ground, washed and screened. The pulp-wood grinders are large grinding stones and when the pulp is ground it contains a certain amount of sediment from the stone that has to be washed off the pulp. It has to be run through screens to take out the slivers, and through rollers, a large amount of machinery. There is none of this in the power-house, and there is no room for it. Now he is proposing to perpetrate upon the community of Fort Frances a still greater wrong than he has yet perpetrated. He proposes to grind wood into a solution in that power-house, and then pump it across to his American mills to make it into pulp and into paper. If he did not intend to do that, he would be busy getting up his pulp-mill and his paper mill. Now he says he is building because he made a promise to Sir Wilfrid. I say he is not building. What he is doing he was bound to do anyway. He is attempting to make a further use of his power-house. He will say to the town of Fort Frances, I am not going to build you a flour-mill nor an oatmeal mill, I am build-

ing you a pulp-mill. We are using the power in Ontario, what more do you want? Now what does that amount to? That is not a use of power in Ontario, that is a diversion of power. He has got his power-house in the centre of the stream, 400 or 500 feet from the shore. The steamboat channel into the canal is between his power-house and the shore. Why was that done? It is apparent now. It was so that no Canadian concern can get hydraulic power, and without hydraulic power they cannot make ground-wood pulp. How are they going to take it across to the Canadian side? Mr. Backus said they could take it by a shaft either under the canal or overhead; but any one who knows anything about mechanics or the transmission of power knows that that is pure and simple humbug.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have attended the Private Bills Committee as faithfully as I could, but there is one point in connection with this legislation on which my mind is not yet clear. I refer to that part which the promoter says seeks to make more definite the wording of the previous Act with regard to the transference of power and electric energy from the Canadian side. I would like to have that point cleared up before I cast my vote in this committee. If it be true that in the former legislation certain words were used which, as the hon. member for Rainy River and Thunder Bay (Mr. Conmee), says, were not intended to be used, and did not express the intention of the legislation, are we right in rectifying that legislation? It appears that there was a doubt as to what was meant by those words. Are we to establish as a precedent in this House that when contentious parties have rights or claims under certain legislation, we are to interpret that legislation for them? I do not know where we shall stop if, every time there is a lawsuit in sight and it is said there is a rich man on one side and a poor man on the other side, and the poor man thinks he is down-trodden, the parliament of Canada must interpret his own statute. Are not the courts of the country the proper places for people who differ in the interpretation of statutes to go?

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 2,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would suggest as an amendement that in lines 21 and 22 the words: 'Capable of development by the flow of the said waters,' be struck out, and there be inserted in lieu thereof: 'Actually and from time to time developed.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLES. At six o'clock I was endeavouring to state a difficulty which presented itself to my mind. What I endeavoured to place before the committee and particularly before the promoter of the Bill was the principle of the legislation which is involved in this Bill. One of the reasons why the hon. gentleman asks that this legislation should be accepted is that in the year 1905 this parliament passed an Act which in its words did not enact that which this House intended to enact. If I understand him aright, he desires that we shall believe that the legislation referring to the concurrent power upon the Canadian and American sides was framed in words which failed to give expression to the intention of parliament, and consequently during the years since then there has been more or less dispute as to what the legislation really meant. So far as that is concerned, I am of opinion at present that such a contention should more properly be placed before the courts for their interpretation. Are we to establish a precedent here, that every time there is a contention as to what may be the proper interpretation of an Act of parliament we shall be asked to remove any obscurity in it by further legislation? Might I illustrate this by referring to a grave and important question which has been before western Canada for many years. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter the legislation was framed in words by which it was intended that within twenty years after the company became owners of the land the exemption from taxation should commence to run. Later there came into the arena the question when that twenty years would commence to date from. I think everybody admitted that the intention of parliament when the Canadian Pacific Railway Act was passed was that the exemption from taxation should commence to run as soon as the company became the owners of the land. The company became the owners of the lands and had sold a great deal of them, but just because the patent had not been issued they contended, and eventually succeeded in their contention, before the Privy Council that the twenty years exemption from taxation did not commence to run until the patent was issued. In a great question like that why would it not be within the rightful duty of this parliament to pass legislation at a later date rectifying and interpreting and correcting that which had by mistake in legislation been enacted. I cannot see any difference between that case and this; if difference there be I should like to have it pointed out. In this very year of 1905 when this Act was passed

there were Acts passed incorporating railway companies, steamship companies, and amongst others the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. If, every time a man has a grievance against the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and sets up a contention that such and such words should mean something else from what the company contended, and were enacted to mean something else, and he comes here and asks us to interpret our own legislation for him, are we going to do it? Would it be in accord with our policy? Would we not more regularly say to him as we said to Alberta and Saskatchewan in regard to the Canadian Pacific railway taxation exemption: Go to the courts, that is what they are for, they are to interpret legislation, if there be any contention, it is the judges of the land who are to decide what was meant. Every one who is any way familiar with the law knows thta there are text books after text books written upon the interpretation of statutes and why are we going to all of a sudden to take one particular private Act about which there has been some contention and say: We will interpret it, and by a more or less party vote and after a more or less inflammatory agitation, and more or less abuse of a stranger who came into this committee, decide that which the courts would ordinarily decide. I have been for years a member of the Private Bills Committee, and I do not think I ever saw a private Bill discussed with such animus as this. Mr. Backus came here, as far as we know he was a respectable citizen, and words were addressed to him which I think every one must regret. I am referring to that at this moment because my hon. friend from Thunder Bay (Mr. Conmee) stated that Mr. Backus forced certain deponents to make certain affidavits that were false. I do not know why the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) should use such language.

Mr. CONMEE. I rise to a point of order. I did not say they were forced. I said I did not think it was anything to his credit, or words of that kind, in relation to men in his employ.

Mr. KNOWLES. The word 'forced' I took down, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) did not use it I must have misunderstood him although he spoke at some length and very clearly, and it is my fault if I did not hear him because his voice was not low. I accept his assertion. I do say there has been animus in this matter, and I will illustrate that by referring to the assertion made in the Private Bills Committee that some gentleman had been discharged from Mr. Backus' employ because he was a Canadian. Well, one of the gentlemen who represented Fort Frances told me that that statement was absolutely untrue, and that such was not the reason why the gentleman in question left Mr. Backus' employment. I refer to this unnecessary and unfair treatment of their opponents as not indicative of the strength of the Fort Frances case. I am at a loss to understand why we should be called upon in this particular instance to pass an Act of this kind.

On section 3,

Mr. BOYCE. I confess that I do not understand the meaning of the words in this clause. What is meant by this company affording all practical facilities?

Mr. CONMEE. The object of this is quite apparent to one who understands the local conditions. The power-house is placed in the middle of the stream some 400 feet from the Canadian shore. Between the power-house and the shore is the steamship channel the entrance into the Canadian canal, the company is required to give to Canadian users of power, hydraulic power and electric power. It is not imposing any new condition on them to say that they shall give it in such a way that it can be used. For instance, if they said to the Canadian consumer: There is the power in the Canadian power-house, help yourself—how could he get it? This company must provide means and ways of delivering that power to the Canadian consumer, otherwise no hydraulic power could be used in Canada. I do not know if the language of this section goes far enough to compel that, but at all events it shows that there is to be practical and feasible means of using the power. I do not think anybody could object to that.

Mr. KNOWLES. Why does the hon. member not insert the words: 'prospective users of power'? As it reads, with simply the word 'users,' it might in future be taken to refer only to perhaps four or five men who were actual users of power, and thus others wishing to use power would be prevented from obtaining it.

Mr. CONMEE. I understand it includes that, but I would be glad to have the word 'prospective' inserted.

On the preamble,

Mr. BOYCE. Before the preamble carries, I desire to point out the very grave infraction and danger which is involved in this Bill. The Prime Minister has put on this Bill his seal of approval, he has a majority behind him sufficient to carry it, and I do not desire that the time of the committee shall be wasted in further consideration of the principles involved. There are two very grave questions involved, and on him and his goverment must rest responsibility for the infraction and invasion of those principles which this Bill perpetu-

ates. This is not the only instance in which that has been done. I have pointed out that the very provisions of this Bill, the very remedies sought by it, are included in the jurisdiction of the Ontario government with respect to this company and are included and the remedy provided by the agreement of the company which has been referred to. Now that there is jurisdiction in the Ontario government is absolutely clear. There is no question that they have the riparian rights in an international or interprovincial boundary stream; saving as to the question of navigation they have a right to the bed of the stream, and the right to the bed of the stream gives them jurisdiction in all matters which are the subject of this Bill. Having assumed that jurisdiction and exercised the control of the works and operation of this company, having entered into contractual relations with them as regards the matters which are the subject of this legislation, we are going far towards invading provincial rights and interfering with contractual relations between this company and the provincial government, and we are also rendering more confusing the working out of the conflicting remedies which the dual legislation will cause than if the legislation had been left entirely within the control of the province of Ontario, where it properly belongs.

The province of Ontario has inaugurated a power policy. I do not say that this government has not jurisdiction over navigable streams, but it has a jurisdiction which is limited by the decision of the Privy Council in the fisheries case with which the right hon. gentleman is acquainted. It has jurisdiction over the regulation of navigation, but this is not a question of navigation. Therefore, the province of Ontario was, in the first place, well within its rights in propounding this power policy; secondly, it was well within its jurisdiction in bringing the company under that policy; and thirdly, in making a contract with that company, and in penalizing the company for default in carrying out the contract. But the legislation now proposed is an interference with that contract. It is importing new terms and conditions into it, and I submit that my right hon. friend should hesitate before taking the responsibility for this legislation. I do not expect him to agree with me; I do not consider myself fortunate enough to get his sympathy to that extent. But I submit that this is a question of conflict of jurisdiction with regard to power development such as comes more and more frequently every session before this House, and I would respectfully suggest that efforts be made as early as possible to arrange that disputes of this kind between this parliament and the provincial legislatures should be referred to the courts for decision or that some policy should be definitely agreed upon which will render it unnecessary to take up time in the discussion of such questions in this House.

Mr. BOYCE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I might observe that my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) is but a recent conquest to the doctrine of provincial rights for in days gone by, up to the advent of the Whitney administration, I do not think either he or the party to which he belongs, were favourable to that doctrine. As I am a believer myself in it and have been all my life, I may be allowed to say that I think I understand it at least as well as does my hon. friend. I do not see in what way this Bill will interfere at all with provincial rights. The power which were given by the Act of 1905 to this company were powers which could not have been given to it by the province of Ontario. True the bed of navigable streams belongs to the provinces, but the regulation of their water comes properly within the jurisdiction of this parliament. Any obstacle to the navigation of a navigable stream comes under our jurisdiction; and as this is a stream of that nature, I think that my learned friend's opposition to the Bill on the ground of a lack of jurisdiction cannot be maintained.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PETIT ROCHER SPUR.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. What was the cost of the spur built from the Intercolomial railway to the public wharf at Petit Rocher, N.B., in the year 1908?
2. What revenue has been received yearly for traffic over this spur since its construction?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Cost of spur built from Intercolonial railway to public wharf at Petit Rocher in 1908, $15,000.
2. No separate account kept of revenue over this spur.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What is the distance from Sydney to Montreal?
2. What is the freight rate on coal from Sydney to Montreal on the Intercolonial railway during winter and summer respectively?
3. What classification is coal given on the freight schedule on the Intercolonial railway?
4. What other articles are included in this classification?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Freight mileage, 977 miles.
2. $2.55 per gross ton.
3. 10th class carloads.
4. Lumber, cement, stone, sand, scrap iron, ore, lime, brick, hay and other commodities.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What is the freight rate on pig iron, steel billets, steel wire rods and steel rails, from Sydney to Montreal on the Intercolonial railway during winter and summer, respectively?
2. How many tons, respectively, of coal, pig iron, steel billets, steel wire rods, and steel rails, were shipped from Sydney to Montreal during the last fiscal year via Intercolonial railway?
3. What was the cost per ton mile to carry each of the above?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $2.50 per gross ton, all the year.
2. Coal, nil; pig iron, 941 tons; steel billets, 13,013 tons; steel wire rods, 28,132 tons; steel rails, 54,698 tons.
3. Accounts do not show cost per ton mile for transportation of any particular commodity.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MONCTON EXTENSIONS.

Mr. CROCKETT:

1. Has the government acquired any land at Moncton for the use of the Intercolonial railway from the Builders' Woodworking Company, Limited?
2. If so, what is the area and what price was paid therefor?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes, the government has acquired land at Moncton, for the use of the Intercolonial railway, from the Builders' Woodworking Company, Limited.
2. Area, fifty-five thousand five hundred square feet. Price paid, $14,400; this amount includes all damages past, present and future, and for the removal of all the machinery, plant and buildings.

ONTARIO FISHERIES SERVICE.

Mr. PORTER:

1. How many officers were there in the fisheries service for Ontario prior to 1910, what were their names, jurisdiction, territorially, salaries and duties?
2. How many patrol boats in the service for Ontario, where located, how many employed in each boat and their salaries?
3. Does anything, and if so what, come within the term maintenance of the service, as mentioned in the return made 17th of March, addition to salaries and fuel for boats?
4. What services do the officers of this service perform that is not performed by similar officers of local legislature?

Mr. BRODEUR. Three.

J. M. Hurley.—That portion of Ontario east of the western boundary line of the counties of Durham, Victoria and Haliburton, including Lake Skugog and the eastern boundary of Muskoka and Parry Sound districts.

O. B. Sheppard.—That part of the province of Ontario west of the eastern boundaries of the county of Ontario, and the districts of Muskoka and Parry Sound, along the Mattawa and Ottawa rivers, and northward along the northeastern boundary line of said province to James bay.

A. G. Duncan.—That portion of Ontario lying west and north of Lake Nipissing, the rivers Mattawa and Ottawa and the northeast boundary line of the province to James bay, embracing Nipissing, Algoma, Thunder Bay and Rainy River districts, Lake Superior and such portions of Lake Huron and Georgian bay as lie adjacent or opposite to the part of Ontario above described.

Salary, $1,200 per annum each.

The exercise of a general supervision over the fisheries in their districts.

2. One for Lake Superior. Two men in addition to the inspector, when the boat is in commission. They are paid the regular per diem wages prevailing. Last season, $2 per day.

3. Yes, travelling expenses of the officers when on official work, and provisions for the crews of the patrol boats.

4. They will require compliance with the provisions of the Federal Fishery Regulations, and so afford the fisheries of the province the protection contemplated thereby.

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

Mr. GILBERT:

What total amount has been paid by the government as bounties up to the present time to encourage the manufacture of iron and steel in Canada?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $17,119,051.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Correspondence, reports, orders in council, &c., relating to the purchase of expropriation of land at Moncton from the Builders Woodworking Company, Limited.—Mr. Crockett.

Return showing the mileage of railways owned, controlled or operated in the United States by the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific and other Canadian railway companies.

2. Also the mileage of railways owned, controlled or operated by the United States railway corporations in Canada.—Mr. Rutan.

Correspondnce, contracts, assignments and other documents with regard to what is called the Percy Aylwin Irrigation Grant, granted to him under order in council under date 1st September, 1908.—Mr. Campbell.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Fisheries—Amount required to compensate Fishery Overseer Wm. Robichaud, of Inkerman, Gloucester County, for destruction of his property by fire, $2,400.

Mr. BRODEUR. I explained the other night the object of this vote. This fishery overseer's property was destroyed by fire under the following circumstances: He was advised by the department that poaching was being carried on in his district, and was instructed to see that it was stopped. He seized some nets that were being illegally used and brought them to his barn. The nets were soon stolen. A few days afterwards he made another seizure of nets and placed these also in his barn. The same evening the barn was set afire and Robichaud lost not only his barn with a season's crop that was stored in it, but also his house and shed. It was a very severe loss. Criminal action was taken against those suspected, and a long trial took place before a stipendiary magistrate, who, after hearing the evidence, declared that the men should be committed for trial. I have here the report of the case made by the agent of the department, showing that the inquiry was a very careful one. Under the circumstances we think we should stand by our officer, to show these criminals who tried to terrorize those who protect the public interest that the force of the law is behind our officers, and that they will be maintained in the performance of their duty. The amount has not been absolutely determined, but by the report of the officer of the department it is believed that it will be about $2,400.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). While on this item, I desire to inquire if it is true that the minister has appointed fishery officers throughout the province of Ontario over waters that are already fully taken care of by the Ontario government? In my own constituency, two or three have been appointed—Mr. M. J. Connolly, whom we all know, is appointed at Brockville, and a gentleman at Westport for the back lakes. The Ontario government has a man at Prescott and one at Gananoque, and these two are travelling these waters with a gasolene boat and protecting the fisheries properly. What object there can be in these new appointments of this government, except to give salaries to political hacks, I cannot understand. As to the vote before us, I have no objection to offer to it. If this officer has met with a misfortune under the circumstances explained by the minister, he should be compensated.

Mr. BRODEUR. On a former item, I gave an explanation of the point to which the hon. member (Mr. Taylor, Leeds) refers. Perhaps he will have no objection to waiting for a few minutes, when, I expect, we shall have an item bearing on this subject, and when I shall have my papers before me and can give him the information he desires.

To pay customs officers for services in connection with issuing of modus vivendi licenses —further amount required, $61.62.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many licenses are there under this modus vivendi?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year, 126 were issued.

Unprovided items, 1909-10—To cover unprovided items, 1909-10, as per Auditor General's Report, page C-5, $101,169.01.

Mr. FELIDING. This is not an appropriation of money, but is in accordance with a memorandum which the Auditor General sends in at the close of the year to cover over-expenditure in various departments, sums necessary to enable him to square his accounts. This an annual vote.

Mr. BARKER. Have any of these items been questioned by the Auditor General?

Mr. FIELDING. No, there is no question regarding any of them.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that this is to make good to the Auditor General for moneys that may have been paid in, for which there was no appropriation or the appropriation was overdrawn.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the fact in some cases. In most cases the amounts are small, and the Auditor General allowed them to pass depending upon the usual practice of geting this vote at the close of the year's affairs.

Mr. BARKER. The item has been passed by the Auditor General?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it is inserted at his request.

Department of Justice—Exchequer Court of Canada, contingencies, $1,400.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The system in the Exchequer Court is that at the trials of actions which are heard in that court there is always a shorthand writer present, and if parties desire afterwards to obtain copies of the evidence given, in that way they are able to do so. The cost of the work of the shorthand reporter is in the end paid by the parties. It forms part of the general cost of litigation falling upon the unsuccessful party. But in the first instance, the expense of providing the reporter, and his fee is paid by the registrar of the court. This amount, therefore, while it is in the shape of an actual disbursement by the registrar, will probably all of it ultimately be returned to him. But he has found that he will need about $1,400 more than the amount he had estimated and which had previously been voted.

Printing, binding and distributing Exchequer Court reports—further amount required, $600.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. This amount will be payable to the Printing Bureau. The necessity for it is because the reports have been a litle more voluminous than the registrar expected.

Mr. BARKER. Are these reports, which are supposed to issue to the legal profession, paid for by those who get them?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. They are paid for by somebody, they are not issued to the public free of expense, of course.

Mr. BARKER. I mean that ordinarily members of the legal profession pay for the reports of long cases, and does the money thus come back to the government?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Any one who receives the reports, whether he is a lawyer or not, has to pay the regular price. The Law Society of Ontario takes a considerable number of copies in bulk, and distributes them to the members of the society.

Dominion police—To pay retiring gratuity to constable Samuel Shore, $1,501.25.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. This constable has reached an age where he was no longer able to continue his services on the Dominion Police Force. He has been on the force over 27 years. He has presented medical certificates, which are accompanied by a certificate of the Commissioner of Dominion Police, Colonel Sherwood, that he is not fit either physically or mentally to continue in the service. Accordingly he has been retired, and the practice in such cases has been to give to the constable so retiring an allowance or a gratuity calculated upon the footing of one month's pay for each year of service after the first ten, and half a month's pay for each subsequent year of service.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would that apply to all constables who are retired by the government?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. There is no general system. We have not a large force, and we do not often have men needing to retire from old age. So each case is dealt with by special vote.

Mr. HUGHES. I understand this officer acquired his disability through special work in the service.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. He is a man well on in years, and exposure has probably contributed to his feebleness.

Mr. BARKER. What system prevails in the department which would prevent one man getting an allowance through favouritism, and another man being refused? That has sometimes happened without any respect to efficiency.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I cannot say that any system prevails. So far as I recollect, this is the only instance in which anything of this kind has taken place during the five years I have been minister. While I am ex-officio head of the Dominion Police Force, the whole management of the force is in the hands of Colonel Sherwood, the commissioner. I have not even the pleasure of an acquaintance with a single member of the force, and in such a matter as this I would act entirely upon the views of the commissioner. In this particular instance the recommendation for the item is based upon medical certificates, and the commissioner's recommendation that this should be done.

Mr. BLAIN. How many are there in the force?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I think the number is 62 at the present time.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they all in Ottawa?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. No, we have recently sent four or five to Halifax to the naval building there, which it is desired should be under the guardianship of a detachment of the force; and a similar body has either been sent, or is about to be sent, to British Columbia on similar duty. Otherwise the whole force is in Ottawa.

Mr. HUGHES. I observe by the press of Saturday and to-day that a special officer of the Dominion Police has been detailed to prevent the horrible Tory party from running away with the Minister of Finance or waylaying him and robbing him of the secrets of the reciprocity deal. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what are the facts with regard to this guarding of the Minister of Finance?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I think my hon. friend has the authority of the newspapers for the statement.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there any authority of the minister for it?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I have no knowledge of it except what I have seen in the newspapers.

Mr. BARKER. With regard to the minister's reply to my question as to the allowance to the retired policeman, while I have the utmost confidence in Col. Sherwood, he is not directly responsible to this House. I think the minister ought to be responsible for any item in these estimates that comes under his authority, and I do not think he should accept the dictum of any official as to what he should pay to individual members of the force. There might be to-morrow a man put in the place of Col. Sherwood in whom the members of

this House might not have the same confidence that they have in that officer, and a policeman might, by mere subserviency to his chief officer, be favoured with a recommendation for an annual pension. It is of vital consequence to the efficiency of the corps that the minister should assume his full and proper responsibility and be able to tell the House that he himself approves the grant, and has reason to approve the grant the House is asked to make.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I am sure that the committee will not have understood me as in any way disclaiming responsibility for the recommendation of this vote. I am responsible for it certainly; but at the same time I want all the members of the committee to understand that it was not a recommendation proceeding upon my personal knowledge as distinguished from the personal knowledge and opinion of the commissioner who, under me, has his responsibility for the force and for keeping it as it ought to be. If I saw this old gentleman, I do not suppose I would be able to know as much about the case as I know from the report and certificate of the commissioner. I might see that he was feeble and might think that he was not at present fit to discharge the duties of his position; but I should need the certificate of a medical man as to whether or not he was permanently disabled. That certificate is given, and it is backed up by the opinion of the commissioner, who has daily personal relations with the members of the force, and probably knows more fully than any other individual man what exactly is required from each member of it. Of course, this incapability for discharging his duties has been coming on gradually. Lighter duties have been put upon him until a time has been reached when there is really no work requiring to be done that is light enough for him to be able to do it, and when, as I am told, he has to be retired, and this is to make some small provision for him, as he may of course live for years. In the circumstances, I had no hesitation in accepting the recommendation of Col. Sherwood and in turn making my recommendation to my colleagues in Council that this item should be placed in the estimates as a special vote.

Mr. BARKER. There is, perhaps, no real difference between us. All I wanted to know was whether the minister had taken the precaution of inquiring and satisfying himself that the money was properly payable before recommending the payment. I do not think any of us thinks very much of the ordinary assertion of a minister that he is responsible. We all know that every minister is responsible for every dollar paid in his department. When a gratuity is recommended, I think the House and the country would like to be assured that the minister had assured himself that the recommendation was a just and proper one, and that he was not acting merely in a perfunctory way in ordering the money to be paid by the country.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. To answer the observations of my hon. friend categorically, I would have to say that I have not made personal investigation into the circumstances of this particular case; yet I have no hesitation in stating to the committee, and taking the responsibility of so doing, that I am satisfied that this is a case in which it is just and fair to make this payment. I say that from the knowledge I have acquired, not merely during the five years that I have been Minister of Justice, but during many years before that, of how accurate and reliable a man Col. Sherwood is; and when he made his recommendation in this case, knowing by experience that his recommendations were of a character which I could unhesitatingly accept, I did not think it necessary to go any further except to see that there was a medical certificate supporting the view that Col. Sherwood himself expressed.

Mr. BARKER. That brings us to the very point I was raising. The minister has no greater confidence in Col. Sherwood than I have, but I do not think the House would be expected to pass this vote if Col. Sherwood had asked us to do so. I am quite aware that the minister in charge of a department has to act upon the advice and opinions of his subordinates; but, after all, a minister is answerable to the public, and it is his duty to satisfy himself, not merely because he knows that Col. Sherwood is a respectable honest official, but because he has himself ascertained it, that the gratuity is properly payable.

To complete payment of expenses incurred in the North Atlantic Fisheries Arbitration, before the Hague, $100,000.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How much did it cost altogether?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. This item it is hoped will complete the expenditure in connection with this arbitration. There has already been voted $200,000, of which a few thousand dollars is still unexpended. It is thought this vote will not only complete the whole payment, but may possibly leave some small surplus. While the total expenditure in connection with the arbitration is probably somewhat substantially less than $300,000, the whole of that amount does not fall upon Canada. At the time the United States agreed to the arbitration of these questions with the British government, an intimation was made by the British government to Canada and Newfoundland that the two colonial governments would be expected to bear the expense between themselves, and an ar-

rangement was then entered into between this government and the government of Newfoundland that the expense would be shared equally between them. At that time, while I had had a little to do with the preliminary preparation of the case, I had no expectation that I should be in general charge of it. The difficulties were more of concern to Newfoundland than to Canada. At any rate the acute difficulties which had reached a stage that necessitated arbitration had grown up during the last few years between the United States and Newfoundland, rather than between the United States and Canada. Ever since the modus vivendi of 1888 between the United States and Canada few difficulties have arisen between us out of the North Atlantic coast fisheries. As the existing difficulties were, in that view of them much more between Newfoundland and the United States than between Canada and the United States I had expected, and I think my colleagues shared the expectation, that general charge of the arbitration would be taken by some one from Newfoundland. But as the work progressed, matters rather drifted than otherwise, first into our taking care of it, Canada engaging the counsel who had been agreed upon and the solicitors who were at work upon the preparation, and in the long run matters drifted into Canada advancing all the money and Newfoundland has not yet paid to Canada any portion of its one-half contribution. We have an arrangement in the shape of an interchange of letters with the First Minister of Newfoundland, and the understanding on his part is that as soon as matters are closed Newfoundland will settle accounts with us. Newfoundland, I assume, paid the expenses of Sir James Winter, who addressed the tribunal with special reference to the questions which particularly concerned Newfoundland. The First Minister of Newfoundland, as well as the Attorney General, were also present at the Hague and no doubt the Newfoundland government bore that expense. I should say further, not only because it affects the matter of dollars and cents, but because it is something that ought to be most gratefully acknowledged on our part, that, while it is true that at the beginning the British government intimated to Canada and to Newfoundland that we would be expected to bear the expense of this litigation, the British government has not adhered strictly, or at all nearly, to that position. They began by doing a great many things in the way of furnishing material; they then began doing the printing, and it has ended by the British government, without any thing at all being said about it, bearing the whole expense of printing the great mass of material which was used in connection with this arbitration. I avoided any very close inquiry as to the amount of that expense, but I know it necessarily must have been a very large sum indeed. I hesitate to make any guess at it, but I am satisfied it would bear a very considerable proportion even to the $300,000 which will be shared between Newfoundland and Canada. The behaviour of the imperial authorities in that connection, was generous, handsome, more than we asked for or could ask, and we can do nothing less than gratefully recognize and acknowledge the handsome way in which we have in that respect been treated by the British government. If any one is interested in the details I can give approximately or exactly the amounts which have been already disbursed to the five gentlemen who formed the board, to the counsel who were engaged in our behalf, and in regard to the various items of expenditure which have been made. The expenses of the tribunal, that is of the five arbitrators, and what I might call court costs: small fees amounting altogether to some $500, which were payable to the officials of the permanent court at the Hague, and the cost of printing the formal record of proceedings which was attended to by the officers of the permanent court at the Hague, were shared equally by the United States on the one part, and the British Empire on the other, and the British half share will fall upon Canada and Newfoundland equally.

Mr. BARKER. As between us and the United States I understand from what the minister says there was a distinct understanding. That ends that. As to the division between Newfoundland and ourselves my own feeling would be that we should deal with it in a generous, open spirit, without any niggardliness whatever.

The Senate, to pay the services of an additional messenger for the session, $530.

Mr. BEST. Some time ago I drew attention to letters of the Auditor General stating that some officials of the Senate were being paid more than they were entitled to receive under the Civil Service Act. Could the minister give us full information in accordance with the promise of the Prime Minister at that time?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give my hon. friend the whole details. I know that a question arose between the Auditor General and the Clerk of the Senate in regard to salaries properly due to certain officials of the Senate. The officers of the Senate who were responsible contended that by the law these officials were receiving what was due them by law. The last I heard of it the question had not been settled completely. There are some half dozen officials whose salaries are in dispute.

Mr. BEST. I do not want to find fault with the salaries received by any civil

servant, it may be that in many cases they are not receiving enough. But I thought this was a grave charge and that if these men were getting more than the law said they should get it should be looked into.

The Senate, to pay one-half the services of an engrosser in preparing the joint address to His Excellency, $175.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does that not seem a very large price to pay for an engrosser?

Mr. FISHER. It does seem to be rather high, but it has to be in both languages. It was arranged for by the officers of the House and the Senate jointly.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I would certainly find fault with an expenditure of $175 for an address to His Excellency. We have a Printing Bureau and I think that in future we had better get these addresses printed and sent down to His Excellency. It would only be thrown in the waste-basket anyway.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is mistaken, it is not printed, it is a carefully engrossed and illuminated address. I have not seen it myself, but I have no doubt it is a very artistic piece of work, by as good a man as could be found in the country. The whole parliament wanted to do honour to His Excellency and I am sure the officers of the House would see that it was done as beautifully as possible. An expert capable of doing that kind of work is an artist and ought to be paid very well, for men competent to do such work are very rare.

To pay one-half the cost of a casket in which to place the joint address, $81.25.

Mr. DANIEL. Was that a silver casket?

Mr. FISHER. I believe it was.

Mr. DANIEL. There does not appear to be any pall provided for this casket?

Mr. FISHER. No, I do not think there was a doctor concerned.

To provide for the promotion of deputy clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to second division, subdivision A, from September 1, 1908, $200.

Mr. BARKER. Why is there a special vote for this?

Mr. SPEAKER. This is due to the fact that the deputy clerk was inadvertently placed in 1908 in the second division of sub-division B instead of sub-division A.

Mr. HUGHES. What is his total salary?

Mr. SPEAKER. $2,100.

Sessional clerks, further amount required, $9,000.

Mr. HUGHES. How many are there and what are their duties?

Mr. BEST.

Mr. SPEAKER. One portion of the staff is directly under the charge of the Clerk of the House for the preparation of returns and the other portion is employed in the post office.

Mr. HUGHES. Do these include stenographers for the use of members?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, there are none.

Mr. DANIEL. How many sessional clerks are there and how are they employed?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are 32 and particulars will be found on page 41 of the main estimates. They include the Speaker's secretary, two chief clerks, 11 employed in the post office and 16 others, including the secretaries to the two chief whips and to the leader of the opposition.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these sessional clerks employed mostly down in the office where the typewriting is done?

Mr. SPEAKER. 11 are employed in the post office, 16 are employed down stairs and partly throughout the building, one in the Speaker's office, one in the office of leader of the opposition, and one each in the offices of the whips besides one or two in the committees.

Mr. DANIEL. Are any working in the rooms of private members?

Mr. SPEAKER. None to my knowledge. For the last two years a number of members on both sides have presented petitions to the Board of Internal Economy asking that members be given assistance of stenographers in their correspondence on a system similar to that which has been in existence in Toronto the last 10 years and has given perfect satisfaction. Hon. members find it very difficult to attend to their own correspondence on account of the time taken up by the committee and sittings of this House. In Toronto a number of girls are employed and paid by the government under the supervision of an experienced person, and these stenographers are employed by the members to do their correspondence. That question is now under the consideration of the Board of Internal Economy and it appears to meet with favour. The Board received a petition signed by many members on both sides.

Mr. HUGHES. Not by all.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, but by a good many.

Mr. DANIEL. The matter is under advisement?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, but I hope something will be done next session.

Mr. BARKER. Is any portion of this vote to pay stenographers for work for

members such as that Mr. Speaker has told us of?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, the system has not been organized yet. This is for sessional clerks.

Mr. BARKER. But I would like to understand distinctly whether members of the House have been allowed to utilize the services of these sessional clerks for their own purposes. There are a great many members who pay for assistance of this kind. If some members are able to command the services of government officials to do their work, it is unfair to those members who pay their way. I would like to know whether any of this vote is to pay for services given to members on either side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that there is not. The duties of the sessional clerks are specified, and they are under the control of the Clerk of the House. When the day's work of a sessional clerk is over, he may do the correspondence of a member, if he so desires but the stenographers' services are paid for by the members themselves. It is felt, however, that that is unsatisfactory, and the idea is to organize this stenographic bureau.

Mr. BARKER. I think that would be satisfactory to both sides, if it is distinctly understood on the assurance of Mr. Speaker that no person employed by the government is giving his services to any member of the House without being paid for it by that member.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the rule—no officer of the House gives his services in connection with the correspondence of any private member.

Mr. BARKER. But what I want to know is whether any clerk employed and paid by the government gives, gratuitously or otherwise, his services to a member of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. I can only answer so far as my knowledge, and the information given to me. The Clerk of the House tells me it would not be allowed. If any complaint is received, I would have to apply the rule.

Mr. DANIEL. It is not likely that any member would complain.

Mr. SPEAKER. I believe sincerely there is no ground for complaint on that score. But if we had a correspondence bureau similar to the one in Toronto, we could control the system, and we can not control the system that now exists.

Mr. HUGHES. As the government is looking to Washington for models in other things, they might take a note of the system there. In Washington, each member is furnished with a secretary for himself, which is better than for members to await their turn to have letters written by a small staff of clerks. I am sure that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who has had an extended sojourn in Washington, where he caused great interest and curiosity, must have noticed how this business is handled there, and will be able to give the government that information about it.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) had better take care or he will be accused of annexation sentiments.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not annexing nations or peoples; but I annex a good idea wherever I can find it.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has annexation on the brain. He never speaks without mentioning it. I am getting sick of it. I rose to ask, Mr. Speaker, as to the duties of the men who are doing typewriting downstairs. When are we right, and when are we wrong, in asking them to do something for us? There is quite a staff of them there and they do very good work, but I do not want to ask them to do anything for me that I have not the right to ask for. I have never asked them to do anything in the way of correspondence, but I did ask them to copy a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. The staff downstairs is divided into French and English staffs, each with a chief. They are required to do the work of the House under instructions from the Clerk. The copying of a return, or any other work that properly belongs to the House of Commons, is done by these men. Any member wishing to have such work done can apply either to the chief of the sessional clerks or to the Clerk of the House. The clerk informs me that they do their work very satisfactorily.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these clerks employed to send out political matter for either side?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, that is not allowed.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they doing it?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not to my knowledge.

House of Commons—committees—further amount required, $13,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a vote for the current year, the amount voted being inadequate. This additional vote is necessary because last session extending into the present fiscal year, and also because of the Lumsden investigation, the expenditure upon which was $11,103.17.

Mr. HENDERSON. What was the original vote?

Mr. SPEAKER. It was $7,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this additional vote include payment for witnesses and their expenses?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, payment of witneses and translation of evidence.

Debates—further amount required, $15,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. The same explanation applies to this item. The money voted for the year expiring is not obtainable after the 31st of March, and the session will continue into April and May.

Postage, telegrams and telephones—further amount required, $500.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many telephones does the government own around these buildings?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand there are about 50. Many of these have been installed for a long time, and others are put in as the need arises. Some of the members' rooms are supplied with telephones. As soon as the House closes they are removed for the summer. We hope to have a general switchboard installed comprising the whole House of Commons, so that when anybody wishes to call up any one in the House of Commons he will call the general number, and then the operator will switch on to any particular room.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood Mr. Speaker to say that some of the members' rooms had telephones. Now I wish to notify Mr. Speaker that the room allotted to myself, along with my hon. friend from Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), and other members, has no telephone. If other members have telephones in their rooms, I think I am entitled to the same privilege. I see no reason why any other private member or group of members occupying a room together should have a telephone put in by the government, and paid for by the country, while I should be obliged to go and hunt up a telephone when I wish to send a message, instead of simply turning around and speaking from my desk. I would like to know what special privileges are given in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER. All the applications are handed over to the Sergeant-at-Arms, and are treated on the same basis. All who have applied have obtained their telephones.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is very kind of the hon. gentleman to tell us that. It is something we were never made aware of before, that we can have the telephone for the asking. I will expect that there will be a telephone put into my room immediately.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must make application in writing.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think I should go to the trouble of sending in a written application if the Sergeant-at-Arms. who is present, will not take the trouble to accept my verbal request.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Sergeant-at-Arms says he will attend to it.

Mr. HUGHES. As one occupying that room with my hon. friend, I wish to be understood that I have a right to be consulted. I decidedly object to being made an auditor of telephone conversations.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not going to have my rights curtailed by the member for Victoria-Haliburton. He does not occupy the room very much anyway, and I do not know that I am going to be restricted in my privileges, even though it should be a little annoying to him.

Sessional messengers, doorkeepers, &c.—further amount required, $4,000.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Who appoints the messengers?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Speaker appoints the sessional messengers; permanent messengers are appointed by the House, on the recommendation of the Speaker.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Do the messengers have to undergo an examination?

Mr. SPEAKER. Unfortunately up to the present time they have not. But the Board of Internal Economy have been asked to make a change in that respect, and to fix an age limit at which they may enter the service and at which they may leave the service. We are now in the position of having on the staff three or four very old men, one of whom has been here since 1859, seven years before confederation. Another man has been here 27 years, and is now 85 years of age. When these men are turned out the country can do nothing for them. The Board of Internal Economy has been asked to apply for a gratuity of one session's salary to give them on retirement. But we keep them as long as possible.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who is this Board of Internal Economy?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Speaker, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who are appointed at the beginning of each session.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Do these messengers have to pass any examination? I have heard many complaints made that a number of messengers cannot speak English. You often ring for them, they come to your room, and you tell them what you want, and they shrug their shoulders and say, 'I don't understand.' Then you have

to send for another more competent messenger who is able to speak French and English.

Mr. SPEAKER. No doubt every messenger should be required to speak both languages, and there may be one or two who do not understand English perfectly. On the other hand, I am told that there are several who do not understand French; so one balances the other. But all should be required to speak both languages.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not think anything of the kind.

Mr. HENDERSON. Many of them are French, and I understand cannot speak English. I know I have found several.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that when any English messenger has been appointed from Ontario or the maritime provinces I have never inquired whether he could speak French or not.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The difficulty is that the French members nearly all understand English while the English members generally do not understand French.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it would be fair to select messengers only from among those who can speak the two languages. To impose that additional test would throw the work into the hands of a particular class, because as a matter of fact there are a great many more French who speak English than there are English who speak French.

Mr. HUGHES. It would be manifestly unfair to require every English-speaking messenger to speak French, as there are a great many more English-speaking members of the House than French. I am not objecting to French messengers being appointed. The matter might be settled by asking how many French messengers and how many English messengers there are now on the staff?

Mr. SPEAKER. Colonel Smith informs me that in his experience of many years here no English-speaking messenger has been required to speak French, but in almost every case a French messenger, when appointed, is informed that he must be able to speak English, otherwise he cannot properly perform his duties. As far as my experience goes, English-speaking messengers have always been replaced by English-speaking, and French by French, and generally each appointment has been taken from the district from which his predecessor came.

Mr. DANIEL. I understood, I think from the Speaker himself, that there was some rule with regard to a certain number of messengers being allowed to each province. I would like to ask if that is the case, and also on whose recommendation these messengers are appointed usually?

Mr. SPEAKER Colonel Smith tells me that there has been no system in vogue, but generally we have on the staff messengers coming from nearly every part of the country, and when a vacancy occurs from one province, the members generally see to it that it is filled by the appointment of another from the same province.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there any limit to the number?

Mr. SPEAKER. The present number is 47. These are not all messengers, however, Some act as door-keepers, some as book-keepers keeping the time of the other messengers. During the present session we have been greatly handicapped by illness in Ottawa. There have generally been four or five men away on sick leave, from typhoid fever or other cause. Though we have been short-handed, we have made no appointments in the last three months, and there were no additional messengers appointed last year.

Pages—further amount required, $1,750.

Mr. HENDERSON. I see that there are four additional pages.

Mr. SPEAKER. These were appointed in the session before last. They were made necessary by the construction of the new wing, with a large number of new rooms opened and numerous additional telephones introduced into the building. The number of pages was increased from 16 to 20.

Sessional charwomen—further amount required, $1,800.

Mr. THOBURN. I see that these charwomen get the large amount of 75 cents a day, while the pages get $1.75 a day? Are they supposed to work the whole day for 75 cents? There seems to be a great inequality in wages.

Mr. SPEAKER. I quite agree with the hon. member that the amount paid is very small. I think the Dominion could well afford to make it at least $1. The women do not work all day. They come very early in the morning, at 5 or 6 or 7 o'clock, and work till 8 or 9 o'clock. They are generally widows with children depending upon them, and when they finish their work here they can go and attend to their own household duties. They have to come here every morning during the session, sometimes wading through deep snow, and 75 cents a day is a very small amount and I would ask the Board of Internal Economy to make it at least $1.

Mr. DANIEL. Does Mr. Speaker provide them with some hot coffee when they come so early?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Speaker is not up early enough for that, but I will lay the suggestion before the Restaurant Committee.

Servants—further amount required, $425.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a new kind of officer. I did not know that we had that designation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Sergeant at Arms tells me that this designation has been in the estimates for the last 20 years. There are six. They include the attendants in the bath rooms and wash rooms and the men who take the coal and ice to the different rooms.

Electric light attendant—further amount required, $75.

Mr. SPEAKER. The main part of this man's salary is paid by the Public Works Department. This amount is paid to him for his special duties during the session.

Mr. HUGHES. How many families or persons reside in the parliament buildings?

Mr. SPEAKER. There was a return brought down a couple of weeks ago giving that information. Speaking from memory, I may say that in the House of Commons there are the Speaker and his family, the Deputy Speaker, the Sergeant at Arms, the steward of the restaurant and his family, the housekeeper and his family, and the assistant steward, who occupies one room. This year we paid our way with the restaurant and had a surplus, which is different from the experience of the past. I should have mentioned that the Deputy Speaker has rooms in the building as in the last parliament. A return was brought down which gives all the details and which the hon. gentleman could consult.

Mr. DANIEL. Who is downstairs?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is an assistant steward who replaces the steward, who is supposed to be here night and day, and these are the only two families downstairs so far as I know. Mr. Dubé has his quarters in the front of the building. I am sorry to say that after nearly 40 years of service Mr. Dubé is now in poor health, and is applying for superannuation. His successor will simply have an office there, and the remainder of the rooms will be given to the service of the House.

Printing, paper and binding—further amount required, $80,000.

Mr. HUGHES. Would Mr. Speaker give us an explanation of the change made this year in reference to the supply of stationery to the members? So far as I am personally concerned I do not want jack-knives and things of that kind, but I do believe that members of the House of Commons are entitled to a proper supply of stationery to transact the business connected with their position as members. I have no use for any peanut policy whether it is supported by the government or by members of the opposition, and I do not think the people would object to proper supplies of stationery being furnished to their members.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Board of Internal Economy passed a resolution last session that in future members are to be supplied during the session with all the stationery they may require, but the giving of a trunk of stationery to be carried home was thought to be an abuse and was stopped. The giving of the leather trunks to members at the opening of every parliament will continue. I may say that in addition to the stationery, a number of articles were put in these trunks which to some members were satisfactory and to some others were not. These articles consisted of work boxes, and chatelaine bags and things of that kind, and some members objected to them, and the board of internal economy decided to do away with that practice.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the same thing been done in the case of the senators? I understand they are supplied with a certain amount of money, and that they provide these things for themselves. Has the same policy of economy been extended to the senators?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Senate being an independent chamber, they distribute their funds as they think best. They continue the practice in the Senate. I understand it is taken out of the vote for contingencies. We have no control over them.

Mr. DANIEL. I see no reason why the same rule should not be extended to the Senate as to the House of Commons. The money is voted by this House, and it should be made clear that in future there will be no money for that purpose.

Mr. HUGHES. How much is saved annually by this policy?

Mr. SPEAKER. About $10,000.

Mr. HUGHES. That is about one-third of the amount that is wasted on every mile of the transcontinental railway. What was thrown away on the Quebec bridge and some other transactions of the government would continue supplying the members with decent stationery for the next thousand years.

Mr. SPEAKER. The clerk of the House informs me that during session the members can get all the stationery they require by filling out a requisition. It is the practice of giving a trunk at the beginning of each session that has been discontinued.

Mr. HUGHES. I have no apology to make about this. I say the Dominion of Canada is entitled to give to every member

of this House all the stationery he needs during session and all the stationery he needs during the year in connection with his public duties. I am surprised at the board of Internal Economy getting down to such small matters, especially as they are the gentlemen who are so magnanimous about Quebec bridges, and national transcontinental railways and all that sort of thing.

Mr. EDWARDS. With regard to this practice of furnishing a small trunk of stationery I believe the government has done quite right in discontinuing it. We get all the stationery we require here to carry on our correspondence and transact the business of the country, and that is all we should have. If we cannot provide ourselves with stationery between sessions then I think we had better quit and go out of the business. But at the same time it is not fair that the senators should be treated differently from the members of this House. I take an opposite view from the hon. member from Victoria, and I think it is a piece of peanut politics on the part of members of this House to want a lot of stationery, and fancy note paper and knick-knacks that are of no practical use to us. It may be all very well for those gentlemen who carry on a fashionable correspondence, but for the practical every-day member of parliament it is absolutely useless to supply us with little leather bags and purses that are stuck in, and all that kind of thing.

Mr. FISHER. I am not a member of the internal economy committee, but I think that the fact that all these trumpery little articles, apart from real stationery were put into these trunks—

Mr. HUGHES. I am not advocating that. I referred only to the stationery.

Mr. FISHER. It was the fact that these trumpery little things were put into the trunks that led to an abuse and to criticism being somewhat freely bandied about in the country. I do not think there was any desire or idea of cutting the members off from any supplies they may require in their capacity as members.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), is entirely in error. I have never directly or indirectly asked for trunks or useless stationery, but what I asked for and do ask for and am going to have is proper stationery for my use as a member. If the hon. member wants to use these little peanut bags, &c., let him use them, I never use them. I spoke of stationery and I maintain that the members of this House are entitled to stationery.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was not making any objection to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton getting his stationery. I was under the impression that he had been told as all of us have that stationery was available for him and for every other member.

Mr. HUGHES. No, it is not.

Mr. EDWARDS. I repeat that I think the Internal Economy were right in cutting off the little trunks of fancy paper and knick-knacks.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the interests of economy, I suppose the committee have cut off this supply of stationery. I am glad to know that at last the government has commenced to economize and I think the country will appreciate it. I endorse it, but I do insist that having stripped the members of the House of Commons of their stationery they will deal with the other chamber in the same way and strip them as well. I do not know any reason why the Committee on Internal Economy should be so economical that they will put the pruning knife into the little perquisite that was given to the House of Commons for, I suppose, the last 100 years. But I do say they should carry their economy one step further and deal alike with both Houses. We have to vote the money, the Senate cannot get five cents unless we give it to them, and if the item of Senate contingencies has not passed, I will be glad to move to strike it out.

Mr. HUGHES. Those of us who have been in the House for a number of years will remember the titled gentleman who was one of the leaders in this cheese paring policy of cutting down jack-knives. One gentleman used to go for this item in opposition and he was always the fellow who would get two or three extra jack-knives. The most despicable creatures you could find in the House were always the ones who talked thus. The men talking about it in the country were of the type of the leaders of the Grangers and Patrons of Industry. I do not mean the membership of those bodies but the leaders, men a good deal of the type of the leaders of the Grain Growers in the west who are coming down here, who are always finding fault and always the first to hunt for a government job, men like Joe Haycock and Jim McMullen in the House of Commons were the men who were up to this sort of game, men despised in every regard, men whose opposition I would a thousand times have rather than their support. I always courted the opposition of such men and I do to-day. I just give this little explanation in passing.

Salaries and allowances, outside post office service, $3,457,457.75.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Some four weeks ago this matter was fully discussed. I have agreed with my hon. friend from East

Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) that we shall take an afternoon some time this session to discuss the rural mail delivery.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask if any provision has been made for increased paymen to the railway mail clerks, and also post office clerks generally in the outside service?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course I cannot give a pledge on behalf of the government, but I have given the clerks to understand that I was in favour of an increase, and the question is now under consideration. It will include not only railway mail clerks, but clerks in the post offices.

Mr. DANIEL. That is not in the item under discussion?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I would have to bring in a Bill, because I would have to amend the schedule of the Civil Service Act for the outside service.

Mail Service, $4,130,700.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The increase of $60,000 in the railway mail service is on account of new lines and increased frequency on existing routes, particularly in western Canada. $27,000 of the increase is due to the extension of the service over the Grand Trunk Pacific between Winnipeg and Edmonton from tri-weekly to daily. The increase in the mail service by steamboat is due to the increase in the cost between Vancouver and Naas Harbour and intervening points. The Canadian Pacific railway are the contractors. The increase of $175,000 in the land service is to provide for the extension of rural mail delivery, for new post offices, increasing the frequency in the existing service and in the prices asked for when old mail contracts have expired and public tenders are invited. I could give a very detailed statement regarding the extension of the rural mail delivery system, but I think the House will agree that I had better defer that statement until the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) is in the House. We have extended the service very considerably, especially in Ontario, where the people take advantage of the new system. We are now manufacturing the boxes in Toronto and going as fast as possible on the new routes.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand that other hon. members will have the same freedom of discussion of this item as the hon. gentleman for East Lambton.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly, every one will have the same privilege. I referred to him particularly because he usually takes the leading part in discussing these matters.

Mr. HUGHES. In other words he is the coming Postmaster General?

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must say that although he is a very persistent critic, we understand each other and he criticises in a very gentlemanly way.

Mr. HUGHES. I might draw attention to the fact that some time ago I communicated with the hon. minister's department about a mail clerk on the Irondale and Bancroft railway from Kinmount Junction to Baptiste lake. I hope he will take a note of that now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall do so and see about it in the morning.

Mr. BOYCE. I have called the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that the postal communication between Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton has given rise to complaints which, I believe, are well founded.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have had the facts before me, and have given instructions to the inspector to take up the matter.

Mr. BOYCE. And he will take up the matter and deal with it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. GOODEVE. The Postmaster General said that when this item came up I should call his attention to various applications that I referred to him. One is for a postal clerk on Arrow lake. I thought they put the case strongly when they pointed out that in one case it took five days to carry the mail six miles.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I took up these various questions in a letter to the hon. gentleman, which, if he has not received, he will find in his mail this evening.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I desire an explanation with regard to the dismissal of the postmaster at Escott. I put a question on the paper with reference to the matter. This postmaster was in charge of the office for thirty or forty years, and he is now a man of 85 years of age. No complaint was made to him, to the inspector or any person else. On the contrary, his services were approved by the whole community. But, without further notice than a letter from the Postmaster General that his services would be dispensed with on March 1, his successor was appointed. I would like to have the correspondence and to have an explanation why this was done. In answer to the question I put in the House the Postmaster General said that one reason for dismissing him was that he was leaving the premises in which the post office had been carried on. He had a deputy, and this man built a store not more than ten feet away from the post office, and intended moving into it with his business and the post office. But to serve a political party friend of the Minister of Railways,

this old gentleman, who had always attended the office and given everybody satisfaction, was turned out on the street and a younger man put in.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I find that during the present session, my hon. friend put a question on the paper which was answered by myself. The question and the answer are as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Who is the present postmaster at Escott, in the county of Leeds, province of Ontario?
2. What was the date of his appointment?
3. Who was the postmaster at the said office up to the appointment of the present incumbent, and how long had he occupied the position?
4. Was the retiring postmaster dismissed, or for what reason was he discontinued?
5. Under whose representations, and at whose instance was he so retired?
6. Had any complaint as to incompetency to discharge the duties of the said office been made against the retiring postmaster or his assistant? If so, what was the nature of such complaint, and by whom was it made?
7. Is the government aware that the postmaster who has been retired is said to be an old man, a cripple, and a man who was in need of the income derived from the position he occupied?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Mr. F. T. Hutchison.
2. January 27, 1911.
3. Mr. George Dowsley, since December 1, 1891.

4, 5 and 6. It having been brought to the attention of the department that the postmaster was not giving his personal attention to the duties of the office, inquiry was made in the matter, and the inspector reported that the postmaster had not attended to the duties of the office for a long period. He farmed the office out to several persons in succession, and it was learned that the person then in charge of the office was obliged to vacate the premises. As the present location of the office was considered to be wholly satisfactory and very convenient, and it would not be in the public interest to have it changed, and as the postmaster was unable to give any attention to the duties of the office, it was deemed advisable to place the office in charge of some one who would keep it in the same premises and give it his personal attention.

7. The department has recently been informed that this is the case.

If my hon. friend will move for the papers, I will bring down the report of the inspector, and, if any injustice has been done, I am ready to repair it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I know that an injustice has been done. I am well acquainted with this postmaster. He attended his office once or twice every day, and he had his assistant or deputy sworn in who attended to the work of the office and did it faithfully and well. The only question was of removing from one building to another ten feet away.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This change was made in the routine of the department. I will get the papers and will discuss the matter with my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor, Leeds).

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If we allow this item to go through, when we are discussing some other item of the Postmaster General's, may we deal with this matter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Surely.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I had a communication from one of my constituents the other day asking me to see the Post Office Department with regard to rural mail delivery in a certain section of my riding. I wrote my friend and asked him to give me a description of the route, and in his reply he said there were several routes which might be utilized, and he suggested that I ask the Post Office Department if they would send the inspector to look over the ground and see which would be the best route to utilize.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman will make his application to the department and send it to me, or if, when he is passing the department, he will see Mr. Anderson, who is in charge of that service, the inspector will receive the necessary order.

Post office—outside service—miscellaneous, $762,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This item shows an increase of $115,000 over last year. This is due to the expansion of the service. The number of officers has increased remarkably during the last few years. I have had compiled a set of statistics showing the growth of the department, which I will not weary the House with reading, but which I will hand in to 'Hansard':

POSTAL NOTE BUSINESS.

1900—Number of postal note offices.. ..	3,160
1910—Number of postal note offices.. ..	10,890
Increase..	7,730
Increase per cent, 244 per cent.	
1900—Amount of postal notes paid..	$1,289,976
1910—Amount of postal notes paid..	5,904,414
Increase..	$4,614,438
Increase per cent, 358 per cent	

1900-1910—FINANCES.

The year 1900 was the year in which the immediate effects of the great postal reductions were felt to their fullest extent. This was the first complete year of the Imperial Penny Postage and of the reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents per ounce on letters passing within Canada and from Canada to the United States.

REVENUE.

1900..	$ 4,345,823
1910..	11,068,753
Increase..	$ 6,722,930
Increase per cent, 155 per cent.	

EXPENDITURE.

1900..	$ 4,807,485
1910..	10,325,543
Increase..	$ 5,518,058

Increase per cent, 115 per cent.

1900—Deficit..	$461,662
1910—Surplus..	743,210

Advantage of 1910 over 1900 is $1,204,872

1900-1910—POST OFFICES.

Number in 1900..	9,627
Number in 1910..	12,887
Increase..	3,260

The number in 1900 has been increased to the extent of over one-third in ten years.

1900-1910—MONEY ORDER SYSTEM.

1900—Number of money order offices..	1,847
1910—Number of money order offices..	3,311
Increase..	1,464

Increase per cent, 80 per cent.

1900—Amount of money orders issued.	$16,209,069
1910—Amount of money orders issued.	60,967,162
Increase..	$44,758,093

Increase per cent, 276 per cent.

MILEAGE OF ANNUAL TRAVEL WITH MAILS.

1900—Number of miles travelled during year..	33,099,838
1910—Number of miles travelled during year..	46,773,727
Increase..	13,673,889

Increase per cent, 41 per cent.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF CANADA BY PROVINCES, FOR THE YEAR 1909-1910.

	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Percentage of Expenditure to Revenue. Per cent.
Ontario	$4,867,922	$3,892,007	79
Quebec	2,059,541	1,988,499	96
Manitoba..	1,104,877	873,453	79
Brit. Columbia..	779,152	763,467	98
Saskatchewan ..	596,680	658,585	114
Nova Scotia.. ..	581,176	725,366	124
Alberta	542,645	602,326	111
New Brunswick.	410,265	546,356	133
P. E. Island ..	76,043	109,356	143
Yukon	23,290	138,966	
	$11,041,591	$10,298,381	

REDUCTION IN RATES.

During the last ten years the following reductions have been made:

In 1900, the rate on newspapers from publishers to subscribers was ½ cent per pound; in 1910, the rate was ¼ cent per pound.

Newspapers to Great Britain and to all other parts of the empire were in 1900 charged at the rate of 1 cent per 2 ounces, or 8 cents per pound. In 1910, the rate from publishers in Canada to subscribers in Great Britain and many parts of the empire is ¼ cent per pound.

The rate on drop letters in cities and towns where there were letter carriers was in 1900 2 cents per ounce. In 1910, the rates are 1 cent per ounce.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

In 1900, all letters from Canada to foreign countries were 5 cents per ½ ounce. To-day the rate is 5 cents for the first ounce, and 5 cents for each subsequent ounce, where a letter weighs over one ounce.

Parcels for Great Britain were charged 16 cents for the first pound and 12 cents for each subsequent pound. In 1910, the rate is 12 cents per pound all through. Similar reductions were made in the parcel rates to many other countries.

SAVINGS BANKS.

Accounts Open.

At the end of 1900..	150,987
At the end of 1910..	148,893
Decrease..	2,094

Amount on Deposit.

At the end of 1900..	$37,507,456
At the end of 1910..	43,586,357
Increase..	$ 6,078,901

Increase per cent, 16 per cent.

Archives, $30,000.

Mr. HUGHES. How many employees are there in the Archives?

Mr. FISHER. Twenty-eight altogether. They come under the Civil Service Act.

Patent record, $17,000.

Mr. FISHER. The same sum as last year. It is printed in the Printing Bureau.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it of any use?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. People who are interested in patents know that these reports are very valuable.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What is the amount derived from the Patent office?

Mr. FISHER. About $200,000. It has risen much in late years.

Statistical year-book, $6,000.

Mr. JAMESON. I have seen in the library books of a similar character from Australia and some of the other colonies, but I think they are got up in better form than this one.

Mr. FISHER. I think the books my hon. friend refers to have been descriptive of the country, containing articles more or less of an advertising character. But the Year-book of Canada, being a pretty bulky volume, we think it better to confine it exclusively to statistics.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is the officer immediately in charge of the Year-book?

Mr. FISHER. The chief statistician is the officer responsible, while Messrs. Wilkins & Skead have been the officers in charge since I have been in the department. This is not a report of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUGHES. The Year-book includes a great deal of material that is included in

the report of the American Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. JAMESON. One difficulty in connection with this Year-book is that it is somewhat late in reaching the public, it is many months after the fiscal year has closed. If it could be got into the hands of the public at an earlier date, its utility would be greatly enhanced.

Mr. FISHER. It is impossible to issue it more rapidly, because it is compiled from blue-books of the different departments; we have to wait until they are out and then compile the tables from them. It is generally four or five months after the close of the fiscal year before the departmental reports can be completed. I have asked that the first proof sheets be sent to the department, so that the compilation of the Year-book may be hastened, and we have succeeed in getting it out earlier. The Year-book of the present year is now in the hands of the printer. Under the circumstances, we can hardly get it out in less than ten months.

Printing and distributing reports and bulletins of farms, $10,000.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would like to ask the minister if the bulletin recently issued by his department with reference to cattle raising will be distributed to the farmers of a member's constituency upon his application? The publication issued by the department two or three years on sheep husbandry was a very useful publication, and I had quite a number of requests for it from my riding.

Mr. FISHER. This item refers only to Experimental Farm reports. The bulletin my hon. friend refers to is issued by the Live Stock Commissioner. If a member sends us a list of farmers supposed to be interested in the subject of a particular bulletin, it will be sent to them as long as there is a supply on hand. Some members have asked me to send them large numbers of bulletins for distribution themselves; but in view of the fact that we have a large list of farmers in almost every riding of the country, I have always asked them to send the list to us, so that we might compare it with our own list, and thus avoid duplication.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I have sent a list on several occasions to the Live Stock Commissioner, and in every case I have found that the book has been immediately sent.

Mr. FISHER. That is the rule. I may say that that particular bulletin is a rather expensive one for which we have received a good deal of commendation. We send it to every farmer interested in meat production, but we do not like to have it distributed among those who will not read or study it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The method I adopted with regard to the book on sheep husbandry was to write a letter to each farmer in my riding informing him that the department had issued a publication containing very valuable information, and when a farmer sent me his name, I immediately sent it to the department and the book was sent to him.

Mr. EDWARDS. What objection has the department to supplying a member with a number of these bulletins for distribution by himself?

Mr. FISHER. There are two objections. The first is that we have ourselves a list of over 200,000 names of farmers in Canada who receive our bulletins, and if my hon. friend were to get say a couple of hundred bulletins to send to his county, the chances are that half or three-fourths of those to whom he would send them would be on our list and perhaps would have already received them. Many of these bulletins are very expensive and of great value, and should not be duplicated or wasted. Another objection is that it has sometimes been the practice for members to get their voters' list and employ a clerk to address envelopes by the score or the hundred, sometimes by the thousand, to their constituents, and send to them all kinds of documents. These bulletins are too valuable to be sent to people who are not interested in them and would not pay any attention to them or perhaps take them out of the post office. But I can assure my hon. friend that if he sends us a list of people who are interested in agriculture, their names will be put on our list and bulletins will be sent to them.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is just because I recognized that some of these bulletins are more valuable than others and cost too much money to be sent out indiscriminately that I brought the matter up. The Minister of Agriculture cannot possibly know whether he is sending a particular bulletin to the right people or not, but the member knows, and when an important bulletin came out, one too expensive to distribute in large quantities, the minister might ask the member to check over the list he had. In that way, I think he would get better results than he does now. The minister no doubt desires to place them where they would do the most good, but I think the supply could be distributed to far greater advantage if the members were consulted.

Mr. FISHER. The farmers' list is divided into beef men, dairy men, poultry men, and so on, and if the hon. gentleman sent us the name of a sheep man the sheep bulletin would be sent to him for example.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I understand that every member of a farmers' institute and agricultural society is on your list.

Mr. FISHER. If they send in the names they will be put on the list. Some years ago we had a list of 75,000 and the list is now over 200,000.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Are the names divided according to constituencies?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Would the minister have any objection to showing a member the list for his constituency?

Mr. FISHER. No objection at all.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I wrote to some of my constituents and they answered they were receiving these bulletins.

Mr. FISHER. Their names were on the list.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Agriculture gave some reasons why these bulletins were not sent to the members to be distributed by them, but he forgot to state that one reason was that if they were sent to the member he might send them to his constituents with his compliments and thus interfere with the credit which the minister seeks to retain for himself.

Mr. FISHER. Not at all, I would have no objection to that.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I suggest that the mailing list should be submitted to members once a year or once in two years for revision. I think you will find a number of dead men on these lists.

Mr. FISHER. I am reorganizing the system, and the lists will be sent not only to the members once a year, but the post masters will be asked to report the names of those whose mail is not called for.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the minister supply on request a copy of the list for his constituency to each member?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the hon. gentleman accept my verbal request for the Frontenac list now?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I will not promise to supply every member of the House immediately because that would take some time, but I would be glad to see that my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) gets a list.

Tracadie Lazaretto and Leprosy generally, $11,000.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Are the leper patients increasing?

Mr. FISHER. The number always remains about the same.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It is time to adjourn now.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to have a few more items passed but my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has done very well, and I move that the committee rise.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fisher, House adjourned at 11.14 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 28, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

IMPORTS OF BUTTER AND EGGS.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg to lay on the table a supplementary answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) on the 9th of March:

Statement showing the quantity and value of butter and eggs imported for consumption into Canada, by countries, during the month of February, 1911.

	Lbs.	Value.
Butter—		
Great Britain	2,800	$ 689
Australia	15,008	3,000
New Zealand	181,826	41,813
United States	6,838	1,707
Total	206,472	$47,209
Eggs—		
Hong Kong	4,250	$ 193
Chinese Empire	11,138	1,673
United States	719,315	131,341
Total	734,703	$133,207

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 156) to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act. He said: It is the wish of the department to legalize the establishment of certain funds in connection with the Intercolonial railway. We have during the past two or three years laid aside a certain amount for equipment renewal purposes and a certain amount for rail renewal purposes, and I wish to add a certain amount for fire protection purposes. We have been doing this with the consent of the Auditor General, and he and the Finance Department think it advisable for us to have legislation to enable us to do this, so that there will be no question as to its legality.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEED CONTROL ACT.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Seed Control Act by providing,—

(a) That the Governor in Council may make regulations determining the species of farm weeds which shall be included within the meaning of the term 'noxious weeds';

(b) That no person shall sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding, any seeds of cereals, flax, grasses, clovers, or forage plants, except timothy, alsike or red clover and alfalfa, unless they are free from any seeds of noxious weeds and unless the receptacle containing them is marked with the name and address of the seller, the name of the kind of seed, and the names of the noxious weeds, the seeds of which are present in the seed sold, offered, exposed or had in possession for sale;

(c) That every person who sells, offers, exposes or has in his possession for sale for seeding any seeds of timothy, alsike, red clover or alfalfa, or any mixture containing them in or from any receptacle, shall cause such receptacle to be marked with the designation of the grade of seed;

(d) That no person shall sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale any seeds of timothy, alsike, red clover or alfalfa, in or from any receptacle unless marked with the designation of the grade of seeds and come within the requirements prescribed for each such designation;

(e) That no person shall sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding, any of the said seeds if the seeds of noxious weeds or other useless or harmful plants are present in the greater proportion in the seeds sold, offered, exposed or had in possession for sale than the maximum number of such seeds that may be permitted of the grade designated therefor.—Mr Fisher.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the minister explain the general effect of the resolution?

Mr. HENDERSON. And how it differs from existing law?

Mr. FISHER. The main differences are that by this section the Governor in Council is authorized to name the seeds which should be considered the seeds of noxious weeds. There is now a list named in the Act, but we have found occasionally that a weed appears in a part of the country, that is very noxious indeed, but which is not contained in that list. We want to have authority to add it under such circumstances after due warning. We also want to bring flaxseed under the section dealing with grain seeds. There is a large amount of flaxseed raised in Canada, and we desire to include it in the list. We provide for the grading of timothy, alsike, red clover, or alfalfa, seeds under different standards of quality. Under the present Act there was a standard for No. 1, and then another standard up to which all grass seeds have to go. Seed merchants put on their seed that it was up to the government standard, and the farmers were tempted by that into believing that this was a high standard fixed by the government to ensure very good seeds, whereas, as a matter of fact it was a standard fixed as a minimum below which no seed could be sold. We now wish to grade the seeds Extra No. 1, No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, &c.

The changes have been very carefully considered, we have investigated the conditions in the country both in regard to the growing and handling of seeds, and the requests which are embodied in this Bill have come from seed growers in the country in large numbers, and have also been endorsed and supported by the seed merchants. The Seed Commissioner has been in close touch with the seed growers and merchants, and I think I am safe in saying that the changes meet with the universal approbation of both these classes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think that the consideration of the legislation in Committee of the Whole House will be satisfactory. It would be much better to refer it to the Agricultural Committee, where every one interested in agriculture may submit such questions to the experts as he desires.

Mr. FISHER. Former Bills on this and similar subjects have been dealt with in Committee of the Whole House, and the result has been satisfactory. The method of conducting business in the committee is more informal and less conducive to the production of a thoroughly satisfactory Bill than a discussion in a Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEST. Under section 9 a penalty of $1 is provided for the first offence. This penalty is not sufficient to afford any protection to the farmer. It would pay the dishonest merchant to buy dirty seeds and to sell them to the farmer and pay the penalty in each case, as he would thus make an extra profit of $1 or $2 per bag. A bag of seed would seed ten acres, and if the farmer had such a plot infected with weeds it might cause him a loss of $100 or $200. Even a fine of $25 would not be a protection.

Mr. FISHER. That has been the penalty under the present Act, and we have never had to prosecute the same offender twice. Prosecutions are published broadcast, and the injury to the reputation of the offender is so great that he does not repeat the offence. If such a condition as my hon. friend fears had resulted I would have asked the House to increase the penalty.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I endorse the suggestion of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that the Bill be referred to the Agricultural Committee. There, we would know what we were doing, but here we are asked to pass amendments without understanding them. It is a very important measure, and we seem to be legislating in the dark.

Mr. FISHER. We have before us now only the resolution. On this the Bill will be founded, and will be before the members of the House for some time before being dealt with, after which, it will have to go through its three stages in the usual way. To discuss a Bill like this in the Committee of Agriculture, I think, would lead to much informal discussion, and probably not result in giving us a Bill in as good form as would discussion in Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I made the suggestion in the interests of economizing time. When we have a Committee on Agriculture which can properly deal with this Bill, it does seem reasonable that we should not take up the time of the House with the discussion. This will probably take up a whole afternoon, and probably another afternoon when the measure is in the Committee of the Whole. The Committee on Agriculture could devote time to it and leave the House free to attend to other matters. Besides, as suggested by the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith), we could have practical men come before the committee and explain the different clauses of the Bill, and so have a more thorough discussion.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry that my judgment does not agree with that of my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson). A committee like that on agriculture, where there is no formality, where one member can discuss one point and another member another point, and where there can be practically no ruling of the Chair to keep the discussion to the point immediately at issue, would not lead to a satisfactory or complete discussion of the Bill. I think the Bill may reasonably go through in a couple of afternoons in the House, and I think it can be done better than if the Bill were referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BLAIN. I endorse the valuable suggestion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). If the Committee of Agriculture is to be of service to the country, it should have something to do.

Mr. FISHER. It has plenty to do.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister, then, what have we been doing? I am a member of that committee, and very regular in my attendance at its meetings. We listen to valuable reports from officers of the Experimental Farm or other branches of the Agricultural Department—all very good. But the committee is a body of listeners, in the main, and I believe we ought to be a committee of doers as well. The policy of this House is to refer important measures to a committee. Almost every day some minister tells us that a certain measure is one that should receive careful consideration, and therefore should be sent to a committee. Why not follow the same course with this Bill? It would not detract from the lofty position of my hon. friend, Mr. Fisher, in his department. I am sure he would not have that small matter in consideration.

Mr. FISHER. Not at all.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement at once. But I am in earnest when I say that the suggestion of the hon. member for Halton is a good one. In the main, the Committee on Agriculture is composed of farmers. It is rather a reflection on the chairman of that committee to suggest that he could not keep order if this Bill were under discussion.

Mr. FISHER. I did not suggest that.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) said that rulings could not be given, and he suggested, as I understood him, that there would be confusion in the committee.

Mr. FISHER. I said the rulings had not the weight of rulings of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. The members of the Committee on Agriculture are much more free to ask questions and to change from one subject to another, to debate one clause now and another again than in Committee of the Whole House. I think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has had experience enough to know that.

Mr. BLAIN. I have had experience, but I would come to the rescue of my hon. friend the chairman of the committee. I think he can keep order in the committee; he has shown himself capable of doing so.

Mr. FISHER. Quite so.

Mr. BLAIN. What objection is there, then, to sending this Bill to the committee?

Mr. FISHER. Not because I have any objection, but I think it would be the privilege of any member of the committee to do what he wanted to in the way I have suggested, and the chairman, perhaps would have no right to restrict him, whereas the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House has that right and that authority.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman's point is that members could be curbed in the House, but not in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. Exactly.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that the estimate the hon. gentleman has of the members of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. FISHER. I have had some experience of them.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not a remark we would expect from a gentleman occupying the lofty position of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I have faith in the Committee on Agriculture—in the members on both sides. I think that committee would give an excellent criticism of this Bill. Farmers experienced in growing seeds comprise its membership. I have no doubt that, if the original Bill had been scanned by the Committee on Agriculture, it would have included the different seeds that the minister suggests should be named in the present Bill. It is because new weeds, not known to my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) and his department at the time this Bill was passed, have since become a menace in one part of Canada or another that he comes forward with this Bill to include these seeds under the law.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman does not understand.

Mr. BLAIN. I have not read the Bill, but did I misunderstand the discussion?

Mr. FISHER. Apparently.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, what is the explanation?

Mr. FISHER. This Bill will give the Governor in Council authority to name those seeds that are to be regarded as noxious weed seeds. There is a list of such seeds in the present law, but new weeds may appear, and we wish to give the Governor in Council power to include these without special legislation.

Mr. BLAIN. But certain seeds were named in the original Bill?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought I was right on the main point. I was pointing out that, no doubt, had the committee considered the original Bill, the seeds which the minister thinks of adding to the list would have been made known to the committee, and could have been included under the Bill.

I am in earnest about this. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Halton will appeal to members on both sides. It will give an opportunity for discussion untrammelled by rules that are necessary here but are not necessary in the committee. I appeal to the sense of fairness of the Minister of Agriculture whether he should not revise his opinion in reference to a Bill of this kind, one of the most important that could come before the House for consideration. Foul seeds are spreading in every part of Canada, and are a source of great expense and annoyance to the agricultural community; therefore the best this House could contribute should be put into the discussion of this measure, and then it can be considered in the House after it has been discussed in committee. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) is a valuable one and should be accepted by the minister.

Mr. FISHER. Contrary to my judgment I am willing to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend, and let it go to the Committee on Agriculture, where amendments may be proposed before the Bill itself is brought down to the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). His idea is that if the Committee on Agriculture made certain amendments and those amendments were accepted by the government, then the Bill will come back with those amendments, when it might be necessary, as a technical matter, that a new resolution should be put through the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no idea that the Agricultural Committee would amend the Bill or amend the resolution, they would simply send down their recommendations to the House, and let the minister deal with them in the House.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I am pleased to see that the minister has changed his mind, and not allowed that reflection to be cast on the Agricultural Committee. I do not see why any difference should be made between that and other committees. I have attended a number of different committees, and although in some of them the conditions of a bear garden occasionally prevail, nothing of that kind has ever been seen in the Agricultural Committee. It is generally conducted on sensible lines, and with reasonably good order. I congratulate the chairman of the committee on the stand he has taken, and the order he has maintained in that committee all through.

Mr. STAPLES. It is an annual occurrence for the Minister of Agriculture to come down to this House towards the close of the session with some amendments to his Seed Grain Act. The first occasion I had to get on my feet in this House about seven years ago was in relation to a question similar to that which is before the House to-day. It was quite evident then, as it is to-day, that the Minister of Agriculture is on the wrong track, and this Bill does not meet existing requirements. The minister may go ahead and legislate all he pleases along this line, and noxious weeds will not by any means be exterminated, far from it. The Minister of Agriculture claims to be a practical farmer, and he should know that the seed that goes on to the farm should be absolutely pure and clean, and he may legislate as he pleases, and he will never accomplish that until he adopts a policy whereby the farmers of

this country may be furnished with clean seed. The only way the minister can do that, in my opinion, is to establish clean seed farms throughout the Dominion of Canada. If he would do that, and supervise them properly, and see that every farmer who has occasion to buy seed can go there and get it, and be guaranteed that it is absolutely clean, then the whole difficulty will be remedied. It would not cost a very large sum of money, the system would be self-sustaining. Every farmer in this country is anxious to get clean seed, and every farmer would be pleased to go there and get seed, and the minister would have no difficulty in getting the real value of that seed; in fact there would be a premium on it, as there always is on clean seed. If the minister would adopt that policy, the farmers would get cleaner and better seed, and they would get what they call at the present time, seed that is bred. The minister knows that you can increase the yield a great deal per cent by getting properly bred seed. Until that is done, the minister may legislate as he pleases, and the country will go on losing millions of dollars through noxious weeds; particularly in the west the farmers are losing millions of dollars every year. Look at the returns from the various provinces, and you will see that there is no other way in which farmers are losing as much money as they are losing through noxious weeds. The minister may come down here, as he does, every session with new Bills, and make long speeches—of course we know that the minister is noted for short speeches—but the time of the House is taken up in amending this Seed Grain Act session after session; whereas if he would adopt the policy I suggest the farmers would get clean seed and the noxious weed pest would be exterminated. The minister may reply that he has his experimental farm already, and that my suggestion would cost a great deal of money. I have told him my system would be self-sustaining. He can get in every municipality a section of land, or two sections if necessary, and put on a good practical farmer who would see that the land was properly cultivated, and that the best seed possible was produced. Although a great amount of money is gathered from the people, and about eighty per cent of it comes from the farmers, the minister allows other departments to get their hands into the treasury and take out what they please, while he neglects those for whom he is supposed to be looking after. I have always claimed that the Minister of Agriculture has not got for the farmers what they are justly entitled to.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that two years ago—I have not the information for the last year—the farmers of the three prairie provinces needed about 10,000,000 bushels of wheat for seed.

Mr. STAPLES. The minister certainly does not suppose that 10,000,000 bushels of seed are purchased by the farmers. There are hundreds and thousands of farmers that raise clean seed themselves, and it is only occasionally that they have to go outside and buy seed. Not one-tenth part of that amount is purchased. That shows how much the Minister of Agriculture knows about what is required.

Mr. FISHER. I understood my hon. friend a minute ago to say that it was my duty, or that it would be advantageous for me, to produce all the seed for the farmers of this country.

Mr. STAPLES. You misunderstood me.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad; I will not not say any more.

Mr. STAPLES. It is simply what is required to be produced and that is all that this resolution provides for. Two years ago I purchased some lawn grass seed with the government's guarantee that it was clean, I sent it out and had it sowed on my lawn and it was chuck full of Canadian thistle and sow thistle.

Resolutions reported and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 157) respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time.

Mr. FISHER moved that the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HENDERSON. I hope, now the minister has been good enough to grant the very reasonable request made, that he will be careful to see that when this Bill goes before the Committee on Agriculture he has the best expert in his department there to advise the committee. I think it is very desirable.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES SINCE CONFEDERATION.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. GRAHAM. In the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Gilbert) on the 13th February figures were given of a comprehensive nature which might lead to a misunderstanding. Presumably what the hon. member desired was a statement of the amount paid by the Dominion in cash as subsidies since confederation. The answer to this is that the amount charged by the Department of Railways and Canals against

railways on account of subsidies paid by the Dominion since confederation was $146,932,180, up to 30th June last.

THREATENED COAL STRIKE IN ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. HERRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King) if his department is doing anything to conciliate the difficulties between the mine operators and workers in the very serious situation which exists in southern Alberta, and perhaps also in British Columbia. This is a case where an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. After these men have gone on strike we all know it is a very difficult matter to bring them together, and I would like to impress upon the minister the seriousness of this case and to express the hope that his department is doing something to obviate the difficulty.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Herron) has brought up this subject because I think it is well that the members of this House and the people of this country should appreciate the very serious and critical state of affairs in the Crowsnest Pass at the present time. As my hon. friend knows the operators and miners held a conference last week with the object of arriving at an agreement if possible to govern their work and conditions for the next two years. There was a reason to believe that the conference would result in effecting an agreement. On the other hand, it occurred to me, having regard to past experience, that there was a possibility of the conference not arriving at a satisfactory agreement; so, I at once sent out to British Columbia Mr. McNiven, one of the officers of the Labour Department, to be on hand with the view of conferring with each of the parties in the event of an agreement not being reached. I understand that on Friday night of last week the two parties broke up without reaching an agreement, and that on Wednesday night of this week a meeting is to be held in Fernie at which a report by the delegates to this conference is to be made to the miners.

It is a little difficult to know just what can be done in the interval by the government, or by any one. Mr. McNiven is there for the express purpose of informing the miners and the operators that the good offices of the government are available to each of them to any extent that may be possible if they can suggest any way in which the good offices of the government can be used. Their attention is also being drawn to the fact that by legislation passed in this House a little time ago it is unlawful for a strike or a lock-out to be declared until a board of investigation has been appointed under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. Knowing the feeling of the parties in a situation of this kind and fearing that some of them might think there would be delay in the appointment of a board, I have instructed Mr. McNiven to say that if they will make application, because the government cannot act without an application from one side or the other, and if he looks it over and finds it conforms with the requirements of the Act, a board will be granted on the receipt of the application by wire, so that there will not be any necessity for delay. In fact, I think that I can undertake to say that, if the parties themselves will assist towards that end, we could appoint a board inside of twelve hours.

Any party who is responsible for inciting a strike in this situation will be assuming a grave responsibility, and I am glad for that reason that my hon. friend has brought up the question, because I think it is important that all parties concerned in this threatened trouble should realize just how serious may be the consequences if any action is precipitated which is not in accordance with the law. The Industrial Disputes Act provides that:

> It shall be unlawful for any employer to declare or cause a lock-out, or for any employee to go on strike, on account of any dispute prior to or during a reference of such dispute to a board of conciliation and investigation under the provisions of this Act.

Penalties for causing a lock-out in violation of the Act are fixed at from $100 to $1,000 for each day or part of a day that such lock-out exists. The penalty for going on strike contrary to the provisions of the Act in the case of an employee is from $10 up to $50 for each day or part of a day that such employee is on strike. Then, there is this penalty for inciting to lock-out or strike:

> Any person who incites, encourages or aids in any manner any employer to declare or continue a lock-out, or any employee to go or continue on strike contrary to the provisions of this Act, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of not less than fifty dollars nor more than one thousand dollars.

I hope that in this matter wise counsels and moderate action will prevail, and that the parties will see the wisdom of deferring any precipitate action until all the means which the law has provided have been exhausted. I would say to my hon. friends opposite that if they, or any one can suggest, in view of the situation as it is at the present time, anything which the government or the Department of Labour in particular can do further I would be very glad, indeed, to consider any proposals and if possible to give effect to them.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. LAKE.

Mr. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Before the orders of the day are called I desire to rise to a question of privilege. At the meeting held in Montreal on Saturday last the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), is reported in the Montreal 'Herald' to have made use of the following words:

I have told you what Mr. Haultain says. What does Mr. Lake say:

I approve of the agreement, the agreement is in the interests of my people, it will be in the interests of the people of Canada. What is my complaint against it? I complain against it because it does not include a larger measure of manufactured articles.

The words attributed to me are placed in quotation marks. If that is a correct report of what was said by the minister I desire to say that it is absolutely untrue as to any words I used, and it is an absolute misrepresentation of my meaning. My statement is on 'Hansard' so that there can be no question as to what it was. I cannot believe that the minister read the 'Hansard' and I can only imagine that he got his information from other sources. I am aware that the Liberal press has misrepresented the attitude which I have taken in regard to this matter, but that is not unusual and I did not think it necessary to call attention to it. But when a minister of the Crown makes such a statement it is of course quite another matter and I must raise my protest against it.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say positively just now whether the words read are the exact words I used, but I heard the hon. member's speech and I read the 'Hansard' afterwards and I certainly did understand the hon. member to give this House to understand that he approved of the agreement, that he believed the agreement was in the interests of his people and of Canada, and he complained that there was not along with the agreement anything to indicate a reduction of the duties on some manufactured articles. That was the impression that his words and the reading of his speech conveyed to me. I did not undertake to quote the exact words of the hon. gentleman because I had not the 'Hansard' with me but I did state what was my interpretation of his words. If I have misrepresented him and if my understanding was not the proper one I can only regret it and I shall accept any explanation of his words which he chooses to put forward.

Mr. LAKE. I have made my explanation to the House and I do not presume it is necessary for me to make it over again. If the Minister of Agriculture did take that understanding from the words I used I can only say that he has shown a singular lack of intelligence in regard to the matter.

RECIPROCITY—BRITISH AMBASSADOR

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Before the orders of the day are called I wish to point out that according to the associated press despatch the British ambassador leads the press to believe that the members of the Canadian government who represented us at Washington were warned by the British ambassador that commercial union would bring about political union. I would like to ask whether the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the Minister of Customs were warned in that regard.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will quote any statement that the British ambassador made on the subject I shall be exceedingly happy to take note of it. I do not think it would be fair in a matter of that sort, to pay attention to some rumours in the public press.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We assist the associated press by a money grant to send despatches to this country and I would naturally expect that these despatches would be correct. This is in accordance with a statement said to have been made in the British House of Commons.

Mr. FIELDING. In giving assistance to the associated press it was distinctly understood that while we would aid in getting this news we incurred no responsibility whatever for the character of the news sent.

CHARLES D. SHELDON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I ask the Minister of Justice whether any action has been taken by this government to assist in bringing back to Canada, Charles D. Sheldon the former wizard of finance in Montreal who has been arrested in Pittsburg?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Nothing in reference to that matter has come to my knowledge except the item I have seen in the newspapers, and I do not suppose that in the ordinary course of public business it will come to the knowledge of the Department of Justice. Everything relating to the administration of justice in the province is by the British North America Act assigned to the authorities of the province.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are we to understand that the Department of Justice is not to take any action in reference to the fraudulent use of the mails?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I can only say that if this man is brought back to Canada, any information in the matter which is brought before me, so far as it falls within the province of the Department of Justice, will have the fullest consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say that I am informed that the Attorney General of the province of Quebec has issued a warrant against Sheldon which will still have effect when he is brought back to Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And is it the intention of the Postmaster General to prosecute him for the fraudulent use of the mails?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We will see what the Attorney General of Quebec will do.

SUPPLY—THE BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Supply.

Mr. STAPLES. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he has any information, official or otherwise, from the government of Manitoba as regards the proposition made by this government for the extension of the boundaries of that province. When the Prime Minister was in the west last summer he stated in my constituency and in my hearing that if Mr. Roblin would only come down to Ottawa he and Mr. Roblin could settle the boundary question in ten minutes. The Prime Minister knows that Mr. Roblin took the first opportunity to come to Ottawa, that he conferred with the right hon. gentleman, that they discussed the question for much longer than 10 minutes and that the result was that instead of making a satisfactory proposition to Manitoba the right hon. gentleman made such a proposition that both the government and the opposition in the legislature absolutely refused to accept it. In fact, they have taken it, and justly so, as an insult. All that the province of Manitoba asks is equal treatment with other provinces and I would like to ask the Prime Minister now what he proposes doing towards that little province; whether he intends to make another proposition or whether the matter is to stand as it has stood for many years much to the dissatisfaction of the people of Manitoba.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Staples), that up to the present time I have received no information as to the answer of the province of Manitoba to the suggestion made on behalf of the government of Canada for the extension of the boundaries of the province. I know at the present time no more about the matter than the hon. gentleman has himself seen in the newspapers. I presume that before long we shall have the official answers of the province and we shall then be in a position to discuss it in this House, when we shall be very glad to have the views of my hon. friend. It is quite true that in his constituency and in his presence, I stated that if Mr. Roblin would come to Ottawa and discuss the question I had hopes that in ten minutes we would dispose of it. I am sorry to say that in making that statement I presumed too much on Mr. Roblin, although I believe that we can still convince him. I may say that Mr. Roblin at the present time is simply uniting together two things which are quite separate, namely, the extension of the boundary and what terms should be given to the province in lieu of lands, and, another readjustment of the subsidies paid generally to the province of Manitoba as well as to the other provinces of the confederation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the Prime Minister is doing justice to Mr. Roblin in this connection. The right hon. gentleman said in the west that he could settle the question with Mr. Roblin in ten minutes. Mr. Roblin came here twice at least without getting any suggestion or answer from the Prime Minister; and even after going back to Manitoba he waited for a month or perhaps two months before any offer was made. I am speaking of reports which are current in the public press; if I am not correct, the Prime Minister will contradict me. Therefore, in saying that he relied too much on Mr. Roblin's moderation, or something of that kind, the Prime Minister is hardly doing Mr. Roblin justice. As I understand the circumstances, the offer eventually presented by this government to the province of Manitoba was in writing, in the form of a telegram or a letter. It was the first offer that this government had made with respect to financial terms that could be reasonably treated as such. The result of that has been that the Liberals and the Conservatives in the legislature of Manitoba have united in saying that that offer is one that cannot possibly be accepted by the province. Therefore, I see no reason for the suggestion of the Prime Minister that Mr. Roblin has not acted in an eminently reasonable manner in this connection. As I understand the contention of the province of Manitoba, it claims to be put either in the position of the two provinces to the west or in the position of the provinces in the east. In the one case it would be entitled to a very much larger financial allowance than that which the government has offered; in the other case, it would be entitled to its public domain and to compensation for the public domain that has been disposed of by this govern-

ment in the past. That is the situation, and looking at it with every desire to be reasonable, I cannot see that very much fault can be found with the claim of the province. I do not think it can be attacked logically.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the matter at this moment. I will simply say that in my judgment the two positions my hon. friend has suggested are not necessarily connected. The extension of the boundaries of the province and the adjustment of the subsidies are two things apart, and we will discuss them later on.

THE MARKETING OF CHEESE AND BUTTER.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). I desire to bring to the attention of the House, and more especially the Minister of Agriculture, a matter which I think should be legislated upon before the close of this session. Some weeks ago a deputation of five or six hundred dairymen waited on the government and asked for protection in the marketing of cheese similar to that granted to the grain growers of the west in the marketing of their wheat. I understand that the grain buyers are obliged to give guarantee bonds covering the amount of their purchases of wheat, thus protecting the farmers of the west against possible loss through the failure of any buyers who are financially irresponsible. Canada, I believe, exports more than three times as much cheese as all the other countries of the world put together, so that it is a very important industry to Canada as a whole. It is particularly important to eastern Ontario and western Quebec. In the past many failures have taken place owing to the buyers being financially irresponsible, resulting in serious loss to many farmers. I think that steps should be taken before the close of this session to provide against the possibility of similar losses during the coming season. If legislation of this kind were introduced, I believe it would receive the general support of members on both sides of this House, and be approved by the country. It could not be successfully introduced by a member on this side, because the government apparently are jealous of any legislation put through by members on this side of the House. It should be introduced by a member of the government. I wish to add a word with regard to numerous complaints that have been made as to the weighing of cheese in Montreal, and as to the quality specified by the buyer. Heavy losses have been sustained by the producers of cheese through buyers cutting the weight and claiming that the cheeses were inferior in quality, the price in consequence being placed very much below what it should be. Some years ago there was appointed by this government an official referee, whose duty it was to decide any disputes as to the weight of cheese, and I think that official should be reappointed. His services were dispensed with because it was urged that there was not enough for him to do; but the Chief Dairy Commissioner has stated that the very presence of the referee had a good effect in so far as the weighing of the cheese was concerned. I think that this government could easily provide work for an official referee and a staff of experts to look after the marketing of our cheese and butter. I think there should be certainly at Montreal and possibly at other places a government cold storage warehouse for the reception of cheese, butter and other perishable products, and that that warehouse should be free to the public. If we had there a staff of experts who would not only see the cheese or butter weighed, but would test it and stamp it with the government's certificate as to its quality it would have a very valuable effect and would stimulate the producers to produce only the very best quality and would put us on a more equal footing with some other countries which have adopted a similar plan. The fact of our cheese before export having been examined by competent men who would stamp on it its quality and guarantee its weight, would be an advantage to our cheese in foreign markets. The government would be remiss in its duty if it did not take steps to provide effectively against loss through the failures of buyers in Montreal who are practically irresponsible.

Mr. FISHER. Unfortunately owing to an engagement of long standing I was unable to be present when the deputation met the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I have gone over their recommendations and discussed them with my colleagues, and some of my officers. I do not think that the deputation advised the plan suggested by my hon. friend of having a government cold-storage warehouse available to the trade. That would be a very large undertaking, and would interfere with private enterprise, perhaps in an objectionable way and I doubt the advisability of such a course. We could not require shippers to put their products in our cold-storage, and we would be entering into competition with private cold-storage. I doubt if we could arrange for a system of management of that cold-storage which would be satisfactory to the shippers. I recognize that in New Zealand they have a system of government inspection, grading and stamping of dairy goods, but that is done in a way which I do not think our dairy producers or the dairy trade would like to have here. It would mean that the goods would have to be delivered to the government warehouse, where they would have to be inspected,

graded and stamped and then they would have to be wholly controlled by government officers until they were shipped out of the country. That is the case in New Zealand. I do not think our dairy trade would like that, they have certainly never asked for anything of the kind in Canada. If the government inspected and stamped these goods, and then allowed the shippers to have control of them, it might bring discredit on the stamping because the goods might be held in such a way that their quality might deteriorate and still they would go forward with the government stamp as having the government approval and grading. That would be a very risky thing for the credit of our dairy products.

There are obstacles in the way of doing what the deputation suggested. My hon. friend spoke of the weighing of butter and cheese at Montreal. Here I have to say most emphatically that the dairy sellers in the country have not done justice to themselves in utilizing the services of the official weigher of the city of Montreal for their own protection. Under the Act, boards of trade are authorized to appoint official weighers. The Montreal board has an official weigher. I have never yet heard a complaint of any certificate issued by the official weigher of the Board of Trade of Montreal. Mr. Cameron, the only official weigher of the Board of Trade of Montreal, has told me and written me himself that he is able and willing to weigh all shipments of dairy products to Montreal, but his services are very little availed of by the dairy shippers of Ontario and Quebec. The produce dealers of Montreal without any legal authority, under no legislative Act of either the local or Dominion parliament, have appointed a weigher of their own, a Mr. John McLeod. They have all the goods that are shipped to them weighed by Mr. John McLeod, and the certificate which they make use of, and on the authority of which they cut the prices of shipments made to them are of no more value in law than the weights marked by the makers at the cheese factory or butter factory before the cheese goes on, and yet our dairy shippers have allowed themselves to be imposed upon by certificates of that gentleman. Mr. John McLeod is the servant of the purchaser in Montreal. He is paid by the dealers there who purchase the dairy products. He is their officer and servant. The shipper of dairy products from outside Montreal who ships in there, and has his bill cut on the strength of a certificate of Mr. John McLeod, is being imposed upon; he has no reason at all to accept that certificate, and he can at any minute he likes, refuse to do so, and secure his money. Any who are doing that to-day are doing it with their eyes open, for, as long as six or seven years ago, I went into that matter with the butter and cheese branch of the board of trade. I made the statements I am now making, published them in a letter over my own name in the press, and had the subject explained at a number of the cheese boards and dairy boards in the country. I have said over and over again that, until some fair complaint was made against the legal weighers of these articles in Montreal, I could not take any steps in the matter. Mr. Cameron is the only legal weigher of these articles or any other articles that come into Montreal, and I have never yet heard a single complaint in regard to the certificates issued by Mr. Cameron. I believe his weighing is absolutely fair and right. But, if the people who send their goods to Montreal will not insist that the official weigher shall be employed, that is their fault.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the shippers to Montreal be equally well paid for the goods weighed by the board of trade weigher as for the goods weighed by themselves?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say. That is a matter which must be left to them. Purchasers in Montreal have the right to pay what they please.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is not the minister aware that they practically force the shippers to ship direct to them and accept their weights?

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter of bargain between the buyer and the seller. If there were a dozen official weighers in Montreal, the same thing might as easily occur. If I were to appoint an official weigher to-morrow, he would have no more authority than Mr. Cameron has, and the purchaser of butter and cheese could refuse to have his weighing as well as Mr. Cameron's. I am sorry to say that, in many cases the sellers in the country allow themselves to be dictated to in their dealings with the buyers in the city. But they have the remedy in their own hands; they need only insist upon their rates. If there were a dispute and it were carried to the courts, the certificate of Mr. John Macleod would have no more authority than the marking on the box of cheese or tub of butter by the maker in the factory. It would be the testimony of a private individual and no more. The certificate of Mr. Cameron, on the contrary, is of official character.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the minister mean by Mr. Macleod, the official referee appointed by the government?

Mr. FISHER. He never was an official referee, nor was he employed by the government in any way. I said he was an employee of the Butter and Cheese Association of Montreal. His certificate carries no more weight with the public than the certificate issued by a warehouseman.

Mr. EDWARDS. The certificate of the official referee would.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Cameron is there as official weigher of the Board of Trade of Montreal. But what is the use of having two sets of official weighers when there is already an official weigher appointed under the law by the authority of the board of trade, why appoint another man to do the same work? I cannot see any reason for it. The parliament of Canada passed an Act providing that the official weighers in the cities should be appointed by the boards of trade. That is one of the things that is handed over to the boards of trade.

Mr. EDWARDS. Why did the government appoint an official referee and subsequently dispense with his services?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) should keep the two things separate. The official referee has not anything to do with weights. He was there to decide disputes as to quality——

Mr. EDWARDS. And weights.

Mr. FISHER. No, the hon. gentleman is mistaken. It was I who appointed the official referee and gave him his instructions, and those instructions were to see whether the butter or cheese was of the quality of 'finest,' as it is commonly called in the Canadian trade. The referee was appointed because of some complaints. And for the first year there were quite a number of references made to him and he dealt with them, I think, in a most satisfactory way. He was appointed, if I remember well, in 1901. He was a very efficient man, and his judgment was recognized. The position of official referee was held by Mr. A. W. Woodard until 1906 or 1907. Other gentlemen were appointed until 1910, when no referee was appointed. The reason for the non-appointment was that references to the referee had practically ceased and the referee was doing nothing most of the time. In 1910, I am informed, there were only three or four applications for the referee, and I confess that we did not consider it was in the public interest to keep a man at a high salary—because a man for such a position had to have a man of high qualifications and character—doing nothing all summer. Had he been useful, had he had work to do, we would have continued the appointment. There was no desire to save the money, if the money was doing any good, but, so far as we could see there was practically no need for an official referee in Montreal. I point out to my hon. friend that the referee had to do only with the question of quality. Weighing is under the control and management of the official weigher, and I do not think it would be wise to interfere with the authority of the appointee of the Board of Trade of Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything in the law which says that the weight of an article as given by the official weigher must be accepted as correct, in other words, that his evidence in a court of law would be given more credence than the evidence of a private individual who had weighed the same article?

Mr. FISHER. I think there is a clause in the Inspection and Sale Act which says that the certificate of an official weigher should be taken as prima facie evidence of the fact. Now, I will say a word or two about the licensing system which has been proposed. I appreciate the difficulties that have arisen, and I regret the losses that have occurred through the purchases of butter and cheese by regular buyers. I fear, however, that if we were to restrict in any way the number of people who might buy and sell butter and cheese as freely as they do other commodities, we would land ourselves in greater difficulties than we are in now. My hon. friend has cited the experience of the grain trade in the west. While I have not, I am not thoroughly familiar with the working of their system, I know licenses are issued, and I believe that these licenses carry with them some kind of guarantee which is supplied to the chief commissioner or some other official; the buyers of grain have to supply a guarantee. I want to point out that if we did that in the city of Montreal, we should probably have to do it elsewhere, and we would probably reduce considerably the competition in the purchase of dairy products. The number of men who deal in these things in the ordinary way is already rather small, and if we were to restrict to such as took out licenses and gave a guarantee, and the right to purchase butter and cheese from producers, I fear we would interfere with the competition in these articles and reduce the price to consumers. As a matter of fact to-day we do not know when butter and cheese are bought for export or for home consumption. I have known instances where a grocer goes out and buys large quantities in competition with the regular dealers, but he may do so only occasionally. An individual who thinks he knows something about the business may want to buy dairy products and put them into his store, but if he is obliged to have a license and to give a guarantee, he cannot do it, because he would not think it worth while to take out his license. Therefore, I fear that it would work to the greater detriment to the sale of our butter and cheese at the factories.

Mr. EDWARDS. The dairy men themselves do not agree with the minister.

Mr. FISHER. Some of them do not, and some of them do. The question has been discussed for some time. I know that the

deputation my hon. friend refers to gave that view, and I venture to think they did not consider the other side of the question very thoroughly. I know there are a number of dairymen who have expressed the fear I have just uttered. I think the result would be that comparatively few men would take out their licenses and furnish the guarantee, and that a closer monopoly would be established than now exists. True, there have been a few failures. I think in the last quarter of a century there have been comparatively few among purchasers and dealers in dairy products. None of the great houses, none of the big dealers, have failed, within my memory. I do not think the hurt to the farmers has been as great as would be the restriction and the monopoly of the right to purchase. I am glad to discuss this question, and have discussed it with my deputy, and with the Department of Trade and Commerce, and will do so again. The views I am now giving are, I think, based on the best interests of the trade. I am not wedded to my opinion, I am only giving it as an opinion, perhaps not absolutely final. I want to put that side of the question before the hon. member and before those for whom he is speaking, so that they may realize that what they are proposing has its dangers—dangers which are very considerable, and which may work greater harm than their proposals would work good.

Mr. KIDD. If the minister would appoint an official weigher at Montreal it would remove a grievance of which the farmers and dairymen have been complaining for years.

Mr. FISHER. What difference would a second official weigher make?

Mr. KIDD. He would settle the disputes that arise in Montreal.

Mr. FISHER. Will not Mr. Cameron do that to-day? He has every power of an official weigher.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have not the pleasure of Mr. Cameron's acquaintance, therefore, this matter cannot be taken as having any personal bearing. I do not question his standing at all in any respect but in the minds of some people, possibly entirely wrongly, there is the impression that in a dispute as to weights between a shipper, say, from Frontenac, or any other part of the country, and a buyer, a resident of Montreal, the official weigher in Montreal, appointed by the Montreal Board of Trade, and living there, would be influenced in favour of a fellow resident of his own city rather than a stranger. Many of the shippers of cheese have felt that about the only way they could have any guarantee that they were getting correct weights was to follow their shipments down to Montreal, a course entailing expense and trouble, I do not think they would have that impression with regard to an official weigher appointed by this government.

Mr. FISHER. The shippers allow themselves to be imposed upon by the certificate of a man who is not an official weigher. I would immediately yield if anybody could show me that Mr. Cameron's certificate has been disputed. The trouble is that the sellers accept Mr. McLeod's certificate. Mr. McLeod is a servant of the man who buys and they allow themselves to be imposed upon. It is not the certificate of the official weigher in Montreal with which they are confronted but it is the certificate of an absolutely irresponsible employee of the other side of the bargain. Mr. Cameron is there, he has every authority that anybody I could appoint could have, and until his certificates are shown to be bad, unfair or unjust, it seems to me that it is not necessary to appoint a second man. I do not think that the hon. member has realized that it is not the official weigher's certificates that have been complained of. If they had been then there would be reason for appointing a second official weigher or changing the official weigher, but that is not the case. It is the certificates of Mr. McLeod, who is not an official weigher but who is the servant of the buyer and who therefore is under the control of the buyer, that are complained of. Mr. Cameron is not under the control of the buyer, he is under the control of the Board of Trade of Montreal and he has no responsibility and is under no obligation to any butter or cheese association.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The position taken by the Minister of Agriculture is a most pitiable one. The minister knows full well that in the past ten years the members on this side of the House have been trying to force him to appoint a government weigher at Montreal. He knows full well that even his own officials have told him that that is the position for him to take. Mr. Parmelee who went down and examined into this question showed him the utter folly it would be to continue the system which now prevails at the port of Montreal. The men in the dairy industry of this country are being fleeced out of hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, the minister knows it and yet he says let these men go to the courts and collect from the exporters the amount that is due to them. That is nothing but a baby position for any man to take; that is not the position that the Minister of Agriculture should take. If the Minister of Agriculture would ap-

point a government weigher at Montreal and force all shipments to be weighed by that government weigher, not by an official appointed by the Board of Trade, but a man in the employ of this government, whose duty it would be to weigh all the butter and cheese shipped through the port of Montreal, the people would be satisfied that they had at least justice. But at the present time the minister says that it is open to the buyers to simply give any weights they wish of butter and cheese sent for export. I certainly think it is a most pitiable position for the minister to take on this question because we have brought it to his attention year after year and he knows that the farmers are being fleeced out of hundreds of thousands of dollars every year and that that money goes into the pockets of the exporters in Montreal. He knows that if he would appoint a government weigher at Montreal and require all goods sent there to be weighed by him the exporters could not take the advantage that they are taking of the farmers to-day. I regret indeed to see the minister take such a position on this question, but we have brought this matter before this House year after year for the last ten years and we do not seem to be able to pound into the head of the minister the fact that it is necessary to appoint a government weigher at Montreal. Every little municipality throughout the country appoints its own weigher and forces practically everything that goes to the market to be weighed on the market scales. If we had a government weigher at Montreal there is no reason why all shipments of butter, cheese and dairy products should not be weighed by him with the result that the shippers of the country would receive their just dues in this regard.

Mr. THORNTON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to a point in connection with the sale of cheese in the old country. Two years ago I called his attention to the fact that Canadian bacon was being sold in England as United States product. Now, we have the fact before us that Canadian cheese is being sold continuously in England as American cheese. Something should be done to prevent misrepresentation of that kind. In proof of the statement I make, I want to call the attention of the House to the 'Weekly Report' issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce and bearing date of March 6, 1911. This contains the report of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, who, under the heading of 'Canadian cheese confused with United States product,' says:

> Upon that point a recent incident which came under the notice of this office occurred at one of the largest stores in London. A well known Canadian cheese manufacturer asked a clerk in the dairy section of the store in question for a famous brand of Canadian cream cheese and also for ordinary Canadian Stilton. The assistant stated that he kept only United States brand, as there was little demand for Canadian. As the clerk proceeded to cut off the required quantities, the purchaser recognized the mark as being a Canadian brand of which he was actually the manufacturer, and the Stilton was also seen to be by the mark as coming from within a few miles of Toronto.

If this thing is allowed to go on it is a great injustice to the Canadian cheese trade. Something should be done to protect the Canadian cheese trade so that the United States would not get the credit for what is actually a Canadian product.

Mr. FISHER. I do not dispute the incident, but I have no knowledge of it. As a general rule Canadian cheese commands a higher price in the English market than American cheese, and I do not see how any one would want to sell Canadian cheese as American except it be some foolish man who does not know the difference.

Mr. THORNTON. There is no question about the fact; it is stated by our trade commissioner.

Mr. FISHER. I am not disputing it at all.

Mr. SCHELL. I want to correct the idea that seems to prevail with some people that the farmers are being robbed by the cheese buyers. I take exception to that statement. I have had a good deal to do with the weighing and handling of cheese in Oxford factories, and I know that the cheese maker or the salesman at the factory usually does the weighing and the buyers almost invariably accept the weights given them. Occasionally they weigh half a dozen cheeses or so, and if they find them varying sufficiently to justify suspicion that they were not properly weighed they make a reduction of say 100 pounds or 150 pounds as the case may be, but usually the weights given to the buyers are paid for. I think that is the custom in other places as well as in Oxford. If the farmers are robbed by the buyers it is because of carelessness on the part of the cheese maker or the salesman in whose hands the weighing of and settlement for the cheese is left. If the weights the buyers propose to pay for are not satisfactory to the salesman he does not have to accept whatever amount is offered. I think it is only fair to the cheese buyers that I should make this statement.

Mr. NESBITT. I attended a meeting of the eastern dairymen, and when I returned home I took particular care to make inquiry from the salesmen of our different factories, and they all assured me they had no trouble whatever of that kind

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did the hon. gentleman ask how much extra cheese and

butter they put into each package they sent to Montreal?

Mr. NESBITT. I explained to them the statement that had been made, and their answer was that they had no complaint of that kind to make.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

To encourage the production and use of superior seeds for farm crops and enforcement of the Seed Control Act, $60,000.

Mr. FISHER. The increase of $10,000 is due to the enlargement of the work all along the line.

Mr. FOSTER. The expenditure of $50,000 for seeds alone is a pretty large expenditure, and the minister might tell us briefly his system, and what the ultimate aim is; whether this is simply to be continued until the time when the farmers may through their associations or individually look after their own seeds, and if so, how long does the minister expect this appropriation will be necessary?

Mr. FISHER. This covers the expenditure for the administration of the Seed Control Act. There is a chief inspector for the maritime provinces, one for Quebec, one for Ontario, one for Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and one for Alberta and British Columbia. We have a seed laboratory at Ottawa where we test samples of seeds, and we have a subsidiary laboratory at Calgary where we test seeds for the western country.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the laboratory cost?

Mr. FISHER. The officials are under the Civil Service Act, and I would have to pick them out to see what the cost is. There are five clerks in the third division, subdivision (a) with salaries ranging from $1,150 to $1,200, and 12 clerks in subdivision (b) including two typewriters and stenographers.

Mr. FOSTER. How many clerks are there in Calgary?

Mr. FISHER. In addition to the superintendent, who is in charge of the whole work in Alberta and British Columbia, there is one permanent clerk, and two temporary clerks who are employed at the rate of $50 a month for a short time in the spring when a great many seeds are being tested. Then, there are the expenses of the laboratory besides. We are asking for $4,000 for the whole laboratory supply, for which last year we had $3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister tell us the cost of administering the Seeds Control Act?

Mr. FISHER. It is about $4,000, not including the salaries.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the next item?

Mr. FISHER. The salaries of the outside service, for which we are asking for $12,000; it was $10,000 last year. For travelling expenses we are asking for $10,000; last year the amount was $8,500. For office supplies generally, we are asking for $2,500. For the publication of bulletins we are asking for $9,000 as against $6,000 last year. The work of preparing these bulletins is done by the staff. We are also preparing a book upon the grasses of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it going to be an edition de luxe?

Mr. FISHER. No, but a very well illustrated book. There is also an item of $12,000 for seed fairs and field competitions. We encourage the holding of fairs all over the country for competition in the judging of good seeds. We pay practically all the expenses except the cost of the prizes. The field competitions are carried on largely in co-operation with the Provincial Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of encouraging the growing of good seeds. Wherever a provincial department of agriculture asks for our aid, we supply the judges and send out the formulae, rules, &c., of the competitions. We also give encouragement to the Canadian Seed Growers' Association, which has been in existence ten or twelve years, and has a large number of members in all parts of the country, of course who are engaged in the production of seed and in what is called the breeding of seed. That association issues certificates for the pedigrees of seeds, to show that they are pure seeds grown under favourable conditions. We make a grant to the association of $4,000 a year. We also give aid to provincial exhibitions to the amount of $2,500 a year, wherever a provincial government organizes a seed exhibition and applies for this aid.

Mr. FOSTER. How many of these exhibitions were held last year?

Mr. FISHER. They were held in every province except British Columbia. To most of them we give about $250 each. Ontario did not apply for it last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the department had knowledge that these exhibitions have excited interest and proved successful?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, very much so. Our officers are always present at them. That is practically the list of items.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like a little information as to what the laboratory does. I find there are 19 clerks and part of the time of a superintendent for Alberta and

British Columbia; the salaries amount to about $16,000, and the expenses to about $4,000. What does the country get for that expenditure in the way of education?

Mr. FISHER. We receive the samples from the farmers, and a great many from seed dealers who wish to know if the seed they are handling is up to standard. We are obliged to reply promptly, we get about 70 samples a day and it takes about an hour for a clerk or employee to do a sample. A little over 7,000 samples were tested last year. The samples come generally from all the provinces, but the greater number from Ontario, which is the great grass seed producing province.

Mr. FOSTER. How many would there be at Calgary?

Mr. FISHER. Not quite a thousand. Two or three years ago when there was a great deal of frosted wheat in the Northwest we received more than 14,000 samples, because the farmers were suspicious of their seed grain.

Mr. FOSTER. Do any of the provinces operate seed laboratories?

Mr. FISHER. No. I may say that we have received high encomiums on the work done. There is an organization of seed laboratories in the United States, and they have frequently praised the work here very highly.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any means by which the information acquired through testing the samples is given to the farmers generally, or is the benefit solely to the farmer who sends in the sample? That is, do you give information as to the best varieties in reference to germination, &c.?

Mr. FISHER. We do not undertake to say whether generally timothy would be the best seed or alsike. We keep the information here of all tests and it is useful in preparing our dicta as to the best varieties to use.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that 7,000 or 8,000 farmers then get the benefit of this service? If you were to make it so general as to be useful to the great majority of farmers, it would involve a great expense. You make no charge for the services rendered the farmers? How is that carried on in other countries?

Mr. FISHER. In Europe the farmers pay for it. In the work in our department we have never charged the farmers for anything we do for them. In addition to what the farmers send in we collect large numbers of samples through our own agents, especially from dealers, and we always publish the results and give the names of the dealers in these cases, so as to be a check on them, to help advertise the good ones and condemn the bad ones. We do not do that with the samples sent in by the farmers.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the laboratory help employed all the time?

Mr. FISHER. During the busy season they are very strenuously employed. At other times, when there is not such pressure, they are employed in sending out bulletins and in carrying on investigations.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). How many copies of the book on farm weeds are on hand?

Mr. FISHER. We have issued the second edition, which has been largely distributed. We found it was an expensive book, and beyond the distribution to members of parliament and to some schools and libraries, &c., the King's Printer has been selling the book at a dollar a copy. It costs us about $1.30 a volume, but we wish to give it as wide a circulation as possible, and so have been charging only $1.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). A couple of young men from my riding, students in the Agricultural College at Guelph, wrote me stating that every other student in the college had a copy of this work from the members of their several counties. I applied to the minister and was politely told that I might have the book if I paid for it. Is the minister so strict as that in the distribution?

Mr. FISHER. At the beginning we gave out a certain number to every member of parliament. Since that, I have been answering every member as my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart, Lanark) was answered. I confess that I have paid for a good many copies myself and sent them out. But the department has tried to be strict in the distribution, because the book is too good for general circulation. Every college library and every school library is furnished on application, and the agricultural colleges have not only one, but several copies. But we have not undertaken to give them to each pupil in the agricultural colleges.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I wanted to know if there was any favouritism in this matter.

Mr. FISHER. There is not.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I think the minister should make an exception in the case of boys studying agriculture, and that in case of application on their behalf the minister might order copies to be sent them.

Mr. FISHER. That would mean a pretty wide distribution. In the Agricultural College at Guelph alone, I think it would mean about 1,200 copies a year. There are a good many of what are called short course men.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the minister supply the municipalities that make application?

Mr. FISHER. I think copies of the first edition were sent to the secretary-treasurers of the municipalities.

Mr. STAPLES. Throughout the entire Dominion?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, whatever we have done in this direction applies to the whole Dominion. But we found that many of the secretary-treasurers took the book for themselves instead of leaving it in the archives of the municipal council. And the same way with school teachers—in many cases the teacher, on leaving school, took the book with him. Now, we send them only to schools that have libraries.

Mr. STAPLES. Is a letter sent to the secretary-treasurer of the school district informing him that the book is for the school library only?

Mr. FISHER. Each book is stamped to indicate that it is for the school library. When a school applies, the inspector must state that the school has a library or the book is not sent.

Mr. HENDERSON. Like the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) I had an application from a young man from my own county attending the Agricultural College at Guelph. I applied to the minister and was told that I should apply to the King's Printer who would supply me at the nominal price of $1 a copy. I had not been accustomed to pay for these publications, and I wrote to the young man and told him that the government sent these books in such cases as his only when they were paid for. But I confess I have no sympathy with this policy of the minister; I think it is false economy. What is the use of this parliament legislating against noxious weeds if the men to whom it is most important to instruct in this matter are not given the information which the minister possesses? I think the minister will find that there are hundreds of thousands of dollars spent in this country for purposes not half so commendable as supplying these students with information which will be valuable to the country as well as to themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) struck the right note in his closing words. I have a great deal of sympathy with the minister who wants to make a show of being economical, though he is mighty extravagant in everything else. But the question has to be settled how far the government is to go into the publishing business, especially in publishing editions de luxe. Well, some one I think has been issuing an edition de luxe.

Mr. FISHER. There has been one issued by the Geological Survey.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought so. It would be nice for the government to go to work and get out all these beautiful things and put them into that splendid form, and send one to every family in the Dominion. But the question is how far the government can go into this matter of book publication and of free distribution. That is a matter which we cannot settle too lightly. But there is one thing that might be done, if the government is determined to make expenditures of a certain sort which are absolutely useless, if they would take the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). For instance, about half a million dollars has already been spent on the Newmarket canal, and with that money all the agricultural students in the Dominion of Canada for years could be given this edition de luxe.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite as to the distribution of this book. It would be a good idea if the Minister of Agriculture would bring about a more general distribution. I have quite a number of applications from young men in my own county, and I have found that by sending a dollar a copy to the department I am able to get the book. I see the difficulty the minister has in drawing the line. But I think it would be desirable if he could find some way by which members would be able to send the book to the young men in their constituencies that really require it for an education. Naturally, the minister is anxious not to charge his department with an unnecessary expenditure, because this is an expensive book. But it could be got out in a less expensive form, and be brought more generally into the hands of those who really desire it and need it for educational purposes. I agree in the idea of a wider distribution.

Mr. FISHER. I must take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) about this book being an edition de luxe. While it is a very handsome and well got up book, at the same time the expense is confined almost entirely to the preparation of the plates and the printing of these illustrations in colours. But that is an essential, there is no luxury about it, is is an essential to the farmer and students who use the book. The letterpress was prepared by my own department, and the printing does not cost any more than that of an ordinary book. Of course, the binding is strong, as it should be for a book that is printed for distribution. There is no luxury about the book unless you choose to call beautiful illustrations a luxury.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not agree that it is essential that the colours should be reproduced in all their beauty. There are other distinguishing marks besides colours which divide books off into families and species. All that is necessary for an intelligent observer is that he should have these distinguishing things put into form, and then put alongside of it the different colours if you want to. Now that you have got the plates you might get this book out for a shilling or not much more.

Mr. NESBITT. I would like to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that they are not alone in being obliged to pay for the book. They might think that simply because they sit on the other side of the House they would be told that they must purchase the book. I have been obliged to pay for the books I have got from the department. I do not agree with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that the book should not be published in natural colours representing the various weeds. That is a feature which is of great assistance to those who are studying the question of weeds, it is essential that they should be represented in their natural colours. Of course I may not know as much about weeds as the hon. member for North Toronto, but that is the view that I take of this question. Nor do I agree that it would be of any great public utility to send a book out broadcast to people who do not appreciate it. It can be found in all reference libraries. The minister has distributed it very freely, and he says he has sent it to every member of parliament free. I have distributed mine where I thought they would be most useful, mainly to schools. The book is, of course, found in all the agricultural colleges, and I venture to affirm that any student who is anxious to pursue the study of this subject can find the book in the libraries of his neighbourhood. If any student wishes to get the book he can apply to his member to get it for him. A dollar for the book is not much for a man who is really anxious to obtain knowledge. After all, I thoroughly endorse what the Minister of Agriculture has done with reference to the distribution of the book.

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). The book in question, I think, is very useful and very beautifully got up. I think if the mechanical part of it were made any cheaper you would largely destroy the usefulness of the book. During the past year I have had quite a number of applications for the book from students and others, perhaps 12 or 15 in all, and on each occasion that I sent a dollar to the department the book was sent back to me. If hon. gentlemen opposite had done the same thing they would have got the book.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me there is a feeling in this House that this book should be distributed with a little more generosity. We are not all like the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), we are not millionaires. We cannot afford to put our hands into our pockets and hand out a dollar for every book which we wish to supply to the students in our respective counties. I think it is the duty of the government; what the government is for is to help the people.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is one of the things that we expect the government to do. We have had a resolution brought down here to-day with regard to the destruction of noxious weeds, and we are actually going to seal up in the archives of the country the information that is necessary to know which weeds are bad and which are not so bad. The Minister of Agriculture has gone back on his record. At one time it was thought that he was the friend of the farmer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. The right hon. the Prime Minister endorses what I say that at one time he was thought the friend of the farmer. I am glad to hear my right hon. friend say 'hear, hear,' to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I believe it yet.

Mr. HENDERSON. He thinks he is yet; I cannot agree with my right hon. friend. I think he has gone back on the farmers. Some two years ago he distributed this beautiful, well-bound, handsome book, it need not have been so handsome. If he had given a little less attention to the outward appearance of the book and paid a little more attention to what was contained within it I think it would have met the need just as well and would have served the purpose of students. I am surprised that the minister went to so much expense in making this beautiful book unless he wanted just to tickle the fancy of some friends. It was very kind of him to send me three copies. I do not know where he ever found so much generosity in his heart as to do that, but he no doubt intended me to place these books in the hands of somebody who would make use of them, and I did that. I do not think that I retained one. But, they are not enough; I want more. I think there should be a liberal distribution of that book. I do not think the country will find fault with, at any rate, meeting the wishes of students at agricultural colleges. They cannot possibly become familiar with the distribution of weeds unless they are given, in some form, the information that they require. I hope the minister will relent,

and turn his economy in some other direction. He could save in some other way the money that would be necessary to print the requisite number of these books. I hope he will give us a sufficient number to supply any of the students in the agricultural colleges who come from our counties.

Mr. FISHER. I will look up and see how many we have of the edition and how far it will go. I shall try to distribute more of these books to hon. members if they wish. Of course, the edition is limited, I think, to 12,000 copies, and we have distributed probably more than half. The idea we had was that the edition would last seven years, but if the House wishes to have a further distribution I can easily order another edition.

Mr. BLAIN. When this matter was up for discussion on a former occasion I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say that every public school would be supplied with a copy.

Mr. FISHER. Every public school that has a library.

Mr. BLAIN. How have the books been distributed—by application from the public school inspector of the county?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any case of that kind in which they have been refused?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) that this is a very valuable book, and we should have a wider distribution of it. I have heard the Minister of Agriculture talking of trying to economize while upon looking at an answer given to a question yesterday, and appearing in 'Hansard' I see that $17,000,000 has been paid out by this government in bounties on iron and steel, which is double the amount that has been spent for the whole agricultural industry of Canada. I have no objection to protection being given to the manufacturer of iron and steel in this country, it is a great industry, and while the government have not seen fit to give it protection in another form they have given it protection in the way of a bounty. Seventeen million dollars is an enormous sum, but here we are carping over the saving of a few dollars for the publication of a very valuable book the object of which is to educate the people right along the lines that the minister wants to pursue and for which he introduced a Bill into this House to-day. It is a ridiculous position that we find ourselves in. We are spending enormous sums of money every day and every year to build up industries that are not one hundredth part as important as the agricultural industry. I think it is time that the members of this House should stand up and advise the Minister of Agriculture to be a little more generous to the great industry of agriculture, and to get his share of the revenue for it. The provincial government at Toronto spends $1 out of every $6 or $7 of its income on agriculture, while the Dominion government spends $1 for agriculture out of every $120 or thereabouts of revenue. As the minister has said that he would be willing to issue a further edition of a few hundred or a few thousand more copies of this valuable book I would strongly advise him to do so.

Mr. MARSHALL. What is the difference in the cost of the first and second edition? I have had several inquiries for the book. I think it is one of the most useful books that the government has sent out. I have placed a copy in nearly every school in my county, and I have applications, I might say, every week for it. I agree with what my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that it is not necessary to have such an expensive book. I understand the minister has the cuts illustrating these weeds and if he has it would not cost nearly so much to print the book. You have the cuts have you not?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. MARSHALL. And they are copyrighted? That being the case it seems to me that a new edition of the book could be produced cheaper than the former editions.

Mr. FISHER. Another edition could be. Of course we had to pay for the plates for the first edition. The second edition contains twenty more plates than the first one and that, of course, we had to pay for out of the edition.

Mr. MARSHALL. What would a new edition cost with the facilities you have for the printing and the plates?

Mr. FISHER. I would not undertake offhand to give an opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the cost per book of the first edition?

Mr. FISHER. About a dollar a copy.

Mr. FOSTER. And the second?

Mr. FISHER. $1.30.

Mr. FOSTER. The second edition only cost thirty cents more.

Mr. FISHER. We had the plates which were used in the first one.

Mr. FOSTER. What would an edition like the first cost if now struck off considering that you have the plates?

Mr. FISHER. You mean having the plates and all that just to strike it off? I

would not like to say; perhaps 25 per cent less.

Mr. MARSHALL. Could not the cost be reduced by putting on a cheaper binding?

Mr. FISHER. I think the book is worth a good binding; the present binding is useful rather than expensive. It is the cost of the plates and illustrations that makes it come high.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is a very valuable book.

Mr. SPROULE. The thought has occurred to me as to how far a member of parliament can buy anything from the government without violating the Independence of Parliament Act. I am told that a member of parliament cannot buy an animal or grain from the experimental farm, and if that be so how can he buy a book from the government? It seems to me that the principle is the same; you get something of value and you pay money for it.

Mr. FISHER. I do not want to give a legal opinion, but I have understood there is nothing to interfere with a member of parliament buying from the government, although he may not sell to the government.

Mr. LENNOX. We will have that point threshed out in the House very soon.

Mr. FISHER. That is my understanding of it, but I may be wrong. If buying this book would interfere with the Independence of Parliament Act there are a good many members of parliament who would be in trouble because I know that they buy seed and animals from the experimental farm.

Mr. FOSTER. And they buy the 'Hansard' too.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but I can hardly think that would be an infringement of the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Some years ago I thought of purchasing some animals at the experimental farm, but a lawyer advised me that it would not be a proper thing for a member of parliament to do. If you cannot buy an animal can you buy seed, and if you cannot buy seed can you buy a book, and if you cannot buy a book how can you buy copies of 'Hansard' as we do. Are we violating the Independence of Parliament Act in that? What difference in principle is there between buying a timber limit and buying a book, so long as you pay the government a valuable consideration for it? It is worth while knowing how far we can go in these things. Can the minister tell what was expended last year in the enforcement of the Seed Control Act, and whether there were prosecutions?

Mr. FISHER. There were a number of prosecutions.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. FISHER.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 137) for the relief of Maggie Florence Sadler.—Mr. Henderson.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year I directed the minister's attention to something that I thought required his personal attention and the attention of his department, that was the fact that in the sale of seeds in small packages at groceries, drug stores and other places of business throughout the country, it was customary to have a goodly number left over at the end of the season, and in such cases the boxes containing the packages of seeds were closed up and put away for another year, and when the spring time came again, these were taken out and put on sale again, the boxes being in some instances replenished and in other instances not. I suggested that it would be only fair, in the interest of the public, that the date when the seeds were put into the packages should be stamped clearly and distinctly thereon. I think my hon. friend said that it was a matter that should have consideration. I hope that he will have a clause put into the Seed Control Bill requiring every person who offers seed for sale in this way to have this done. I believe it will have the support of everybody interested in pure seeds, and my hon. friend's department will receive compliments from all over Canada from people who sow these seeds in the spring only to find at harvest time that they are no use.

Mr. KIDD. I quite agree with the hon. member for Peel. In a great many cases I believe the old seeds are gathered up and mixed with the new. The seedsmen are very often blamed for this, and I think the minister should put a clause in the Act to stop this practice.

Mr. FISHER. There is no doubt that it is a great evil, and if there were any practical way of meeting it, we would be glad to adopt it. We have been carrying on a campaign against this evil. Under section 8a of the Seed Control Act of last year, any person who sells or offers for sale or has in his possession for sale any seeds two-thirds of which are not capable of germinating, must mark the package with the kind of seeds and the percentage of seeds capable of germinating.

Mr. BLAIN. That does not cover the case in point.

Mr. FISHER. It is impossible to tell by any test in the laboratory what the age of seed is. We can tell whether it will germinate or not. A man might put into a package seeds ten years old and mark them as this year's seeds, and there would be no means by which we could check the false marking. The only thing we can do is to fix a standard of germination. That is the practical difficulty, and that is why my officers, who know the trade better than anybody else, have always said that there was no object at all in marking the date when the seed was put into the package.

Mr. BLAIN. I think my hon. friend's reason for not adopting the suggestion is rather insufficient. Every package of seed that is put up is open to the same objection to which my hon. friend has referred. He does not suggest that any considerable proportion of the seeds that are sold and are planted come under the inspection of the department. I do not think the country will expect that my hon. friend should know the age of seeds, but he knows that this evil has been going on in this country for many years. It is to be found in every village and cross-roads in Canada. There are business establishments in Toronto which make a business of putting up seeds in small packages to retail at five or ten cents a piece. These are boxed up and sent out in the spring, and at the end of the season a man goes around and takes an inventory of what has been sold and what is there. The merchant pays for what has been sold, and the rest are boxed up and put away till the following spring, when they are offered for sale again. What objection could my hon. friend have to compelling the person who puts up the seed stamping on the package the date when it was put up? I am quite sure that it would result in this, that instead of these boxes being left with the merchants, they would be returned to the seedsman, and he would find that it would be to his advantage to supply fresh seed, because the old seed would be rejected by the purchaser. I fear that my hon. friend is not conversant with the large trade that is being done in this way throughout this country. The matter should receive careful consideration and I propose to draw the attention of the department and of the country to this evil which I hope my hon. friend will redress, so that the people will have an opportunity at least of knowing what they purchase rather than be in the hands of the larger seed merchants in the centres of population.

Mr. FISHER. This matter has suggested itself and my hon. friend has suggested it over and over again. It has been studied by those engaged in the seed trade, and the remedy suggested is not supposed to be effective.

Mr. BLAIN. What would be effective?

Mr. FISHER. We test the germination of the seeds and if they do not germinate we prosecute the people who sell them as good germinating seeds. The marking of the date on the seed package would deceive the purchaser as the seed merchants necessarily import many seeds and could not possibly know the age of such seeds. They might thus unwittingly put false dates on the packages. Marking the age would not be any real test. The trade is constantly testing in our laboratory for their own convenience, and for the protection of themselves and their customers. I would not be prepared to insist on the remedy my hon. friend proposes which would not be any remedy at all.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has not grasped my point. I never suggested that a person putting up the seeds would be responsible for the age of the seeds. No such suggestion came from me on a former occasion or this year. I am not condemning but approving of the action of the department in finding out the age of the seed. If the department is not doing that it is neglecting the interest of the public.

Mr. FISHER. I said we knew we could not find out the age of the seed, but did try to, and could find out its germinating quality.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not objecting to that. My point is that when the seed merchant puts seed into these small packages, he shall stamp plainly upon the package the date when the seeds are put in the package. I can see no objection to that, and it would prevent the sale of seeds which have been lying in these packages for one, two, or four years.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). In the west we have a great deal of trouble in connection with the seed business, the seed is put in the storekeeper's hands by the seed companies. But that is not the only trouble. One year a seed dealer could not get any one to handle his seeds in our town, and sold them to hardware stores and places like that at half price. These seeds were kept in these stores year after year and sold to the people. If the suggestion of my hon. friend from Peel had been in force and these packages had been dated, the farmers and the farmers' wives would not have bought that kind of seed. While on my feet I wish to say a word about the weeds book —a very fine book, and very much sought after in my constituency. I supplied copies as far as I could from those I received from the department. Some time ago, I received a request from the Mennonite college in my

constituency for one of these books. I went to the department, and found that I could not get a copy except on an order from the minister. I wrote the minister a note across the floor of the House, and he sent back word that if I would write to the department I would get it. I wrote to the department, and received an answer from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) himself, saying that if I would send him the name he would send the book. I did not want the book sent in that way. I wanted to send the book myself. I took the only book I had remaining from the allotment made to me and sent that to the college, and now I am without a copy myself. I do not think that is the way the department should be run: it seems to me very shabby dealing.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sharpe, Lisgar) misunderstood. The college, its name having been drawn to our attention, ought to receive the book

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). It did.

Mr. FISHER. If the book was not sent to the college originally, it was because we did not know of the existence of the college.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). It has been recently established.

Mr. FISHER. All the hon. member had to do was to let the department know of the existence of the college, and the book would be sent by the department itself. If the department answered the hon. member in that way, it was intended to be in courtesy to him and in order that the college might be on the regular list. A book sent without our knowing where it went would not serve the same purpose, because the college would not be known to us any more than before, and we could not send it other papers. I do not know that the idea was properly expressed, for I do not remember the letter, but certainly there was no intention to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman or treat him in any way wrongly.

Mr. SHARPE. I did not consider it very discourteous. But the minister did not say in his letter anything about putting this college on the list, but simply said: Send me the name and I will send the book. The teacher of this college asked me for the book and expected me to send it, and I did send it. But I do not think the department's treatment was fair.

Mr. LENNOX. Referring again to the matter spoken of by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), I think the minister ought to give it a little more study than, evidently, he has given it. The provision of section 8a is good in itself, I think, and no one, so far as I know, questions the wisdom of it. It affords some surety of the germinating qualities of seed. But I think it could be improved by carrying out the suggestion of the hon. member for Peel. That suggestion is that provision should be made in the law that the person who puts up seeds in packages for sale shall, at the time he puts them up, endorse upon the packages—I suppose in addition to the statement provided under the Bill—the date of making up. I assume that wholesale dealers try to procure fresh seed. The danger is not so much, therefore, from poor seed being put up in packages as in seed losing its vitality after being put up in the package. The minister raises the point that it would be difficult to have an honest administration of such a provision. I do not accept that view. The wholesale dealer putting up seed in 1911 would not date it 1912, for he is looking for sale this season. On the other hand, he would not date it 1910, because that would be obviously against his interest. There is a guarantee from the circumstances of the case that he will endorse it honestly if you compel him to endorse it at all. If people buy in 1912 seed put up in packages in 1911, they will buy it with their eyes open. But I understand that the custom of the trade is that packages not sold are returned after the season to the wholesale dealer. It may be said that the wholesale dealer will repack the seed dating the package anew. But this will be got over by a provision that is quite capable of enforcement, and that, even if never actively enforced, would have great effect, and that would be to make it a criminal offence to take seeds from a dated package and put them in a new package.

If you make first the provision in the law that the wholesale vendor has to endorse upon the packet a statement of the date when it was put up, and if you couple with that a criminal provision that he shall not tamper with that package unless under certain conditions, then you will protect the public to a large extent. I realize that people living in the country often desire to possess a garden. I have had that idea grow upon me once or twice, and when I put in a great many seeds, so few of them came up that I became discouraged, and thought it much cheaper to buy my vegetables than to grow them. But if we could have a guarantee of good seed, almost every man who has a little plot of land would have a garden. You can hardly estimate the advantage it would be, both materially and in other respects, for the head of a household to have a garden in which he is much interested, and where he could spend a portion of his time. Anything that we can do to encourage people to put small plots of land into a garden, and raise a portion at least of their vegetables, would be a great advantage to the individual, and if the custom were general, to the public at large. I think the minister will appreciate

this point of view. Let me speak of another class of seeds. It would be a great advantage if people were encouraged to cultivate flowers, to pay attention to beauty as well as to utility; and if we could have some guarantee that the flower seeds we buy would germinate, we would be encouraging the poorer classes of the people to pay more attention to flowers than they do at present. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has urged on previous occasions as well as on the present, that there is a means of making this a useful provision.

Mr. FISHER. I confess I had misunderstood the intention of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) until I have just now heard it explained. I thought he wanted to put on the package the date of the ripening of the seed. I now understand he only wants to put upon it the date on which the seed was put in the package. Is that correct?

Mr. BLAIN. That is all I ever suggested.

Mr. FISHER. There would be no difficulty in a man putting on the date on which he put the seed into the package, except that the people might think that the seed was grown in that year. That is a point worthy of consideration, and when the new Bill comes up we will discuss it.

Mr. LALOR. I am afraid that such a provision as compelling dealers to put the date upon the package of seeds will entail a great deal of trouble and inconvenience upon the men who are engaged in the seed business. If the dealer in seeds was inclined to be dishonest, he could easily empty the different packages into bulk and again put them up into packages and redate them. Some years ago I was in the retail business myself; I remember that these packages are gathered each year and taken back again to the dealer, and if he wished to evade the law it would be easy for him to do so. Our seed dealers in this country are men of character, they have a reputation to sustain, and I doubt very much if they would knowingly put up an old seed, or one that would not germinate. There are a few seeds that do not germinate after a certain number of years, and I am skeptical whether it would be an advantage to have the date stamped upon the package. I think our dealers realize that it is to their own interest that the seeds they put up should be reliable, and if they do not put up reliable seeds, seeds that are not too old, and do not germinate properly, they would soon lose their reputation and destroy the value of their brand. I would like to see everything done which would assure the people good, honest and fresh seed, but I doubt if a proposition to stamp the date on the package will add materially to the reliability of the seed.

Mr. BLAIN. I think my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) has not quite caught my point. I am not suggesting that this would make a dishonest dealer honest, nor am I suggesting that it would cause the dealer to put a better class of seed in the paper. My suggestion is that the public would learn to know themselves when the seed was put in the package. When these packages are gathered up, at the close of the season, they are in many cases taken back and in other cases they are not taken back, but are left in the merchant's place. I am speaking of my own town as a fair example of the country generally. I know that in many cases the packages are left in the store year after year, and in some cases where the seeds are sold out they are replenished, and you can trace them five or six years, you can find the packages that were put up six years ago and are still being offered to the public for sale.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are you speaking now of commission seeds, or of seeds sold outright to the merchants?

Mr. BLAIN. It would apply to both. If seeds were sold outright then what I am saying would apply; because if they are bought outright, using my hon. friend's own term, then the merchant would keep them in a box for sale and offers them year after year. But if they were bought on commission, as my hon. friend suggests, then the ownership is to some extent divided. The wholesale merchant would send his agent as he does now, and receive from the merchant the value of the seeds that were sold out of the box; that is the custom.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then he would take the others back?

Mr. BLAIN. Would he take the old seed out and put new seed in?

Mr. DOUGLAS. A reputable seed merchant generally does that now. No wholesale merchant who has a reputation to maintain would change the seed in the packages.

Mr. BLAIN. If they do that then the suggestion I make would be all the better and it would be altogether in the interests of the people. Purchasers of seed when they go into a store should know by the packages themselves when the seed was put into the packages. I am quite sure that this proposition would appeal to the purchasers of seed throughout Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have listened very carefully to the statement of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). I do not wish to deprecate the suggestion offered

if it can be put into practical form and I think it might work a great deal of good, but my idea is that purchasers of seed must rely upon the reputation of the person from whom they buy. That is the best guarantee we can get under the present law.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not apply the same test to seed that has to be stamped under the Seeds Bill? I suppose the same code honour would apply to one as to the other. If the purchaser of small seed has to rely upon the honesty of the person who puts the seed into the package I presume that the farmer would have to rely on the honesty of the merchant who puts the seed into the bag.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not taking any exception to the hon. gentleman's suggestion, I rather applaud the hon. gentleman for the effort he has made, but I fail to see that anything can be done to put his plan into practical operation, and in the meantime the only certain way is to rely upon the man who sells the seed. Make sure that you buy your seed from a reputable person who would be liable to secure seed that would germinate. I am not finding fault with my hon. friend from Peel, I think he is on the right track, but the minister is unable to give him any encouragement that he will be able to work out the plan that he suggests. In the meantime I fail to see anything better than putting your trust in the man who is selling the seed.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Halton has not noticed the reference that the Minister of Agriculture has made to my statement. The minister said that when the Seed Bill came up for discussion he would keep my suggestion in view. I do not know what my hon. friend could do more than that.

Mr. LENNOX. I cannot be accused of having too much faith in the Minister of Agriculture but on this occasion I very much prefer to put my trust in the Minister of Agriculture to putting it in these seed dealers. I do not think that we are working upon the line of putting trust in people that we are dealing with. We are working upon the line of dealing with them on a business basis and if the reputation of the seedsman was sufficient in all cases then we would not need to have these laws at all. We are working on the basis of compelling these people to treat the public fairly and if it is important in the big case, relatively it is equally important in the small case. These seeds in small packages are not sold upon reputation. I imagine that when the tradesman or the tradesman's wife goes in to buy a few packages of vegetable or flower seeds he or she does not ask who the person is who put them up. I do not think they know the name of the person as a rule. There are a great many people who have very little knowledge of the persons who have a reputation for being good seed dealers. We cannot rely upon the reputation of the seed dealer and I know from experience that seeds do remain for almost centuries upon the shelves of the retail dealers of the country. I want to say a word with reference to the statement of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor). I have great respect for him upon those matters to which he has given special attention, not less respect than I have for my hon. friend from Peel. But, my hon. friend from Peel has been giving some study to this matter. He has been studying it year after year as I think other hon. gentlemen who have spoken upon it have not. We have succeeded tonight in getting the minister to realize where the difficulty is and where the remedy can be found. My hon. friend from Haldimand said that there would be a difficulty because it would entail printing. There is no difficulty upon that point because we do require that certain things shall be printed on the package now and the addition of a few words involves no considerable expense or difficulty. I know the minister will give this matter consideration. It is of very great importance to a class of people that I would like to see encouraged, those who have small homes and grounds and who should be encouraged to cultivate small gardens. In this way a great benefit, far beyond the pecuniary aspects of the case, would result from the adoption of something in the line of that which has been suggested.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Has the minister any idea of the length of time that these garden seeds will retain their germinating qualities?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give my hon. friend an exact statement on that point but we have tables in the department indicating the length of time that seeds retain their germinating power.

Mr. JOSEPH GIRARD (Chicoutimi-et-Saguenay. (Translation.). Mr. Chairman, I listened very attentively to the discussion which has just taken place on the important question of the care to be given the grain and seed trade. I think it my duty to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on the care he has taken, more especially during the last few years, to find the best possible remedies to eradicate the scourge of bad seeds which has been the ruin of the province of Quebec and of the agricultural class throughout the country, a scourge which has entailed considerable losses.

The law about the sale of seeds which has been proposed by the minister, works in a satisfactory way. The reputation of the vendors is no security because it is very difficult to say that the most reliable dealers cannot be deceived by their own employees—it follows that the buying public, being unable to rely on such reputation, is suffering and has suffered in some place very large losses.

In the county I have the honour to represent, spring wheat for seeding was purchased, and fall wheat was delivered; white fyfe wheat was purchased, and red fyfe was delivered. Other apparently fraudulent deliveries were made without the agricultural public having any recourse against the sellers who, of course, deceived the farmers. These can very hardly make out at first sight the difference between those various kinds of grain, as they are not tempted to make a special study of it on account of the trust they are putting in the reputation of certain dealers, and they necessarily rely on the bills that are sent to them, hence the losses I spoke about.

As to hay seed, I would compare it with pharmaceutical preparations containing certain quantities of poison which formerly were freely sold. In order to protect the public against accidental poisoning, they have compelled dealers and producers to label their products by putting the exact composition on the package, so that experts may analyze them and verify the correctness of the composition stated on the label. Weeds contained in hay seed are to farmers' fields the poisons which have caused so much damage and which are bought by the farmers without these being practically able to detect them unless they should make examinations which it is impossible for them to make. In order to protect the farmer in his operations, I think it would be proper to compel the dealers and producers of these seeds, as druggists are compelled, to state the exact composition of the seeds they put in the market, from the point of view of the purity of the product as well as of its germinating power.

The hon. minister has done all that was possible to remedy the evil I speak about and which is occupying the attention of the House, but in my opinion it might be well to still increase the seller's liability, as the farmers are not sufficiently good judges of the products they buy. I had some complaints last spring against certain brands of hay seed which was marked number one and is nothing else but what is called number one seed for consumption.

I would bring the attention of the hon. minister on that point. Serious mistakes were caused in our place last spring. Certain suits were brought by the Department of Agriculture to protect the farmers against unscrupulous dealers and to prevent the recurrence of such sales, which I will not call dishonest, but dangerous.

I would bring the minister's attention once more and would ask him to make the regulations he may make under the present law as hard as possible, in order to better protect the agricultural public against the dealers.

I offer my thanks to the minister and to his officers for the work they have imposed upon themselves in order to check the evil. His work thus far has been practical and there has been much improvement. Without wishing to produce a crisis in the market or create any unnecessary alarm, the hon. minister must continue his work and apply the regulations with vigour so as to bring about all the possible improvement.

Hon. Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for Chicoutimi for the remarks he has just made on the Seed Bill and for the wise advice he has given the farmers in the Quebec district. I well know there has been much improvement in that district, and in my opinion if there is such a large demand for good seeds, that is due to the unceasing efforts of my officers in the strict application of the law concerning seed.

I hope to be able to improve the situation again. I congratulate the hon. member on his constant efforts to improve the condition of the farmers in his home.

Mr. HENDERSON. I never care about buying these small packages for the reason that we have no guarantee of the age of the seed. I would advise every one to buy bulk seed instead of the seed put up in paper.

For the development of the dairying and fruit industries; and the improvement and transportation of the sale and trade in food and other agricultural products, $110,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is the branch of dairying and fruit inspection, and cold-storage, and extension of markets. We have the dairying work under Mr. Barr, we have the fruit work under Mr. McNeil, and we have the extension of markets under Mr. Moore. The $10,000 increase is due to the general extension of the work. We intend to make some special experiments in butter making, and we propose having a national fruit conference such as we had in 1906, and which the fruit interests considered very valuable. The last conference cost $4,000 or $5,000, but I think the money was well spent.

Mr. KIDD. What experiments are you carrying on in butter making?

Mr. FISHER. We will carry on somewhat similar experiments to those with regard to cheese a couple of years ago.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What is the object of these experiments?

Mr. FISHER. In some factories they gather the cream already separated, and in others they gather the milk and separate it at the creamery, and there has been a good deal of discussion as to which was the better method. In both cases good butter has been made, but the question is which system gives the better average.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is it intended to conduct these experiments at private creameries throughout the country?

Mr. FISHER. The experiments will be conducted at one or two selected places by experts, and special apparatus will be required.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Could you not select a number of places and ship this apparatus from one place to the other?

Mr. FISHER. I would have to leave that largely to the judgment of my officers. I assume that experiments would have to be made at one place where the cream gathering system is in force, and at another where the other system is carried on. Not only will one system be tested against the other, but experiments will be made to see how each system can be most successfully operated.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Could you not conduct some of these experiments on the farm here?

Mr. FISHER. They would have to be conducted on a large scale where there is a quantity of cream coming into the factory.

Mr. SEXSMITH. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec are so interested in the dairying industry that you should at least select a place in each province.

Mr. FISHER. The conditions will be the same at different places so that the result of the experiment in one place will apply to the others.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the hon. minister's intention to make these experimental stations schools of instruction?

Mr. FISHER. No. Our expert is there doing experimental work very accurately and carefully, and the presence of pupils would only interfere with the work. Besides, we do not undertake to establish schools of instruction. We leave that to the provincial authorities.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that the minister is losing sight of the very best part of the work. I do not think he is going to gain very much by experimenting on what has been experimented on for the last 20 years—whether the cream should be separated at home or at the factory. At this age it must be pretty well decided what is the best system. I do not see why young men should not be invited to these experimental stations to see the operation of making butter. In that way we would gain very much more than we would by simply having experiments by experts who already know all about the making of butter. I notice that during the past year a very large amount of Canadian cream has been sold across the line, and I presume that under the new treaty, if it goes into force, that will be very much more encouraged, and the making of butter in this country will not be carried on to the same extent that it has been in the past—that the encouragement will be to send the cream out of the country, and have it manufactured on the other side, in accordance with the principle laid down by the president when he said: 'Send us your raw materials, and we will send you our manufactured goods.' I fear there will be too much of that, and I do not see the propriety of voting money to experiment on something that we are practically trying to do away with.

Mr. FISHER. I could only say that my dairy experts believe that the experiments we are making will result in the discovery of some things that will improve butter-making in the country. I do not consider that we know everything about butter-making, in Canada or anywhere else in the world. I believe there is room for improvement. With regard to pupils, I differ with my hon. friend entirely. When you are doing scientific experimental work, which has to be done under the constant supervision of experts, you cannot allow pupils to meddle with it. With regard to the export of cream, anything that will improve butter-making will tend to discourage that, and personally I would rather see the cream made into butter in Canada.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What progress are you making with the cow testing?

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to say that we are making considerable progress. For some time I was rather discouraged about it. When it was started, I thought it would be a very valuable adjunct to the dairying and would be of great advantage to the country, but the people were slow to take it up. We went on, however, under a good deal of discouragement, and I am glad to say that now we seem to have turned the point, and it is becoming more successful. In eastern Ontario there are 25 associations with 1,123 cows, in western Ontario 42 associations with 3,549 cows, in Quebec 62 associations with 4.600 cows, in New Brunswick 11 associations with 342 cows, in Nova Scotia 4 associations with 258 cows, in Prince Edward Island 17 associations with 1,119 cows, in British Columbia 6 associa-

tions with 801 cows; a total of 167 associations, with 1,143 members, and nearly 12,000 cows being tested. There has been a great deal of interest taken in it in the different dairy associations. We have been sending officers of the department to explain the system to them, and I think that now the attention of the cow experts of Canada is being directed to the subject, and I hope that great good will accrue from the experiments.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I realize that it is a good work, but I think you have only touched a very small portion of the dairying districts of Canada as yet. Is there a report on these cow tests?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there is an annual report.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Has the minister any idea of the standard of cows kept in Ontario?

Mr. FISHER. Only of those that were tested. As my hon. friend says, we have only touched the fringe of the work as yet. I would not like to say that we have made a test of the cows of Ontario. We have of course the figures of all the tests that were made. The great point of the test is to show how many cows have paid badly, and how many have paid well, so that the poor ones may be discarded, and the better ones kept and bred from. In that way we give all that information to the farmers, of course not divulging the records of the individual herds.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Has the department compared the tests of some of the herds in Ontario with those of the herd at the Experimental Farm here?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I think the tests of some of the individual herds are better than the tests at the Experimental Farm here.

Mr. FISHER. That is possible; I do not know.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I would think we would have the very best cows at the farm.

Mr. FISHER. I think we have very good ones, I will give that when we come to the Farm vote.

Mr. SEXSMITH. A meeting was held in Peterborough in connection with some testing experiment.

Mr. FISHER. Yes. We propose to place special officers in certain sections to work up this cow testing in a whole neighbourhood, to see its effect upon a group of factories or farmers. We think in this way it will do more good than by the present system of tests with individual herds. Each farmer is asked to take a sample of the milk of each cow, and the samples are sent in bottles to a factory. We pay a factory five cents a test, the results are given to our officer and the farmer himself keeps the record of the weight of the milk. Our officer collates these results and gives them to the farmer.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Is there to be any extension of this work in British Columbia this year?

Mr. FISHER. We have added an officer this year in British Columbia to press and stimulate this work.

Mr. NESBITT. In our section of country, several men in the last five years have doubled the output of their herds through this cow-testing experiment. One man increased it over 50 per cent in a herd of 70 cows in the last three years, and also increased the percentage of butter fat. The farmers there are taking a great interest in it and it is having very excellent results. They keep track of the tests themselves, and this not only teaches them to improve their cows but to improve their feeding to get the best results. The testing gives them an education in bookkeeping on their cows, and they become very scientific not only in the care but in the feeding of cows. One young man in that section of country has in five years increased his cows from an average of 5,500 pounds per cow to over 12,000 pounds per cow, and increased the percentage of butter fat from 3.30 to 3.50. Another farmer in the same district has had practically as good results I would advise members from sections where the farmers are interested in the raising of cattle to get Mr. Grisdale of the Experimental Farm to lecture to his farmers on the feeding and care of cows. It will be quite worth their while and such members will never begrudge any money to the Experimental Farm after hearing Mr. Grisdale's lecture, and I am sure none of the farmers will regret having heard him. He does not speak a word in repetition and every bit of information he gives is worth following. I have followed his instructions more or less myself, and I know that what he states is absolutely correct. If anybody will follow his directions he can increase the output of his cows—the very same cows—probably fifty per cent in one season. I cannot speak to strongly in favour of this work of cow-testing, because it educates the farmer in the keeping of books, and it checks up what his animals are doing. This is the science of farming, and it is the only way, in my judgment, in which farming will ever be made to pay as it ought to pay.

Mr. SPROULE. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt), because I have a distinct

recollection that Professor Robertson came before the Agricultural Committee many years ago and contended very strongly that you could not, to any appreciable extent, increase the butter fat in milk by feeding, that this was a matter controlled by hereditary influences in the animal. He said the butter fat return could be improved by weeding out those animals whose milk showed a low percentage of fat and replacing them with better ones, but that practically nothing in this direction could be done by feeding. Though this was contrary to the opinion held by many authorities at that time, Professor Robertson gave what he thought satisfactory evidence in support of his opinion. The case only shows that even men who have given great attention to a given subject will sometimes disagree.

Mr. NESBITT. No doubt, if you improve the quality of your herd you will get better results. But, there is no doubt in my mind that I have got better results by feeding also.

Mr. SPROULE. You can increase the proportion of butter fat by breeding, but not by feeding, if Professor Robertson's theory is correct.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I agree with the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) in what he says about cow-testing. I appreciate highly Professor Grisdale's teaching. We have had a great many good men engaged in farmers' institute work in Ontario for many years, competent men both in dairy business and in beef business, and good lecturers. But this cow-testing, if you can get farmers to take hold of it, is of far greater importance than speech-making, because the farmers get practical knowledge—it is demonstrated before their eyes. I have in mind a man who had a cow which, at six years old, produced 7,000 pounds of milk, and he thought he had just about a world-beater. But when the cow was 15 years old, the man having learned in the meantime to feed—and he thought before that he knew that—produced better than 15,000 pounds of milk, and with more profit in proportion than when she produce 7,000 pounds. A great lesson that we need to learn is how to feed and what to feed, also the proper care of animals and the culling out of the poor individual cows under this system of cow-testing. If we can extend the use of this cow-testing method, we shall increase our dairy products more quickly than by anything else we can do.

Mr. JOSEPH GIRARD. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister will allow me, I would like to draw his attention to the desirability of having his officers carry on these dairy tests, which he initiated a number of years ago in such a business-like manner. It has been stated within my hearing, in the course of this debate, that these experiments had been carried on for a sufficient length of time to satisfy the public as to their usefulness, and that they should be discontinued. To my mind such a view is not warranted, and these tests should not be given up, but on the contrary continued.

I am a member of the board of directors of the Dairymen's Association of the province of Quebec, and have been so for a number of years. We follow closely the progress of that industry in our province, and we believe we are cognizant of its requirements. Just now, throughout the various provinces, the best means for obtaining an increased supply of milk are being discussed. We are not agreed as to the best treatment for milk to be used for butter-making or for cheese-making. Seeing the lack of uniformity in the views of dairymen on that point in the various provinces, I think it is incumbent on the minister to find out what rules should be adopted under the circumstances and would be likely to give the best results all round.

Another question which is being very much discussed is that regarding the use of hand separators on farms, farmers having been persuaded that they would thereby be in a position to turn out just as good a quality of butter as that made in a central factory. Is it possible and practicable, from cream separated on the various farms, to obtain a butter the quality of which will compare with that of the butter turned out by a central cream-separating establishment? The question is being very much discussed, and this government is the only agency through which a conclusion may be safely arrived at by means of comparative experiments covering the whole ground.

The establishment of schools has been suggested. I am not certain whether it would be advisable for the government to open such schools before these points have been settled, otherwise faulty methods might be advocated. To my mind the government would be acting more wisely by postponing all such action until positive results may be laid before the public. It will be time to have such central schools when some definite conclusion will have been reached in this connection.

Cow-testing associations have been referred to. Surely, the minister is entitled to some credit for having started this work and taking the practical means to ensure the great improvement which it is expected will result therefrom. The results obtained so far have not been very satisfactory. I represent here a constituency wholly made up of farmers. Cow-testing associations have been started in our district, and the government have done everything in their power, through lecturers and financial aid,

towards inducing farmers to join in the work. I am satisfied that farmers throughout the country do not fully realize the usefulness of such associations, notwithstanding the efforts made by the minister and his officers and notwithstanding the energy displayed. If better results have not been obtained, that is due rather to misgivings on the part of the farmers who do not realize fully the significance of such a movement, and not to any fault of the minister. That is why I say it is incumbent on him to continue the work which has been started through all the means at his disposal. I think the best way of inducing farmers to join such associations would be to send out practical men to educate them and make known the great benefits accruing from such work, while at the same time prompting them to show greater perseverance.

That the quality of a cow's milk cannot be improved by a mere change in the feeding is a fact that seems uncontrovertible. Selection is the practical means of getting around the difficulty, and for the purpose of selection it is necessary that the best cows in the herd be distinguished, a result which cannot be reached outside of these associations for the testing of cows which the minister has been striving to have formed for a good many years past. No doubt the results obtained so far are not as satisfactory as they might have been, but I am confident that by sticking to it a little longer the minister who originated this move will secure the satisfactory results which he anticipated at the outset. The improvement obtained in Denmark will necessarily follow here, provided the Dominion government show as much energy as the Danish government did show towards setting the dairy industry of that country on a solid foundation and bringing the Danish farmer to a point where he is looked to as a model by the whole world. The Hon. Mr. Fisher is undoubtedly the man of the hour, and the Canadian farmers are, to say the least, as intelligent as their Danish competitors. Several years of effort have been expended in Denmark before perfection was attained. There is no cause for surprise if in Canada, even after the road has been shown to us, toil and perseverance are required to secure as good results. In this connection all public men should be as one and make it a point to uphold the far-seeing efforts of the minister who, in the public eye, is solely responsible.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, that is splendid. After hearing my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard), I can understand that if he came up to Dauphin he would be elected sure, because, from his flow of language, it is evident that nobody would ever get a chance to put in a word. I can say that for him without offence, I am sure. I was reading over this item 49: 'For the development of the dairying and fruit industries; and the improvement'—so far it is all right—'and transportation of the sale and trade in food and other agricultural products.' The last part of this paragraph I cannot understand: 'The transportation of the sale and trade,' unless it refers in some way to this bugbear of the Liberal party which is called reciprocity. I would like to be enlightened by the minister. How is he going to transport the sale and trade of food products?

Mr. FISHER. The intention is to do what we have been doing for some time back, to transport our perishable food products in such a manner as to contribute to their improvement and their sale.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like the minister to give me a little further explanation of this item, in regard to the improvement and transportation of the sale. I never heard before of the sale being transported, and I would like to know something about it.

Mr. MARSHALL. I was going to ask how we are going to reach these tests. Are you going to send out new men?

Mr. FISHER. These tests are made in the neighbourhood by some prominent butter and cheese makers; we pay them for every test they make. Anybody that applies to us for a test will get a form explaining how he must go to work, and then he applies to the factory.

Mr. MARSHALL. We have been operating a condensed milk factory for three years, and some dairies have found that by changing the food and the system of taking care of cows, they have increased the flow of milk.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I heard the other evening the Minister of Agriculture referring to the fact that he was doing the best he could for the dairy industry in his own province, and also in the Dominion generally. Now I understand that as Minister of Agriculture he poses as a farmer, and has a herd of cattle of dairy breed. Now would it be unfair of me to ask if that herd has been tested along with other herds in the same province? I ask this for the information of the House; and how does his herd stand the test as compared with other herds throughout that province?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give my hon. friend the figures. I have belonged to one of these associations.

Mr. CAMPBELL. My hon. friend as Minister of Agriculture is setting an example to other farmers, he has everything at his disposal, owing to the fact that he can utilize every possibility with regard to tests and everything else, and I would like

to know if his own private herd has been tested.

Mr. FISHER. My herd has been tested, but I have not got the figures, and cannot give them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand this system has been in vogue for more than a year, and if the test has not been published for the last year, surely it was for the previous year. Might I ask what that test was last year?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say, I do not know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, if I professed to be a farmer and did not know the result of my farming operations, I would not call myself a farmer at all. I think that is the most ridiculous answer I ever heard in this House. Surely the minister knows what the test of his herds has been last year, or the previous year, as compared with others in that province. I think that is a fair question for one farmer to ask another farmer.

Mr. BLAIN. I think that is a fair appeal by my hon. friend from Dauphin.

Mr. FISHER. I think that is a personal appeal, and an interference with my private business, which I decline to agree to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not wish the minister to look at it in that way at all. If he looks at it in that way, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. FISHER. Well, I do look at it in that way.

Mr. BLAIN. I think there is a misunderstanding between my hon. friend from Dauphin and the Minister of Agriculture. The question was as to whether the Minister of Agriculture ever had his herd tested, and how the test compared with other herds in the same district; not as to how much money my hon. friend made out of it, not as to whether my hon. friend should keep the best class of catttle or other classes of cattle, but whether my hon. friend would give us the knowledge that he has with respect to the testing of cattle upon his own farm which might be of some value to other farmers throughout Canada. My hon. friend from Dauphin had no idea of entering into any personal matter with the Minister of Agriculture. Is it that my hon. friend's herd stood at the top and he is so modest that he would not state that his herd did stand at the top in that district, or is it that my hon. friend's herd was at the bottom? If it is I am sure that my hon. friend cannot sustain his reputation as being a successful farmer. My hon. friend must not be so touchy upon these points because they are important matters from the agricultural standpoint.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. BLAIN. No, we are not carrying it yet because I think that my hon. friend from Dauphin is entitled to an explanation from the Minister of Agriculture. We frequently have statements from hon. members opposite, perhaps from the hon. member who cried 'carried,' that the Minister of Agriculture is rendering very valuable service to Canada because he is a practical farmer. I remember the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), stating in the House that the Minister of Agriculture is of special value in his department because he is a practical farmer and because he has cattle at home of a superior class. I recall the case of a man in my own county who was out attending Farmers' Institutes and teaching the farmers how to kill Canadian thistles. I do not suggest that that is the case with the Minister of Agriculture because I believe that he has a very good farm, but I urge the matter on the minister because the statement of my hon. friend from Dauphin was reasonable and his question was a very important one. My hon. friend cannot say that he does not know whether his herd stood high or low because he would be as anxious as any other owner of cattle coming under the test in his district to know whether his herd stood high or low. The question of my hon. friend from Dauphin is a reasonable one and I am sure the minister will be able to answer it.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to ask the minister, speaking of the testing of milk by inspectors who are appointed, whether these inspectors are empowered, when they find milk that has been sent by farmers to factories in a deteriorated state, to settle the offence that is created by the act with the person who has been guilty of sending the deteriorated milk. I have had called to my attention a number of cases where the inspectors have found milk sent to the factory in a deteriorated condition. In one case they would settle with the farmer who was guilty for $5 or $10, and in another case they would settle for $25.

Mr. FISHER. These are provincial inspectors who do not belong to our department at all, and we do not have anything to do with that work.

Mr. PORTER. Then, another question: Did the minister ever consider the question of conflict between the provincial and Dominion laws with regard to the sending of deteriorated milk? Under the provincial law a man cannot be convicted of an offence without proving knowledge on the part of the person who is sending the milk. Under the Dominion law a person can be

convicted of sending deteriorated milk even if it can be proved beyond any question that he had no knowledge of the deteriorated milk being sent. There is a direct conflict between the two acts, one requiring knowledge for conviction and the other conviction without knowledge at all. It does appear to me that the provincial Act is much the fairer one because a man ought not to be convicted of a quasi criminal offence without having some knowledge of having violated the statute. I would like to ask the minister if he has or will consider the propriety of bringing these two Acts into harmony in that respect.

Mr. FISHER. I think that question was discussed when the Dominion Act was framed. I confess that if there is to be any change I would like to see the provincial Act changed so as to harmonize it with the Dominion Act. I do not think that ignorance in such a case ought to absolve a person.

Mr. PORTER. It occurs to me that to carry out that principle would be in direct opposition to all other Dominion laws dealing with similar offences. I do not know of any case where a conviction may be made without knowledge on the part of the person committing the offence, but in this particular instance it is so. It would be more in conformity with the general law and it would be more just to make the change I suggest. Let me illustrate what I mean. The milk that a farmer sends to the factory is tested by an inspector and is found to be deteriorated. The farmer is summoned to court for a violation of the Act and he and every one in his employ testifies that they did not do anything to deteriorate the milk, such as taking the cream, pouring in water, or resorting to any of those devices that are used for that purpose. The farmer proves absolutely that as far as he is concerned he is innocent of an offence. That man ought not to be convicted. I have one case in my mind where, after a conviction took place, the milk drawer admitted—and the fine was afterwards remitted—that he stopped at a creek to water his horses and that he took a quantity of milk out of three cans on his wagon, poured it into his own can and put an equal quantity of water out of the creek into the cans that he had robbed. One of the farmers whose cans had been robbed was fined for sending deteriorated milk and he could be fined under the present Act. It was only by reason of the form of the Dominion Act that he could be convicted and he was convicted. It is absolutely no defence to prove that the man had nothing to do with it. He can be convicted of an offence that he did not commit which is contrary to the ordinary principles of fair play.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that the provincial government, in taking up these prosecutions, have found that persons charged could not be convicted under the provincial Act and the consequence is that they generally take the actions under the Dominion Act.

Mr. PORTER. The minister is quite right.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know anything about the circumstances, beyond what my hon. friend has stated, of this particular case, but if the evidence that he now speaks of had been given in that case I can hardly believe that the magistrate would have convicted that man or fined him. Of course, there might be other circumstances that I do not know anything about.

Mr. PORTER. But the fact of proving no knowledge is absolutely no defence. If the milk comes to the factory in a deteriorated condition the offence is committed under the Act. You may prove that somebody else entirely unconnected with the farmer committed the offence, and yet it is absolutely no defence. That is a great hardship. The magistrate or trial court has absolutely no discretion because the Act says that if the milk is found on arrival at the factory in a deteriorated condition the offence is committed and the person sending the milk is liable. That seems altogether unfair. I know, as the minister says, that the inspectors do take advantage of the provisions of the Dominion Act because in some cases where they prosecute under the provincial Act, and where want of knowledge on the part of the accused is proven the court will dismiss the case. But in proceeding under the Dominion Act, even if he proves absolute want of knowledge, the defendant has to be convicted.

Mr. FISHER. Under such circumstances the magistrate I should think would suspend sentence or impose a trivial fine.

Mr. PORTER. But the Act says that the fine shall be not less than so much, and not more than so much, and the magistrate must impose the penalty, having no discretion.

Mr. FISHER. He could suspend payment of the fine.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Minister of Agriculture evidently does not realize the position he holds in Canada. All the farmers of Canada think he is the high mucky-muck, and that he is the greatest farmer that ever lived, and whenever he carries out a test successfully the farmers think the best thing they can do is to follow in his footsteps. The other night the minister brought into this House his own private herd of Guern-

seys, and I assume they were tested the same as any other herd, and that being so it is fair for me to ask the Minister of Agriculture as a leading farmer in Canada, what the result of the test was?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Cannot I have an answer to the question Mr. Chairman?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not usual in debate to make inquiry with regard to the private business of any member. In this case I do not think the question is out of order in this particular connection, but it is for the member questioned whether he will answer or not. To refuse an answer as to a member's private business would not be uncourteous.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not want to inquire into the private business of the member at all, but I heard him the other night bringing his Guernsey herd into the House himself. He is looked upon all over Canada as a leading farmer.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I believe it is a mistaken idea, but he poses as such. He told us the other night that his Guernsey herd was tested and these Guernseys being specially bred for dairy animals it is only fair that the farmers of Canada should know how they turned out in the test. I do not care whether it came out first, second or last, but if he does not answer I will believe it came out last.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) is entitled to an answer, especially as the minister referred to his own herd and admitted they were subject to the same test as others.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think it is a proper thing to bring a man's personal affairs into a public discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has brought it in himself.

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember anything of the kind.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There was a discussion the other day, and I heard the minister refer to his herd of Guernsey cattle. I never knew that the Minister of Agriculture had a thoroughbred calf of any breed till I heard him mention his Guernseys, and while I have no desire to pry into the private affairs of the minister I think my question is a fair one.

Mr. FISHER. I must say that from the way the hon. gentleman asked the question I thought he was prying into my personal affairs, but it is very evident, from what he has said, that he does not understand in the slightest degree this question of testing cows. He talks of a herd being No. 1, No. 2, No. 3. The test is not of herds, but of individual cows. It is a test of the quantity of milk and butter fat which an individual cow gives, so that the owner of the cow may know which are good cows, and which are poor cows. In the reports there is no marking up of one herd as being superior to another or any comparison between herds. There is a marking up of the details of what each of the cows tested makes up for its owner. That is kept for the owner. If he chooses, he can publish it, but the department does not publish it. There are some individual herds reported by permission of the owner, but not in any other way. As a matter of fact, I could not tell the hon. member what any individual cow gave in my herd. I would have to go and examine the records. I have made no comparison between those cows and other cows in the neighbourhood, or in the province of Quebec, or in the Dominion of Canada, and I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question in the way he put it. The data is of no consequence to any one except myself, to enable me to judge which of my cows is the best, which the second best, which the third best, and so on.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I had no desire at all to antagonize the hon. minister by the question. I thought it was a perfectly fair question, because in years gone by, when I studied the various cattle and horse papers in the United States, I saw statements of what certain herds would aggregate or average for milk production and butter fat production, and on those tests the value of a herd largely depended. I can assure the hon. minister that I had no desire to pry into his private business. I thought that under what he called the perfect system of the Department of Agriculture he would have the various herds, not only in his own province, but throughout Canada, recorded for the benefit not only of the owners, but of prospective buyers. I can assure the minister that I had no desire to hurt his feelings.

Mr. THORNTON. If a fruit inspector exceeds his duty, and unjustly and dishonestly has a farmer or a packer fined for putting up fruit contrary to the law, what recourse has the farmer or packer against the inspector?

Mr. FISHER. If any such accusation were reported to me, I would certainly investigate it at once on behalf of the department, because I would not wish to have such an inspector continue in the employ of the department for a moment. I have had no such accusation made against any of my inspectors.

Mr. THORNTON. I was anxious to know because there have been cases in my county.

Mr. FISHER. Has any complaint been made to the department?

Mr. THORNTON. No, because they thought they had no remedy.

Mr. FISHER. I can assure the hon. gentleman that any such conduct on the part of an inspector would be investigated, and if it were proved true, would lead to his dismissal.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Reverting to the minister's statement that an officer of his department has been sent to British Columbia, I would ask him if he can give some particulars of what is being done in British Columbia in connection with his department.

Mr. FISHER. We have been instrumental in the formation of six cow associations in British Columbia, and we have added to the force, so that this season we shall have a man in British Columbia especially for this work of cow-testing.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I asked the minister whether there was any provision under this vote for dairying experiments or dairying operations in connection with the experimental farm in British Columbia.

Mr. FISHER. That of course comes under the farm vote. The agriculturist of the experimental farm system is now on his way to British Columbia to establish a dairy herd and dairy operations at the farm at Agassiz, which I hope will be put through this season. He is gone for the purpose of changing the buildings with that object. Mr. Sharpe, who has been the superintendent of that farm for several years, has resigned, and the new incumbent will be installed on the 1st of April.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I refer to the question asked about the minister's own herd, I have been told on reliable authority that it tested the lowest of any herd in the association. I would like to know whether that is a fact or not.

Mr. FISHER. I don't know.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the duties of the hon. gentleman's agents in Liverpool, London and Bristol, and do they give an annual report as to their work?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Grindley, in Liverpool, is the chief cargo inspector in the mother land. He has under him officers in the other large ports who watch the entry of our products, the conditions under which they are handled, and report on each ship upon its arrival. They also remove and return to the department the thermograph records and thermographs which are placed in cold-storage compartments on this side of the ocean. If they report any inefficient handling of Canadian products we make representations to the shipping companies who respond very well indeed to our complaints. Mr. Grindley makes a general report every year.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they skilled men?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, they are accustomed to the docks and work of this kind. Mr. Grindley is a Canadian who has been over there about 12 years, and is thoroughly competent for this work. He is a man of a higher stamp than the others who were engaged over there, who had been in the employ of the produce houses and were thoroughly acquainted with the practice and method of landing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is Mr. Caldwell who was employed for seven months at Montreal at $90 a month?

Mr. FISHER. He was a farmer in my county for many years. He was thoroughly acquainted with the produce trade. He rented his farm some years ago, and I appointed him in Montreal to act as cargo inspector.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How has this to do with the extension of markets?

Mr. FISHER. Because the extension of markets division includes the supervision and inspection of the handling of our goods, with a view to placing them on the foreign markets in good condition.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand that Mr. Caldwell was such a good farmer that he could rent his farm for only $6 a month. He had let his farm run down so that it was absolutely useless and therefore my hon. friend took him into the fold and gave him this salary. There is another gentleman named Cook who was employed for three months at $75. Who was he?

Mr. FISHER. I never asked Mr. Caldwell at what rate he rented his farm, I never inquire into the private business of my friends or of those who are employed by the government. Mr. Cook is also a cargo inspector for some months doing the same class of work.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where did he come from?

Mr. FISHER. From Lachute.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is a Mr. Daymond, who was employed at $75.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know him or where he came from, he is one of our employees there

Mr. BLAIN. On June 6, 1906, this question was asked and answered:

BEEF CATTLE INDUSTRY.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

Has the government any knowledge by letter, petition or complaint from any source, of the unsatisfactory condition that prevails in the beef cattle industry in the province of Manitoba, and throughout western Canada generally, by which the farmer is not receiving a normal price for his beef sold to wholesale meat dealers? If so, does the government propose to take any action in the premises?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The government has received several communications asking for an investigation and an amelioration of the condition of the beef cattle industry in Manitoba and the west, and has the same under consideration.

What has been done since then?

Mr. FISHER. I would like to have the hon. member ask that question again when the health of animals and live stock division comes up. The investigation was carried on under Dr. Rutherford, who it not here to-night, and I have not his report with me.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What action has the hon. minister taken with regard to the subject discussed very fully in this House, cold-storage as applied to the transportation of agricultural products from the west to the markets of the world?

Mr. FISHER. Nothing further has occurred since that discussion, except the representations that were made by the Farmers' Delegation here. I discussed their suggestions with them. Some investigation has been made by the livestock division into the question. We will have that when the livestock vote comes up.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then, the minister has nothing new.

Mr. FISHER. Not that I can give on this vote. It does not come up on this vote.

Mr. STAPLES. I think this question of cold-storage naturally comes up on this item. It is owing to the want of cold-storage that the cattle production of the west has been falling off.

Mr. FISHER. I have no objection to giving the information if I had it, but as I assumed that this matter would come up on a different vote, the officer who made the investigation is not here, nor have I his report before me. Therefore, I cannot give the information.

Mr. STAPLES. If we let this item pass, I am afraid we get away from the question of cold-storage altogether.

Mr. FISHER. The whole question can be discussed on the other vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the point taken by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) is justifiable. This vote is for the transportation and trade in ' food and other agricultural products.' Surely, meat is food, and surely it is an agricultural product.

Mr. FISHER. There is no objection to discussing the matter, but I have not the information here, and consequently I cannot reply to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad to hear the minister say he has not the information. We have been telling him that right along.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The various items of agricultural estimates are closely connected, and it is not easy to separate them. The particular point now referred to could be discussed under this item. I think it would be a little more proper under item 51, which refers specially to cold storage and the preservation and handling of perishable food products. But the discussion would not be out of order on this item.

Mr. STAPLES. If the minister is not in a position to give the information, perhaps it would be better to wait until he has it.

Mr. FISHER. That is what I suggested.

Mr. STAPLES. The government have voted down a policy which we on this side of the House thought would be of advantage to the producers of live stock, and I think that this committee should not appropriate money under such a vote as this without understanding what benefit the producer is to get from it. I do not want to let the minister get away from the question, so that when we try to discuss it on some other item we shall be told we are out of order. If we can bring the matter up on some other item, for my part, I am willing that the question should stand over. But the minister should be able to fully justify the appropriation, because the producer of live stock is not getting the attention to which he is entitled at the hands of the Minister of Agriculture. The falling off in live stock production is a deplorable thing; and, while the minister may think that he is not responsible for it, I, as a farmer, have to hold him responsible in great degree. The minister has been dilatory, though, perhaps, not consciously so.

Mr. FISHER. I have not suggested that the discussion would be out of order on this item. I was asked a question about one particular thing, and I said that I had that information and would bring it on another vote. But I am perfectly willing to have it discussed now, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not believe in the discussion unless the minister has before him the information which he says is in his possession. It would be only a waste of time, and I am sure the committee does not wish to waste time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I tried to get some sense out of the wording of this item. It speaks of the trade 'In food and other agricultural products.' What does the minister mean by that as applied under this item of $110,000?

Mr. FISHER. It means any other agricultural products, such as meat, eggs and anything in the way of agricultural products that go forward. Our cargo inspectors do not supervise the handling or transport of grain, because these things are not what are called perishable. This item refers to perishable food products such as those that are sent in cold storage or in cooled air, that are liable to be hurt in transportation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is the very point. The minister knew when he came to this House that he would be asked such a question as that. We want the information.

Mr. FISHER. I have told the hon. gentleman that I have not got the information here to-night.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Would the minister tell us what is being done in connection with the improvement in the transportation of fruit?

Mr. FISHER. We have been discussing, and I hope we will be able to carry out, some experiments in the way of chilling or cooling fruit rapidly before it is shipped. There has been a suggestion made by the fruit growers of Ontario with regard to cooling fruit in the car, and I hope in the coming year to see what can be done in that way. There is a system used in California, though the conditions are somewhat different there from ours, still we may be able to adopt some parts of that system in the way of cooling fruit. The system has been in operation for several years in California. I believe it is subject to a patent, but I think something might be done without reference to the patent. According to that system, the fruit is packed in cars in such a way as to leave small air spaces between the packages. These cars are taken to a place where there is a cold storage plant and cold air of a certain temperature is forced through the car by the cold storage plant just as under ordinary circumstances it is forced into refrigerator chambers. Then when the fruit has been cooled down to the proper temperature, the car is closed up. I think ice is put in to maintain the temperature low enough, and then the car is shipped to its destination. I think there are two such plants in operation in California, in each of which many thousand cars are cooled, and from which fruit is shipped all over the continent. It is said that the fruit is carried in much better condition than when cooled in any other way. We propose to try the experiment in this country.

Mr. STAPLES. The minister said there was a patent, what is the nature of the patent?

Mr. FISHER. I am not quite sure.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What officers are employed to administer the Fruit Marks Act?

Mr. FISHER. We have a chief inspector, and 13 inspectors altogether. Three of these are only on for a short time. We have several temporary inspectors, and five helpers at Montreal and two at Halifax.

Mr. STAPLES. Are these inspectors employed the whole year round?

Mr. FISHER. Ten of them are. They are employed during the shipping season in inspecting, and the rest of the time they are employed in going around the country giving lectures and explaining to the people the best way of packing and handling fruit.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With regard to this patent for cooling fruit, does the minister mean that he cannot employ that system until he finds out whether some one has the patent?

Mr. FISHER. We would not be able to employ the exact system that is patented, if the patent is valid; that is a matter I will have to inquire into.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the minister inquired what they ask for this patent?

Mr. FISHER. I have not yet.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What steps has the minister taken to find out?

Mr. FISHER. I am making inquiries.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If these inquiries take as long as the inquiries with regard to the validity in other matters it will take many years to find out. I am referring to the inquiries of the Minister of Agriculture with regard to a contract; it has taken him two years to find out and we have no solution of it yet. I would hope that the Minister of Agriculture would expedite matters so that he would know inside of a reasonable time. This system has been in use in Canada by the Hudson Bay Company for three hundred years. They have left an air space in the storing of frozen rabbits and fish for three hundred years and the minister ought to be able to show that it is a question of precedent, not of patent.

Mr. THORNTON. Have the fruit inspectors any other duties than inspecting fruit? I understand that during the apple season they are busy but have they duties other than those in connection with the inspection of apples?

Mr. FISHER. During the shipping season they are extremely busy with the

inspection. During the slacker season they go around and give lectures on packing and orchard treatment. Most of them are expert fruit growers as well as handlers. They inspect during the whole shipping season, commencing with the small fruits in the early part of the summer and running through the fall almost to the end of winter. During the winter there is not as much fruit shipped as in the fall but during most of the time they are busy with the inspection.

Mr. THORNTON. They would have no authority to settle any difficulty that packers might have in their business relations with the growers?

Mr. STAPLES. The inspectors that the minister is providing for, I suppose, are the inspectors who inspect apples that are packed and shipped out to the west?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. That is part of their duty?

Mr. FISHER. We do not undertake, under the Fruit Marks Act, to inspect all shipments. It is quite impossible. But, the inspectors, wherever they happen to be, keep an eye on the fruit and they may inspect fruit that is being sold by the retailer as well as by the shipper. They are liable to examine any lot of fruit that does not fulfil the requirements of the Act. But, we do not undertake to inspect the whole shipment of fruit.

Mr. STAPLES. How is the fruit marked?

Mr. FISHER. It is marked No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3.

Mr. STAPLES. Who puts the mark on the barrel?

Mr. FISHER. The packer.

Mr. STAPLES. Would an ordinary farmer put it on?

Mr. FISHER. Whoever packs the barrel. It does not matter whether it is a farmer an expert packer, or a merchant or anybody else, the man who packs the barrel is responsible.

Mr. STAPLES. How does he determine what the qualifications are?

Mr. FISHER. He has to know what the Act says. The grades are described as follows:

Fancy quality consists of well grown specimens of one variety, sound, of uniform and of at least normal size and of good colour for the variety, of normal shape, free from worm holes, bruises, scab and other defects, and properly packed.

No. 1 quality, includes no culls and consists of well grown specimens of one variety, sound, of not less than medium size and of good colour for the variety, of normal shape and not less than ninety per centum free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects and properly packed.

No. 2 quality, includes no culls and consists of specimens of not less than medium size for the variety, and not less than eighty per centum free from worm holes and such other defects as cause material waste, and properly packed.

Then there is another condition:

In any package in which the faced or shown surface gives a false representation of the contents of such package; and it shall be considered a false representation when more than fifteen per centum of such fruit is substantially smaller in size than, or inferior in grade to, or different in variety from, the faced or shown surface of such package.

These are the conditions which guide packers as to what fruit they are permitted to put in their packages.

Mr. STAPLES. How are the proceedings taken against a man? Who can lay an information?

Mr. FISHER. Anybody.

Mr. STAPLES. For example, if I go on the market and buy a barrel of apples and it is not up to the quality indicated on the barrel, what is my redress?

Mr. FISHER. You can take out an action against the person who sold you the apples under the Fruit Marks Act, or you can take an action against him for defrauding you. If you do it under the Fruit Marks Act and if you prove your facts in the case you can have the penalty imposed.

Mr. STAPLES. I have a right of action against the retailer?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. Is there any redress from the person he bought them from?

Mr. FISHER. There is no special provision by which the retailer can have redress, but he can have the same redress against the person who sold the barrel of apples to him as you can have against the retailer.

Mr. THORNTON. We have been told by the superintendent of the fruit division that he would like to see more attention paid to associations packing and handling fruit. I would like to know whether the inspectors have found that the associations' work has been more successful than that of private individuals.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there is any doubt but what the associations have done a great deal indeed to improve the packing of fruit, and the proper marking of

it. I am not sure that I can say that no cases have been found of fruit packing by an association that did not fulfil the law, but I am quite certain that few cases have been found. The report from the inspectors and especially from the chief inspector, is that these associations are doing a lot of good in the way of fruit handling and marking.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the penalty for the violation of the Act?

Mr. FISHER. There are several different clauses in the Act which provide penalties. For a first offence the penalty is not less than $10, and not more than $25, and so on.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the inspection apply to apples going from Ontario to the west the same as it applies to apples which are exported to Liverpool?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. We have been doing a good deal in the way of inspecting apples going to the west and in the west when they arrive there. We also inspect the fruit that comes from the United States into the west to ensure that it fulfils the requirements of our law.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the minister ever considered the question of the freight rates charged on apples from eastern Canada to the west? That is a serious matter just now when under reciprocity a great many of the apples consumed in the west will be coming from the south. These American apples do not compare in quality with the apples we have been getting from eastern Canada. and I suppose the western market will now be flooded with inferior fruit. If the government directed its attention to the question of freight rates on fruit from eastern points to western points it might help the Ontario fruit grower to keep the market in the west. We are anxious to get Canadian fruit of good quality rather than United States fruit of inferior quality, but the great difficulty in the way is the high freight rate. That is the problem the minister and his colleagues should have been dealing with instead of running down to Washington.

Mr. FISHER. The freight rates are under the control of the Railway Commission and in some parts of the country they have ordered the rates to be reduced. I have no doubt the same will be done in the Northwest if it is found necessary.

Mr. STAPLES. I know that the Railway Commission fixes rates, but unless some person brings the matter to its attention the Railway Commission does not go around the country looking for an opportunity to reduce railway rates. I do not know any one that could bring the matter before them with such effect as could the government, and especially a character like the Minister of Agriculture, who would be able to present the case with great intelligence. Is the minister making any effort along that line?

Mr. FISHER. I have not made any complaint to the Railway Commission about freight rates.

Mr. STAPLES. Did the minister ever make a complaint about the freight rates on fruit going to the west?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. STAPLES. Then I have to criticise the minister if there is any man in Canada that should be up and doing along this line, it is he. When he tells the committee that he has never taken the matter up with the Railway Commission and hints that he is not going to do so. I do not know where we are going to get a remedy. Usually the Railway Commission and the railway companies will sit up and listen to a complaint from the government when they wont pay much attention to a private citizen. I hope the minister will be more active in future along this line.

Mr. SEXSMITH. No reference has been made to-night to the very important poultry industry which last year produced in Canada $40,000,000 in poultry and poultry products, and the product of which in the States amounted to $700,000,000; it being the greatest industry except corn in that country. It looks as if in the near future we will not be producing in Canada enough poultry and eggs to supply our home market unless greater progress is made. That is a serious state of affairs in this country where we should be producing twice as much as we consume. Has the minister done anything for that particular industry?

Mr. FISHER. The poultry industry is very progressive and I think there never before has been as large a production in Canada as during the last 12 months. Ten years ago there was a large export trade in poultry but of late years it has almost disappeared because of the greatly increased consumption at home. The prices have been very high in Canada, and not so high in England, and consequently we have not been exporting to the same extent as formerly. We do still export some eggs though a very small quantity in comparison with former years.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I agree with the minister that the industry is progressing fairly well and that the production has increased enormously in the last 10 years, but I believe that the product could be doubled in a few years if the government put forth some well considered efforts.

Mr. EDWARDS. With regard to the egg trade of Canada I think the policy of this government as well as of former govern-

ments has been entirely wrong. As a matter of fact we are not now producing enough eggs in Canada to supply the home market, and we have been importing 700,000 or 800,000 dozen a year. The United States government placed a duty of 5 cents a dozen on eggs, and I believe that our policy was entirely wrong in allowing eggs to come into Canada by paying a duty of only 3 cents a dozen. That is not giving the encouragement to the producer in this country that he should receive. I think this is an industry which could be and should be more encouraged than it has been. I think we should have had a duty on eggs at least as high as the United States had on our eggs going into that country. If we had increased our duty to five cents a dozen, it would have greatly stimulated the poultry business in this country and the production of eggs. I do not see why Canada should not produce at least enough eggs for home consumption. As a matter of fact, we have not been doing that for a number of years. I think our farmers should have sufficient protection on eggs to enable them to compete successfully with the producers across the line, where the season continues the year round, whereas ours is limited because of our climate.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the export of butter on the increase or the decrease?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there has been any considerable variation in the last two or three years, but the exports are much less than they were five years ago.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that mean that we are producing less or consuming more?

Mr. FISHER. I think we are consuming a great deal more. We have a means of getting at the amount of creamery butter produced. The production of dairy butter is an estimate, but the estimate is that there is a very much larger amount produced in Canada than there was five years ago.

Mr. BLAIN. At page D—36 in the Auditor General's Report I notice this item:

Oshawa Fruit Growers, Ltd.: apples, 204 brls. at $3.75, 202 brls. at $3.25, 140 brls. at $2.75, 140 brls. at $2.50, 229 brls. at $1.35, 226 boxes at $1.25; total, $2,748.15.

What was this purchase for?

Mr. FISHER. It was to try some experiments in keeping apples in cold storage.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the result?

Mr. FISHER. They were bought in that year and sold in the year afterwards, so that my hon. friend does not see the returns. There was a bulletin issued recently giving the results of those experiments.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. BLAIN. Were these held in Canada?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and the apples were afterwards exported, some at one time, and some at another. We watched carefully the results, and had reports from our officers in England as to how they reached the markets. The bulletin was published in June last.

Mr. BLAIN. Were the experiments entirely satisfactory to the department?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. The market went off that year, and we did not do very well with the sales.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a profit or a loss?

Mr. FISHER. There was a profit on some, and a loss on some.

Mr. BLAIN. The government of Ontario is experimenting in the shipment of fruit from that province. Is the hon. minister co-operating with that government, or with other provincial governments to further the interests of the farmers who grow fruit?

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact, we shipped a large amount of fruit last year to England as an experiment. When my hon. friend says that the Ontario government shipped fruit, I think they assisted some private individuals to ship it.

Mr. BLAIN. There was a shipment of their own peaches.

Mr. FISHER. I am told they did not as a government ship any at all. As a matter of fact, we shipped a considerable quantity of peaches of last season's crop, and made a very good profit on them. We took the peaches from the grower, packed them and sent them to England, and out of what we got for them, we more than covered all the expenses, and gave to the shipper a considerably higher price than he would have got if he had sold the peaches at his own home. The experiment involved no expense to the department, except the supervision of the work. We guaranteed to the shipper the market price at the time, and we handed over to him three times the price we had guaranteed.

Mr. STAPLES. This is a new policy which the minister has adopted. He has been buying and selling fruit, and has been paying the lucky individual who got in touch with the government three times the price he would have got in his home market. I hope the minister did not show any partiality when he went out to purchase the fruit. He might tell the committee where he got the bulk of the fruit, and if he advised the fruit producers throughout the country that he was going to ship fruit in this way, so that they all might have a fair chance.

Mr. FISHER. What we did was to make an arrangement with the St. Catharines Cold Storage Company, who are practically the Fruit Growers' Association. We took their fruit of the best quality, and guaranteed them the market price of it at that time. We handled it as we thought best for an experimental purpose to test the best way to put it up.

Mr. STAPLES. Did the minister get the fruit from a company in St. Catharines or from individual producers?

Mr. FISHER. It is an association. We asked the association to co-operate with us to get the best fruit. When we got our returns we charged the expenses only and made a full return to the producers. That was three times what we guaranteed them. It was simply an experiment to show the result of packing and handling the fruit in a certain way and was very satisfactory. We purchased the apples, put them in cold storage and ran the risks.

Mr. THORNTON. From how many points were apples shipped in that way?

Mr. FISHER. From the counties of Elgin and Ontario. The Ontario apples were purchased from the Oshawa Fruit Growers, Limited.

Mr. THORNTON. Who was at the head of that?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Lick.

Mr. THORNTON. Is he or was he an employee of the government?

Mr. FISHER. He was a fruit inspector for us years ago, but has not been for a long time.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the minister intend to continue this policy next year?

Mr. FISHER. We have a carload of apples now.

Mr. STAPLES. The minister has shown what a little thought and enterprise will do. The fault I have been finding with him is that he does not experiment enough along these lines. Will he continue this?

Mr. FISHER. I think the individual fruit growers ought to follow the example given, put up their fruit in the same way, and get the profit. We will not undertake to do the business for them.

Mr. EDWARDS. Did the packages bear a stamp to show that they were shipped by the government?

Mr. FISHER. No, they were simply marked 'Canadian peaches, Niagara brand.'

Mr. STAPLES. Who handled them on the other side?

Mr. FISHER. They were shipped to brokers in the ordinary way.

Mr. EDWARDS. The result of this experiment bears out my contention of this afternoon, that the government might well establish some system for the inspection and guaranteeing of our cheese.

To encourage the production and sale of Canadian tobacco, $15,000.

Mr. FISHER. I have had an expert from France making experiments in different parts of the country in the growing, handling and curing of tobacco. He reported that he would require two or three stations where he could grow tobacco in rotation with other crops, and have them go on permanently. We established one station in Essex and two small ones in Quebec, and have been trying to arrange to establish one in British Columbia. As the stations developed we added two more experts to the staff, one French and one English. I hear very favourable reports of the results of this work. The quality of the Canadian tobacco has largely improved and the growers have taken heart again in the production of this crop in Canada. A few years ago they were nearly in despair, but I am glad to say that things have revived, and last year especially in the county of Essex, they got a very handsome price indeed for their tobacco, and are very much encouraged.

Mr. SPROULE. About what price?

Mr. FISHER. At one time, 18 cents a pound.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister is a strong advocate of the abolition of cigarettes, and has voted in favour of the abolition of their manufacture, importation and sale. How does he square himself—shall I use that term—for proposing such a large expenditure to encourage the farmers of Canada to produce tobacco?

Mr. FISHER. I should be glad if nobody in Canada used tobacco, but if they will use it, I want the Canadian farmer and tobacco-grower to get the full advantage of it.

Mr. BLAIN. How about the youth of the land?

Mr. FISHER. I should be glad if they did not use tobacco.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister attempted once before to explain his position in this matter, but failed. I thought perhaps he would have thought out an explanation by this time. But he does not seem to be able to explain it, and I do not think I can assist him very much, for the matter is very hard of explanation.

Mr. FISHER. We will leave it, then.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister give us information as to the quantity of home-grown tobacco manufactured in Canada, and the quantity imported?

Mr. FISHER. I am told that last year 10,000,000 pounds was grown in Canada, about the same quantity as the year before, but at a better price.

Mr. SPROULE. And how about the quantity imported?

Mr. FISHER. I have not those figures at hand, but I could procure them from the Inland Revenue and Customs Departments.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the commercial value of last year's crop?

Mr. FISHER. I think it would average about 12 cents a pound, but assuming that it was only 10 cents a pound, the crop would represent about $1,000,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. The minister has established two or three experimental stations to assist in the development of the tobacco-growing industry? Has he considered the advisability of helping in any way this industry in eastern Ontario? In the city of Kingston, we have several quite large manufactories of tobacco and cigars. The proprietor of one has been endeavouring to interest the local farmers in the production of tobacco, claiming that it could be produced at a good profit. Seeing that so much tobacco is produced in Canada, I do not think the minister could prevent its production, even if he desired to do so, and if we are to go on producing it, I would like to see the people of eastern Ontario get a share of the profit.

Mr. FISHER. The two regions in eastern Canada where tobacco is chiefly produced are the counties of Kent and Essex, in southwestern Ontario, and such counties in Quebec as Montcalm, Rouville, Two Mountains and L'Assomption.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is the climate of these two sections the same?

Mr. FISHER. No, and the varieties of tobacco that they grow are different. Some tobacco is grown in Prince Edward county, and a little in places along the shore of Lake Ontario. A considerable quantity is grown in British Columbia, especially along Okanagan lake. It is there I hope to establish another station. My expert tells me that there is no reason why tobacco should not be grown in Prince Edward county as well as in Essex and Kent. The farmers, apparently, have not taken it up. The growth of this crop in Essex and Kent is probably due in part to the proximity of Michigan, where, under similar conditions, considerable quanities of tobacco are grown.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. JAMESON. Has the minister any reports of experiments of tobacco growing in the maritime provinces? I know that in the western part of Nova Scotia tobacco was grown by a gentleman as an experiment, and he told me that while it was not sufficiently fragrant to smoke in the house except in the day time—he being a sort of grass-widower—still he had proven that a crop could be grown there.

Mr. FISHER. We propose to make some experiments at the new station at Kentville which is in process of establishment.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the minister made any experiments in Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta?

Mr. FISHER. No, not yet.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.47 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 29, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT—WOOL IN THE FLEECE.

*Mr. ELSON:

For what reason was wool in the fleece, which is a product of the farm, not placed on the free list in the proposed reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States, on which the American duty is now twelve cents per pound on Canada's long wools?

Mr. FIELDING. This item was not one of those upon which an agreement was reached. It might be difficult to determine the reason which entered into the minds of the negotiators as respects any particular item.

IMPORTS OF BEEF, PORK, &c.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. How many barrels, boxes or packages of pork, beef, mutton, lamb and cheese have been imported into Canada during the months of October, November and December, 1910, and for the months of January and February, 1911?

2. What was the weight and value thereof, and the countries from which the same were imported?

3. What was the number of pounds of butter and number of dozens of eggs, and the value thereof, and the countries imported from, for the month of February, 1911.

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The department has no record of the number of barrels, boxes or packages of pork, beef, &c., imported, the quantity in pounds simply being shown.

2. The quantity and value of pork, beef, mutton, lamb and cheese imported into Canada, by countries, during the months of October, November, December, January and February, was as follows:

BACON AND HAMS, SHOULDERS AND SIDES.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
Great Britain	24	$ 5
United States	812,893	139,483
China	271	15
Hong Kong	100	8
November, 1910—		
Great Britain	420	90
United States	299,258	54,312
Belgium	35	12
Hong Kong	455	23
December, 1910—		
Great Britain	74	18
United States	234,408	39,716
New Zealand	20,304	2,894
Hong Kong	741	50
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	56	13
United States	223,392	34,240
Hong Kong	515	28
Japan	62	4
February, 1911—		
United States	195,975	32,583
Australia	8,959	1,569
Hong Kong	23	2

BEEF, SALTED, IN BARRELS.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
United States	247,361	$17,511
November, 1910—		
United States	271,468	18,933
December, 1910—		
United States	134,092	8,636
Newfoundland	1,255	151
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	7,902	702
United States	92,944	6,255
February, 1911—		
United States	198,425	12,384

MUTTON AND LAMB, FRESH.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
United States	76,027	$ 7,046
Australia	217,266	15,766
November, 1910—		
United States	33,760	3,251
Australia	163,909	12,341
December, 1910—		
United States	71,720	6,063
Australia	179,470	11,880
January, 1911—		
United States	54,665	5,027
Australia	157,927	10,371
February, 1911—		
United States	99,359	8,903
Australia	142,751	9,192

PORK, BARRELLED, IN BRINE.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
Great Britain	2,568	$ 304
United States	1,121,100	114,523
China	66	4
November, 1910—		
United States	824,265	85,189
Hong Kong	1,858	131
December, 1910—		
United States	467,820	45,582
Newfoundland	2,916	322
China	291	25
Hong Kong	3,499	246
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	45,000	5,919
United States	852,135	83,072
Hong Kong	302	19
February, 1911—		
United States	540,324	51,024
Hong Kong	398	30

OTHER MEATS, FRESH.

Countries.	Lbs	Value.
October, 1910—		
United States	59,596	$7,774
Australia	6,480	146
November, 1910—		
United States	27,019	4,028
December, 1910—		
United States	42,350	5,303
Australia	800	97
January, 1911—		
United States	29,397	4,526
Australia	11,902	595
February, 1911—		
United States	37,080	5,008
Australia	506	60

OTHER MEATS, SALTED.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
United States	58,941	$8,191
Hong Kong	4,831	323
China	866	57
November, 1910—		
United States	22,701	3,587
Italy	631	179
France	220	81
China	1,481	105
Hong Kong	950	66
December, 1910—		
Great Britain	544	144
United States	25,590	3,645
Hong Kong	3,071	240
Newfoundland	900	93
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	36,800	2,228
United States	22,538	3,037
Hong Kong	200	10
China	200	12
February, 1911—		
United States	20,343	3,039
Hong Kong	840	72

CHEESE.

Countries.	Lbs	Value.
October, 1910—		
Great Britain	8,967	$1,774
United States	21,716	4,234
France	15,879	3,158
Italy	72,709	16,378
Belgium	1,489	210
Switzerland	30,197	5,254
Holland	2,400	397
Germany	1,960	391

CHEESE

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
November 1910—		
Great Britain	10,161	$2,276
United States	19,539	3,708
France	22,482	4,754
Italy	23,224	4,320
Switzerland	36,317	6,755
Germany	18,449	3,141
Belgium	963	123
December, 1910—		
Great Britain	5,184	1,300
United States	20,274	3,961
France	44,559	12,173
Italy	66,775	8,878
Austria-Hungary	3,439	427
Turkey in Asia	850	40
Switzerland	31,873	5,817
Holland	3,543	443
New Zealand	260	32
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	979	254
United States	18,261	3,418
France	1,810	517
Italy	18,280	3,453
Turkey in Asia	538	42
Switzerland	33,519	6,238
February, 1911—		
Great Britain	3,362	862
United States	11,543	2,203
France	900	249
Italy	101,053	22,278
Germany	113	36
Holland	2,759	160

PETIT ROCHER WHARF.

Mr. CROCKET:

What expenditure has been made since April 1, 1910, on account of roadway and repairs to wharf at Petit Rocher, N.B., and what are the items of said expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $1,047.45, itemized as follows:

Balance on extra work on contract	344 70
Labour	273 06
Timber	325 04
Stone	104 65
Total to date, March 23, 1911,	$1,047 45

WHEAT PRICES IN WEST.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar):

1. Is the price of wheat higher in Dakota than in Manitoba?

2. Is the price of wheat shipped from the United States higher in the Liverpool markets than wheat shipped from Canada?

3. If so, what reason does the government assign for wheat in Dakota being higher than the price of wheat in Manitoba?

Mr. FISHER:

1, 2 and 3. The grain markets in Dakota are purely local, and in order to get prices current it would be necessary either to write local dealers or else procure copies of the local papers.

The principal grain markets in the Northwestern states of the union are Minneapolis and Duluth, and quotations at these centres can be furnished, but Dakota quotations have not been observed by my department.

The price of wheat shipped from the United States and from Canada is exactly the same in the Liverpool markets.

THE DUMPING CLAUSE.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. How often has the government put in operation the dumping clause of the Customs Act in respect to articles for the production of which bounties have been paid in regard to the steel and iron industries?

2. What are the dates, particulars, and reasons which induced the government to put in operation the said dumping clause?

Mr. PATERSON:

1 and 2. The collection of dumping duty is made by collectors of customs as in the case of other customs duties. Subject to the regulations and to certain exemptions temporary and otherwise, the dumping clause is operative through an Act of parliament as set forth in section 6 of the Customs Tariff, 1907—the provisions of the law being applied by collectors of customs to articles of a class or kind made in Canada, when such articles are exported to Canada, if the export or selling price to an importer in Canada is less than the fair market value of the same article as sold for home consumption in the country of export.

It would take a lengthy investigation to ascertain how often dumping duty has been collected in respect of imported iron or steel products similar to those to which bounties applied, since the dumping clause came into operation in 1904.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the government made any definite investigation as to the feasibility of constructing a tunnel under the St. Lawrence river, in lieu of the Quebec bridge at or near Quebec, whether near the site of the bridge or elsewhere.

2. Has the government ascertained anything as to the cost of a tunnel?

3. Is there to the knowledge of the government any report or evidence in existence as to the nature of the material or formation through which a tunnel would be constructed under the river and the approaches to the tunnel at or near Quebec? If so what kind of material would be encountered?

Mr. GRAHAM: This department has no record of any investigation being held as to the advisability of constructing a tunnel under the St. Lawrence river at Quebec, in lieu of the Quebec bridge.

RECIPROCITY—BRITISH TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the government obtained copies of the report of the British Tariff Commission,

to the British government, on the proposed reciprocal trade arrangement between Canada and the United States, and will the government lay a copy on the table of the House?

2. When did the government take steps to obtain official or definite knowledge of this report?

3. Will the government furnish each member of the House with one or more copies of this report, and how soon will they be available?

4. Has the government carefully perused and considered this report, and, in the opinion of this government, are the statements it contains, particularly as to exports and imports of Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom, affected by the agreement, correct?

5. If not apparently correct, or if not satisfactory to our government, has the attention of the British government been called to the matters objected to?

Mr. FIELDING. The government is not aware of any such report to the British government. I think it probable that the hon. gentleman has in mind a document, which is not official, issued by a political organization in England.

VALIDITY OF MARRIAGES.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. Under the laws of Canada or of the several provinces, are marriages valid when contracted between persons of different religious beliefs? If so, in what cases?

2. Has any one the right to urge persons who have contracted such valid marriages to disregard them on the ground that they are invalid?

3. If such right does not exist what is the remedy?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. There is no Dominion legislation on the subject.

The solemnization of marriage in the provinces is, under the British North America Act, matter entirely of provincial jurisdiction.

Section 92 of that statute enacts that in each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say:

12. The solemnization of marriage in the provinces.

EXPORTS OF MILK.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. What quantity of milk was exported from Canada to the United States in 1910, and what was the value of the same?

2. What quantity of cream was exported from Canada to the United States in 1910, and what was the value of the same?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The quantity and value of milk exported from Canada to the United States during the 11 months ended February 28, 1911 amounted to 39,773 gallons, valued at $4,276.

2. The quantity and value of cream exported from Canada to the United States during the 11 months ended February 28, 1911 amounted to 1,866,577 gallons, valued at $1,699,934.

Note.—Milk and cream were not separately enumerated in the classification of exports prior to the beginning of the fiscal year 1911.

BARK LAKE POST OFFICE.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. When and why was the Bark Lake post office closed?

2. When and why was it again reopened, and with what points did it then and does it now receive and send by carrier direct?

3. What was then and what is now the frequency of service?

4. What is the distance between it and the nearest post office east and west?

5. What is the record of business of Barry's Lake post office, Opeongo post office and Bark Lake post office?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Bark Lake post office was closed on the 31st January, 1900, the office not being at that time considered necessary.

2. The office was reopened at a point one half mile distant from the former site on the 21st March, 1903, it having been represented that the office was again required. The office is served direct from the Barry's Bay post office.

3. The service was formerly tri-weekly. It is now weekly.

4. It is three miles distant from Opeongo post office on the west and five and a half miles distant from Barry's Bay post office on the east.

5. The Barry's Bay post office shows an annual revenue of $620.09, the Opeongo post office a revenue of $56.75, and the Bark Lake post office a revenue of $26.90.

EXPORT OF AMERICAN SILVER.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What amount of United States silver currency has been exported each year from Canada by the banks since the policy was adopted of paying them a commission therefor, and what commission and express expenses have been paid therefor each year?

2. Has the department made any estimate of the amount in circulation in Canada, and as to what extent it has decreased since the above policy was adopted?

Mr. FIELDING:

1.

	United States Silver. Exported.	Commission.	Express Charges.
1906..	$ 576,661.30	$2,162.45	$5,054.91
1909-10	918,530.12	3,444.28	5,049.09
1910-11	1,482,503.96	5,557.80	7,476.35

2. No estimate has been made of the United States silver in circulation in Canada on account of the inherent difficulties in making an exact, or even approximate, estimate of this character.

That the Canadian silver is taking the place of the United States coinage thus exported is evident from the fact that during the year 1909-10, $1,097,925 Canadian silver was issued in Canada, and in 1910-11 $1,452,400; whereas, for some years previously the average amount of Canadian silver issued did not exceed $600,000 a year.

TRANSPORT OF FISH.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What amount has been expended each year in assisting the transport of fish from the maritime provinces to the provinces west of them, to whom has the money been paid, and in what manner?

2. What has been the value of fish so transported each year?

3. How far west have assisted shipments been extended?

Mr. BRODEUR:

Year.	Cold Storage Freight Service			
	I.C.R.	Halifax and Southwestern, R. R.	Canadian Express Company.	Dominion Express Company.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1907-08.	224 41	.....	.....	.....
1908-09.	1,374 30	569 59	1,059 36	910 67
1909-10.	295 38	185 91	6,885 79	8,276 41
1910-11.	acct. not yet rec'd.	.....	7,793 23	8,535 69

2. As the department accepts responsibility only for a portion of the transportation charges, it has no record of the value of the fish.

3. To the western boundary of Ontario.

EXPORTS OF POTATOES.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. What is the quantity and value of potatoes exported from Canada to the United States in each of the years 1901 to 1910, inclusive?

2. What is the quantity and value of potatoes imported from the United States in each of the years 1901 to 1910, inclusive?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The quantity and value of potatoes (Canadian produce) exported from Canada to the United States during the fiscal years from 1901 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

	Bushels.	Value.
1901	232,101	$ 68,151
1902	808,041	327,046
1903	138,855	56,969
1904	1,451,070	742,537
1905	34,870	18,301
1906	473,239	128,363
1907 (9 months)	8,941	4,250
1908	34,392	15,459
1909	574,454	251,907
1910	678,632	345,903

2. The quantity and value of potatoes imported into Canada from the United States during the fiscal years from 1901 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

	Bushels.	Value.
1901	136,666	$ 88,649
1902	81,771	87,970
1903	407,425	228,609
1904	77,028	78,025
1905	518,875	232,044
1906	227,155	126,163
1907 (9 months)	94,521	71,065
1908	249,907	195,650
1909	127,110	129,725
1910	217,170	181,751

WINDSOR GOVERNMENT DOCK.

Mr. WILCOX:

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to establish a government dock at Windsor? If so, when does the department propose to start?

2. What will be the preliminary appropriation, if any?

3. What portion of the cost has the city of Windsor agreed to bear, if any?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1, 2 and 3. The matter is now under consideration.

MR. JOHN SINCLAIR.

Mr. BRADBURY:

1. Is Mr. John Sinclair still acting inspector at the new Indian reserve, Fisher river? If so, what are his duties and what salary does he receive?

2. How long has he been employed by the government?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Mr. Sinclair is employed as foreman on the new Indian reserve at Fisher river to look after the construction of houses for the Indians and to give the Indians instruction in farming. His salary is $75 a month.

2. He has been employed by the Department of Indian Affairs since the 28th of April, 1900.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—OVERCLASSIFICATION, &c.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), one or two

questions with reference to the overclassifications and overbreaks and train hauls which are being investigated by the Board of Engineers. Is the minister able to give us any definite information? The other day, on the 10th March, he could not do so. He said there were certain statements which had to be prepared and which it would take some time to furnish, but he hoped to be ready before long to inform the House what the overbreak and overclassifications and other over-charges amounted to in such a way that the House would understand them, and that they would be given not necessarily in the terms which the engineers would use.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said on that occasion that these details were being worked out by the assistant engineer, but he informed me that it would take a lot of work and some time to complete it. I shall make inquiry and see if it is completed, but it strikes me that it cannot be completed until the snow is away as no practical work can be done until then. However, I may be wrong.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister inform the House as to the situation of the Quebec bridge—as to whether any plan has been definitely determined on, whether the contract has been let, and the time limit stipulated for completing the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. Progress has been made, but I think it would not be in the public interest to make any statement at present. I hope shortly to be able to give all the information required. The contract has not yet been signed.

THE SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), for some information with regard to the report of Mr. Boyer upon the charges made respecting the administration of the Soulanges canal. During the session of 1907-8, a report was sent in to the government and we were asked to vote a sum to pay the commissioner. Several times has that report been asked for but my hon. friend has always said that he could not bring it down until the government had taken action on it. It was again asked for during the session of 1909. Before we go on with further estimates of that department, I would ask my hon. friend to lay that report on the table of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thought the report had been brought down. If not, I have no objection to bringing it down; I shall look into it.

Mr. MONK. I have found no trace of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to give notice that to-morrow, I shall bring up the report of the West Indian Commission, if the Finance Minister has no objection.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection.

SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT AID TO AGRICULTURE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. ARTHUR GILBERT (Drummond and Arthabaska.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to invite the House to a consideration of the means which it is desirable we should adopt with a view to forwarding the agricultural interests of the country.

Is our farming community in a position to hold their own against foreign competition on the markets of the world? Of course, they may ship abroad whatever is left over and above the quantities consumed at home; but in order to compete vigorously against foreigners, it is necessary in the first place that they should have as much science as they have with respect to making the soil productive, with respect also to cattle breeding, dairying, agriculture, bee-keeping and fruit-growing. Whatever success has been accomplished by Denmark, Belgium and Holland, and other countries, I think I would have no difficulty in showing that we are in a position to get still better results. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, has so stated to the House in his speech of April 15, 1910, (page 7380) of which I shall quote a few lines:

> Any unprejudiced mind must conclude that in view of the fertile soil which spreads all over this Dominion, and the intelligence of our people, the annual crop production per acre is not what it ought to be. I believe that is due to the fact that scientific methods of cultivating the soil and the treatment of land are not thoroughly well understood by our people generally. To instruct and teach the people, object lessons are of the primest importance.

Of course it is of primary importance that he should be given object lessons. The most effective way would consist in starting experiment stations at a central point in each of the various constituencies, in such a way that the farmers in the neighbouring district might see for themselves the results obtained from good farming methods and a scientific management of the soil. There should be in connection with these experiment stations practical and scientific men whose duty it would be to educate the farmers in these respects. The hon. Minister of Agriculture realizes fully the great importance of having a greater number of illustration stations, and he has clearly stated so in his speech of April 15, 1910, (page 7380) of which the following is an extract :

If those who live in a particular district can go to an easily accessible central point and there see illustrated the result of good management of the crops and of scientific treatment of the soil, they can learn more than they can by any amount of reading and oral instruction. It is therefore highly important that the number of branch stations should be increased. Now, if each of these stations were to cost $25,000 or $35,000 the appropriations I ask from parliament would not enable me to establish any great number. It is my belief that we should establish comparatively smaller stations and deal simply with crop production, and not include stock experiments to any great extent, if at all. After all, the experiment of feeding stock indoors is very much the same in one place as in another, and the results obtained will serve the industry in all parts of the country. But, experiments in the treatment of the soil and the production of the crops must be conducted in as many different localities as possible. I am therefore trying to establish a very considerable number of branch stations of this character on the land of the science which has been adduced from successful experimentation. This is a new principle in the establishment of these branch farms, which I trust will appeal to the House as I know it will appeal to the farming people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, does dairying give as large returns as one might expect it to give? I realize fully the advance we have made of late years, but if we take note of what is going on in foreign lands, we cannot but acknowledge that we might increase two-fold, and even three-fold, the revenue from our cows.

As evidence I shall quote the statements made in this connection by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in his speech of April 15, 1910 (pages 7386 and 7387 of 'Hansard'):

One of the most glaring facts in connection with the insufficient realization of the proper profits on our farms in Canada, is the small average production of the cow. Those of us who have studied this question know that in Denmark and Holland 15 or 20 years ago, they were in about the same position in this respect as we are to-day, but by a thorough system and co-operative work and testing the individual cows, by cutting out the bad one and keeping the good one and only breeding from the good ones, they are gradually and steadily increasing the average products and have reached the point that the cows of Denmark produce more than double per year individual cow, than the cows of Canada. Now this is a very unfortunate, a very bad condition of affairs.

And a little further on he continues as follows:

There is no reason to believe that in a few years the Canadians will not be able to say that the average cow production in Canada is what the Danes produce, 9,000 pounds a year for every cow in the country, instead of the Canadian average of 3,000.

The Danes obtain a yield of 9,000 pounds of milk per cow per annum, while Canadians are content with an average yield of 3,000 pounds; that is a difference of 6,000 pounds per cow per annum against us, through lack of requisite knowledge on our part.

Mr. Speaker, soil drainage is another matter to which we should give attention. There are still a great many who do not realize the importance of improvements in this particular line. It is well known that soil drainage increases the yield from the land; in certain localities that increase may amount to fifty per cent and even more. In order to induce farmers to drain their lands I think the government should grant a bonus. We also need the aid of the government towards draining certain lands which require an exceptional outlay to carry on the work, and the country would benefit thereby.

In my constituency, about Drummondville, St. Germain and Wickham, there is an area of about 3,500 acres of good hay land which suffers at times from the overflow of a small stream. The injury caused by these freshets might be avoided by means of protection works. However, that is a rather costly undertaking which the owners of these lands could not think of carrying out without the help of the government.

Mr. Speaker, considering that thirty or forty families more might eke out a living from these lands when drained, the increase in the population, which would amount to 300 at the lowest, would compensate the country for the money expended. As the population is continually increasing from one census to another, it is difficult to state accurately what revenue the government get per annum per head of population, but I think we might, without exaggeration, place it at $15, and that would mean $4,500 of revenue forthcoming to the government from these families. It is unfortunate that lands of such fertility should not be under cultivation; we are losing heavily every year. These people, unable to live on such lands, have gone to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if we wish to make a success of agriculture, I think we should bring about and encourage the formation of agricultural co-operative associations. The countries which are to-day leaders in agriculture have a great number of these co-operative associations; the subject was a live one at the last convention of the United States and Canadian Agricultural Lecturers held at Washington on November 14, 1910.

Here is a short extract from the report of Mr. Gigault, Deputy Minister of Agriculture:

At each of these conventions the hon. Mr. Wilson, secretary of agriculture at Washington, insisted on the importance of agricultural education and co-operation. Referring to the

high cost of food products, he taunted the farming class for dispensing with the necessary efforts towards acquiring the knowledge indispensable for developing the agricultural resources of the country and increasing the yield of farm lands. At the same time, he recommended that they should have recourse to co-operation with a view to safeguarding their interests and securing a greater proportion of the price paid by consumers. An inquiry has shown as regards certain food products, the farmer received only 35 per cent if the price paid by consumers, the remaining sixty-five per cent falling into the purse of middlemen or being taken up by other factories. It cannot be denied that between the producer and the consumer, there are many useless middlemen whom it would be in the interest of the farming community to dispense with if they are intent on reaping the fruit of their labours. In a great many cases a food product will go through the hands of two or three dealers before reaching the consumer.

In order that we may have within the shortest possible time the benefit of the working of these associations, I think the government should introduce forthwith legislation providing for the establishment of such associations, and send out lecturers to spread a knowledge of their usefulness and of the systems of co-operative association at present known best adapted to the needs of the various localities.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the most effective encouragement these associations could receive would be in the shape of a yearly grant to the treasure of each of these agricultural co-operative associations, say a grant of $5 or more for each farmer who would be willing to join such association, with the understanding that such fund would be employed for the benefit of the said association in accordance with the directions of its officers.

To my mind, that would be a most beneficial appropriation in the interest of the country, for by helping on and developing the farming industry we are actually helping every other class of society, for they are all dependent on the agricultural community. In the very measure that the latter prosper, the whole country is benefited.

Mr. Speaker, these agricultural co-operative associations would aid in developing more rapidly dairying, breeding, poultry raising, bee-keeping and agriculture. They would also enable the grain growers to get better results from their labours through the turning of their grain crops into commodities available for consumption. They would bring about, in connection with the government grant of 30 per cent, the building of cold storage warehouses throughout the country for the preservation of our meats, our eggs, our fruit and other farm products, these associations becoming the agencies through which cold storage accommodation could thus be provided in the various localities.

Then, again, these co-operative associations would enable cattle breeders to build abattoirs with government aid. The hon. Minister of Agriculture seems willing to help those who are intent on helping themselves. Dealing with that question of the abattoirs, he expressed views to that effect, as will be seen in the following extract from a speech delivered by him on December 13, 1910 (page 1242):

Now I wish to say a word or two more in regard to abattoirs. I have here the annual report of the Department of Agriculture for the province of Alberta, and it contains a report of the commissioners on beef, mutton, &c. I have said that this proposal was an enormous one, it was a proposal to expend about eight million dollars. When that proposal was laid before me, I told the promoters frankly that I considered it far too big, that there was no prospect of its being successful. It was a very elaborate scheme, with two or three central plants, and a lot of outside plants. It was going to absorb the whole trade of the country. Now, while I believe that it is important to promote the development of these different businesses, they ought to have some natural basis for success. They ought to begin in a small way, and grow up, instead of starting out at once as huge enterprises, with an enormous capital invested, which would never have a prospect of paying. The only way in which capital could be tempted into this investment was by the government backing it up, and agreeing to pay all the losses. In short language, that is what the proposal meant. Now, I believe, to a certain extent, in giving public assistance, but I believe that the government should only assist those who are ready to assist themselves. I believe in the government aiding enterprises, but at the same time, private individuals ought to be willing to show their good faith in the enterprises, by putting some of their own money into it, because it would then be more likely to succeed. I say it was too large a scheme for the government to undertake. I have here a report of the commissioners to the provincial government of Alberta, from which I will read an extract:—

I am perfectly in accord with the hon. Minister of Agriculture in this connecton.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in a speech of April 15, 1910 (page 7387) referred to some work done by Mr. McNeil for the purpose of encouraging the formation of such associations:

A word in regard to some work instituted by Mr McNeill, head of the fruit branch, which points in the right direction, that is the encouragement and establishment of fruit growers' or shippers' and packers' associations. One of the greatest difficulties our fruit growers in Canada have experienced is that their work is largely done by each individual, and that one individual has not enough fruit to fill large orders or to make an impression on the market. By forming an association, a group of people in a particular district can get together and employ one efficient and competent expert packer and grader, who will grade and pack their fruit so that in the aggregate the fruit which is thus handled in co-operation amongst a number of people will

bring in a larger return and be better accepted and received on the market than fruit sent forward by the individual. This work was started in the southwestern part of Ontario by Mr. McNeill some years ago, and to-day, I am glad to know, there are a number of such associations working most satisfactorily and most successfully. It is work of the department in one sense, because we indicate the road. It is work of the people themselves, however, and it can only be successfully carried on by the co-operative work of the people combining together, mutually trusting one another, associating themselves for combined work and carrying on the whole thing as a business transaction in a business way. I am glad they are doing it successfully as it is an important work, for the improvement of the fruit trade of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in order to promote agriculture the government should undertake the publication of an agricultural paper for the use of the members of these agricultural co-operative associations, wherein such members might record their grievances and impart the required information.

That paper would be for the exclusive use of agricultural co-operative associations to facilitate the work of these purveyors on the local and world markets, and enable them to secure a uniform grading of farm products, &c.

Mr. Speaker, is the farming population increasing as rapidly as that in the towns? Judging from the number of houses which are closed in the rural districts, and from the energy displayed in the building line in cities, I am bound to come to the conclusion that the farming populations is being depleted and transferred to the cities.

I think it is much to be regretted for the farming community and for the country as a whole that such conditions should exist, as they cannot but result in still more enhancing the cost of living.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture pointed out those results when he addressed the House on the 13th December, 1910, as reported in 'Hansard,' page 1233:

> In eastern Canada, in Ontario, and Quebec, and in the maritime provinces the population in the rural districts is almost stationary and possibly in some places it may have decreased while the fact is that the total population of these provinces has increased largely and rapidly. Large cities like Montreal and Toronto in these two provinces, and like Sydney and St. John in the lower provinces, are building up at an immense rate, and the inhabitants of those cities are consumers, and not producers of food products.

Sir, how is it, I ask, that the increase in the population of our rural districts did not keep pace with that of our urban population? In the first place, when farmers are doing well they do not, as a rule, desert their farm lands, and that accounts for that rural population being stationary. Others go west, and rightly so.

As to those farmers who have to give up their farm lands, either because they are over head and ears in debt, or because they do not know how to secure a good return from their land farms for lack of scientific farming, or, again, on account of the infertility of the soil, those men, I say, are like the sons of our good farmers who, for some reason or other, drift away from their homes because the father cannot afford to provide for their settling.

Then those people have to choose between living on a mortgaged farm land or taking up a timbered land which is being plundered by the lumberman. When confronted by such conditions they are to be seen looking all around for some means of bettering their position, and while some go to work on the railways, in the mines or in the lumber camps, others drift into the cities where they engage in various commercial occupations or work in the shops or factories because they get better pay. That is a fact much to be regretted. The hon. Minister of Agriculture referred to it in his speech of December 13, 1910, page 1241, as follows:

> I want to mention another thing which perhaps, may not affect the west so much, but it certainly affects the east. By reason of various economic facts, it has been well understood for the last few years that the reward of a man's toil and investment in other industries, has been much greater than it has been in agriculture, notwithstanding the high prices which farmers have received for a great deal of their products. The consequence is, that a great number of men and women who used to be engaged in agriculture, and who were glad to live on the farm, have drifted into the cities, and have taken up other occupations, dealing with the country's commerce, railroads, mining, transportation, and so forth. The consequence is, that there is to-day, on the farms of eastern Canada, at any rate, less labour and less efficient labour available for agricultural products than there used to be six or eight years ago. This is a fact, which we cannot but recognize, and which we must all deplore. I know that personally, being engaged in farming myself, I deplore it very much, and I find it detrimental to the progress and prosperity of the country. The result is, combined with other things, that our exports of agricultural products, with the exception of raw grades produced in the northwest, have been decreasing, and perhaps in some particular instances, there may be some slight failure in the progress of production.

Within the last few years, Sir, our exports of cattle, butter, cheese, ham, bacon, potatoes, eggs, &c., have decreased to such a point that before many years have elapsed, should the production of those articles not keep pace with the requirements of consumption, we shall have to import those products from abroad.

Sir, what is to be done under such cir-

cumstances? Remedies have to be applied to existing evils. I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture, from what he told us on the 13th December, 1910 (page 1251) when he spoke of stimulating the efforts of the producer to the highest degree, is ready to take action and set to work, and here are his words:

If I knew of any way in which I could stimulate production in Canada to a greater degree, I would be glad to do it.

Sir, the proper remedy within our reach is to be found in the government directly expending at least one-tenth of the yearly revenue of the Dominion of Canada in the interest of the farming community so that agriculture may flourish and advance here, just as it is making headway in Denmark, Belgium, Holland and elsewhere.

May we, Canadian farmers, ever hope to secure our legitimate share of the national budget after having won the fair land of ours from the primeval forest and having, up to now, cleared and tilled the soil in order to wrest from its bosom the necessary food products of our maintenance and that of the whole country, not to mention the fact that we are indirectly paying two-thirds of the country's public expenditure?

Since confederation we have subsidized various railway companies to the extent of $607,776,853.50.

There has been expended on the Canadian militia $83,193,389.45.

The uprising in the Northwest in 1884 saddled the country with an expenditure of $1,697,851.52.

We also gave the British government from 1889 to 1906, for the maintenance of the Esquimalt garrison, $1,237,288.

The South African war, the provisional garrison of Halifax, have cost us $2,826,608.99.

We have also paid bonuses towards the encouragement of the manufacture of iron and steel to the extent of $17,119,051.

Since 1867 there has been expended for arts, agriculture, statistics, civil government, immigration and quarantine an aggregate sum of $28,399,327.37.

What I find most deplorable is that since 1867 we have devoted but $14,464,935.48 to the arts, agriculture and statistics, whereas all the countries which are anxious to succeed do not shrink from making the necessary expenditure towards diffusing the science of agriculture among the farming population and encouraging the foundation of co-operative agricultural societies. To realize just what I just said, you have but to read the reports which have been issued from Rome by the International Institute of Agriculture, which comprises forty-seven world powers.

Sir, the proposal which I make is with a view to promoting the general interests of agriculture. Living as we do upon Canadian soil and feeding upon its products, we should take a deep concern in the tillers of the soil. I do not know of a single man in this country who is not to benefit by the diffusion of the agricultural science and the prosperity of the farming community.

The manufacturers, the workingmen, the traders, the transportation companies, the liberal professions, will all benefit by it. I hope, therefore, that my proposal will meet with no opposition from this House, and I submit the following amendment:

That all the words after 'that' in the main motion be struck out and replaced by the following:

In the opinion of this House, one-tenth at least of our yearly national income could be spent by the government on the improvement and advancement of Canadian agriculture and devoted, among other, to the following purposes:

(a) More efficacious diffusion of the agricultural sciences among the farming community.

(b) The improved drainage of many agricultural lands now insufficiently drained and whose yield would be doubled by means of works necessitating government assistance.

(c) The foundation and subsidizing of co-operative agricultural societies and the assistance given to cold storage plants established by those societies under the Act; the publication and the free distribution of an agricultural journal for the use of the members of those societies.

Mr. EDWARDS. I desire to speak briefly in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Gilbert). While perhaps objection might be taken to specifying a certain amount, such as one-tenth of the revenue, to be devoted to agricultural purposes, the main object of the resolution is nevertheless right. If it should be found in the interest of agriculture to expend three-tenths, or four-tenths, or whatever other amount is necessary, then that sum should be spent. But I do think that much less is being spent at present in the interest of agriculture throughout the Dominion of Canada than should be spent. The amount expended by the Dominion of Canada purely and simply on agriculture is, I believe, less than the amount expended by the province of Ontario for the same purpose. The amount expended by this government is exceedingly small compared with the amounts expended by some other governments in the interest of agriculture:

France	$ 9,200,000
Austria	9,240,000
Hungary	9,400,000
United States	10,000,000
Russia	25,280,000
Japan	3,750,000
Canada, average of last ten years	604,188

Now, I think the motion of my hon. friend is very opportune, especially at the present time when we are considering a proposal brought down by the Minister of Finance to establish closer trade relations between this country and the United States, because, if that agreement is ratified, it will bring our farmers into competition, not only with those of the United States, but with the leading agricultural countries of the world. In view of the inadequate amount expended by the federal government in the interests of agriculture, compared with the amounts expended by some of the countries I have named, it does seem to me that this government should take immediately a step forward, and place our agriculturalists in a position where they will be able to meet the competition which they will have to meet if this agreement is ratified. That is one of the reasons why I think the resolution proposed by my hon. friend is peculiarly opportune at the present time. It will be necessary not only for the federal government, but for the provincial governments, to spend more money along the line of instructing the people in the principles of scientific farming. Instructors must be sent out in order to teach the people how they may compete successfully with the agriculturalists of other countries. There is another point in the resolution to which I wish to refer, and that is the suggestion that the government take up the matter of drainage, bringing some of the waste lands of the country under cultivation. As I caught that part of the resolution, it states it to be advisable that the government should expend money to drain large areas of land that are now under water, or that are otherwise incapable of tillage, because of lack of drainage, and which, if drained, would become very valuable land. I think that part of the resolution should receive careful consideration by this House. The Dominion of Canada is expending large sums of money in opening up the great west by building lines of railway and otherwise, and since the burden of that work is borne by the older provinces, Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces, they are entitled to every consideration in any scheme for reclaiming waste lands by drainage. If it is a good thing for this government to subsidize lines of railway to run into a new country to open it up for settlement, surely it would be equally advisable for us to take some means of draining large tracts of land such as we have in various parts of eastern Canada, and which are accessible to markets, but which are now incapable of being cultivated. With the reservation that I am not prepared to specify what sum should be granted for the general purpose of agriculture, I endorse the motion of the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am fully in accord with the motion made by the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Gilbert). For a number of years in this House I have been urging upon the government the expenditure of more money in the interest of the farmers. If I remember rightly, last year the amount of money ostensibly expended by the Agricultural Department in the interest of the farmers was put down as something over a million dollars; but when we came to analyse that sum, and to take out the amount paid for archives, the patent branch, statistics and so on, the sum was reduced to only about $400,000 actually expended in the interests of the farmer. There are many ways in which a greater sum could be advantageously expended. In a debate which took place in this House yesterday, there was a question quoted which had been put by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) with regard to the meat industry, urging that something should be done to improve that industry. As I understand it, there is not a province in Canada but that is complaining about the meat industry, and urging that something should be done to help the farmers in that respect. Then we have the cheese and butter industry in eastern Ontario. Early in this session we had a delegation of some 600 farmers from Eastern Ontario complaining bitterly about the treatment they were receiving in regard to the disposal of their cheese, and they asked that something be done to relieve them from the losses they were suffering. Not one dollar is being spent for that purpose, no notice is taken of it. There is another thing that I believe should be done in the interest of the farmers of this country, namely, a certain amount should be expended every year towards improving roads throughout the country. Some system should be adopted of assisting the municipalities or the local governments in improving roads for the benefit of the farmers. The province of Ontario is already doing that, but some other provinces are not able to do so, and I think the federal government should come to their assistance. I feel myself that something will have to be done for the farmers if this reciprocity agreement goes through, something will have to be done to assist them to change their mode of farming. At present, even under the measure of protection given to the farmers, large quantities of farm produce are coming into this country. According to a statement made yesterday by the Minister of Customs, in answer to a question put by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), it appears that considerable quantities of agricultural produce are being imported into Canada. This is the statement presented by the Minister of Customs:

Statement showing the quantity and value of butter and eggs imported for consumption into Canada, by countries, during the month of February, 1911.

	Lbs.	Value.
Butter—		
Great Britain..	2,800	$ 689
Australia..	15,008	3,000
New Zealand..	181,826	41,813
United States..	6,838	1,707
Total..	206,472	$47,209
Eggs—		
Hong Kong..	4,250	$ 193
Chinese Empire... ..	11,138	1,673
United States..	719,315	131,341
Total..	734,703	$133,207

Now there is no doubt that something will have to be done to protect the farmers from falling prices, which will inevitably result from importations of agricultural produce, particularly if this reciprocity agreement goes through. For that reason I am in hearty accord with this motion. If the government object to expending any specified sum such as one-tenth of the revenue, they might at least accept the motion modified, and agree that a larger amount should be expended in the interest of the farmers than is being expended at present; because we must all remember that the farming industry is the backbone of this country.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie-Napierville.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as a farmer representing one of the finest agricultural constituencies in the province of Quebec, I think it is incumbent on me to offer a few remarks in reference to the motion before the House.

To begin with, I wonder whether the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Gilbert) holds a special mandate to cut down the appropriation provided to meet the needs of the farming community in such a way that in future they would not be entitled to more than one-tenth of the whole revenue; that is, eight to ten millions?

The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) stated that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has spent last year for agricultural purposes $1,000,000 only. That may be true, but it should not be forgotten that the building of the Transcontinental is properly an expenditure of which the farming community has the benefit. That undertaking will cost, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, more than $200,000,000. Will not this expenditure be beneficial to the general agricultural interests of the country, and more particularly of the districts through which the railway passes? That cannot be gainsaid, and as an illustration I may refer to what is going on in my own constituency. Four years ago this House voted subsidies for various railways, and amongst others to the Napierville Junction railway, which was being built through the constituency of Laprairie-Napierville for a distance of 27 miles and two-tenths; the subsidies thus voted amounted to $174,500. That appropriation, I dare say, was made purely and simply to aid the farming community in the constituency which I have the honour to represent.

Were we to restrict the appropriation for agriculture to an amount of $10,000,000, that expenditure could not be exceeded, and should the rural constituencies be in need of more, they would have to do without, as the law of the country would have to be complied with. That reason would be sufficient in itself to induce me to vote against the proposal of the hon. member. But there are many others. Take, for instance, the improvement of our navigable waterways, and especially of the St. Lawrence, the improvement of the harbour of Montreal, in short, the improvement of our transportation system as a whole. Does not the farming community profit largely by these works? Take the exportation of our farm products to Europe through the port of Montreal. Does not the export trade of these products. of butter and cheese, for instance, profit by these improvements, by the aids to navigation and the deepening of that same channel effected by the Dominion government? Is it not a fact that shippers pay less than they were formerly called upon to pay for the transportation of these products as the result of these improvements brought about in connection with the navigation of the St. Lawrence route?

Since the Liberal party has been in power is it not a fact that we have a cold storage system on steamers and railway lines, by means of which our products are safely taken to Montreal and thence to Europe? All of this enormous expenditure is effected by the government, and nobody's alimony is cut down in consequence.

Moreover, I think that if we asked for a fixed appropriation for agriculture, the other classes in the community might make a similar claim on their own behalf, and such a demand could not be rejected. Would that be a desirable policy to adopt? Would it be in the general interest of the country? I do not think it would.

Is it not to be assumed that the people of this country, and particularly the farming class, have greater confidence in the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who for fifteen years past has administered this department with such wisdom and ability, have greater confidence, I say, in the hon. minister and prefer seeing him at the head of that department rather than confiding to the member for Drummond and Arthabaska? I for one proclaim myself satisfied with the ability shown by the

hon. minister in the management of that department, and as long as he shows such wisdom I shall give him my sincere and loyal support.

The hon. member for Grenville contended that the government should appropriate money for the improvement of roads. He pointed to the province of Ontario where good roads are being built with the help of the provincial government. I must inform the hon. member that we also have a progressive government in the province of Quebec under the guidance of Sir Lomer Gouin, and that for some years past we have been improving our roads as much as they have in the province of Ontario. The Gouin government now grants to all municipalities undertaking to build macadam roads $1,000 per annum provided they themselves expend more than $2,000; $500 is granted in the same way for every $1,000 expended on the improvement of roads which are not laid down to macadam. But I have reason to believe that this government will do still more in the future.

I do not think that the federal government should undertake the construction or the maintenance of roads which are under provincial jurisdiction. The same applies to the request of the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska as to the drainage of lands. That also pertains to the local authorities. It is quite enough for the federal government to build canals, to construct and maintain light houses, to equip harbours, to attend to several other works of national utility without burdening themselves with enterprises entirely within the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities such as the betterment of the roads.

I do not wish to detain the House any longer, Mr. Speaker, and for the reasons just stated I will vote against the motion of the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to justify, as briefly as possible, the principles of the amendment moved by my hon. friend, the member for Drummond-Arthabaska. It is not my desire to underrate the work done by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and his department. I give him full credit for his efforts and the fair play accorded to the French Canadians and the French language. But I sincerely believe that the government should do much more to render the lands more productive and for the improvement and advancement of Canadian agriculture. The questions relating to customs, taxes, transportation and foreign competition have a great influence on the agricultural development of the country. Our railways and water routes are an important factor, but for the moment I will not discuss these problems in the solution of which the different departments of the federal government are engaged.

I extend my sincere thanks to the hon. Minister of Agriculture for attending at the opening of the first exhibition of seed grain held in the city of Quebec, the 19th and 20th January last. In the 'Journal d'Agriculture' of the 15th January, 1910, (page 156), the hon. minister is reported as follows:

The hon. Minister of Agriculture then quoted the report of Mr. Robertson, of the Macdonald Institute, on the agricultural possibilities of our lands. The agricultural production of the land, in the province of Quebec, last year, is estimated at $73,000,000. If all the land under cultivation had been cultivated as it is done on the farm of the Institute, the return would have been at least $147,000,000. If you cultivate with method, you will double the production. The soil, at the Macdonald Institute was, at first, better than at other places. It is only by methodical cultivation that such admirable results have been attained.

On the 11th January, 1910, the hon. minister, speaking at Rigaud, said:

In the whole of Canada, it is the province of Quebec, that have accomplished the greater progress in the dairy industry. But there is much more to be done. The production can be considerably augmented in the province and it is the duty of our farmers to accomplish the necessary improvements.

In these utterances of the minister we have the proof that the government are bound to give their best attention to the productive power of the land and the development of the dairy industry.

We have much to do if we want to get from the soil all the agricultural richness that it contains.

The hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska in his remarks has mentioned the slaughter-houses. At the present moment, a movement is on foot in the city of Quebec for the establishment of large slaughter-houses. The establishment of that industry would be an encouragement to the cattle breeders of the district and would make of the city of Quebec the natural outlet for the cattle industry of the west. I have no doubt that the hon. minister in the interest of the whole country will give aid and encouragement to that industry.

The seed grains competitions, the seed shows, the Canadian Seedmen's Association are very useful to the farmers. Here is what Mr. Robertson says:

Some years ago, a competition was organized in 450 localities in Canada, to determine what results could be obtained by the selection of the seeds. If you look at the results, you find that a surplus of 190 millions of bushels of oats, wheat and barley could have been

obtained by that means only in 1909. Those 190 millions of bushels of grain would give 1,500 car loads.

It is not possible to demonstrate more forcibly the importance of pure seeds. We must also have seeds appropriate to the soil and the climate, and to that end we must have numerous and constant tests at the experimental farms.

According to the monthly statistics of February, over 125,000 bushels of seed grains of first quality and that carried prizes at the shows, were offered for sale at the 33 agricultural shows held in the province of Alberta during the present season.

The local seed grain shows in the province of Quebec were held during the month of February. The Department of Agriculture must make all necessary arrangements to have a strict inspection of the seed grain. The work carried on by the seed grain division of the department has rendered valuable services, but we want more. The hon. minister will shortly have an experimental farm in the district east of Quebec. It is a step in the right direction. Our farmers are too far away from the central farm of Ottawa to derive from it all the advantages they would have a right to expect. With that new experimental station the farmers of the district will be in a position to apply the newest and most effective methods of fighting the weeds and insects.

According to Professor Robertson, the insects take at least 17 per cent of our crops. That will give you an idea of the work to be done.

Every year the minister takes a pretty large vote for exhibition purposes. Since 1900 we have taken part in the exhibitions of Buffalo, St. Louis, Japan, Liège, Milan, Dublin, Paris, London, Seattle, Brussels. At every place Canada has appeared with marked success. Foreigners have admired our agricultural products, the wealth of our mines and our forests. For my part, I think that these exhibitions have a good deal of influence in developing our trade, attracting capital, opening new markets and securing a desirable class of immigrants. We are bound to take part in these great exhibitions where are gathered the producers of every country in the world. There is to be seen the full history of all the products of a country—agricultural, mining, forest and manufacturing.

Formerly Europe was the only continent enjoying the privilege of bringing together the nations of the world. In 1876 a world's fair was held at Philadelphia. Why should not Canada have also its universal exhibition? You would thereby call on our country the attention of all the civilized nations of the world.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture could do much for the progress of agriculture in this country. The hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska insists, wisely I think, on the foundation of co-operative agricultural societies assisted by the government. According to a well known writer on political economy, Mr. J. Meline, 'the co-operative societies will become, in time, the great tool of the emancipation of agriculture. They will afford the means of realizing the greatest possible return for farm products, in bringing together the producer and the consumer.'

In the spring of 1910, the co-operative agricultural society of the cheese manufacturers of Quebec was organized. According to Mr. G. A. Gigault, Deputy Minister of Agriculture of Quebec, that society has already caused an increase of 17 per cent in the proportion of the cheese of first quality. The members of the society have agreed by contract to sell their products through the assistance of the society during the season of 1910. In almost every case better prices have been obtained by the society than by the cheese manufacturers who do not belong to the society.

Denmark owes a good deal of the development of its agricultural resources to the numerous co-operative societies that are to be found in that country. We are meeting with a keen competition in the English market, and if we want to emerge successfully from the fight we must have products of the very first quality.

In the opinion of all statesmen and economists, well administered co-operative agricultural societies have always resulted in bettering and perfecting the agricultural products of a country.

On the 14th of November, 1910, at the convention of the agricultural lecturers of the United States and Canada, held at Washington, Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, laid great stress on the usefulness and necessity of co-operative agricultural societies. In the 'Journal d'Agriculture' of the 15th December last, Mr. Wilson is reported as follows: 'It has been established by a commission that on certain food products the producer gets only 35 per cent of the price paid by the consumer; 65 per cent go in the pocket of the middleman or are taken up by other expenses.'

The 'Canadian Farm' of Toronto, on the 24th March, gives the following statistics based on the findings of Mr. Wilson:

The milk producer gets 50 per cent of the price paid by the consumer. The apicultor, 50 per cent; on eggs, 69 per cent; on vegetables, 48 per cent; on potatoes, 59 per cent; on oats, 74 per cent.

I intend to make a few remarks on the fruit industry. The first experimental stations for fruit trees were established in

1898, and have rendered valuable services in acquainting the farmers with the varieties best adapted to the different districts of the province. Thanks to the numerous tests carried on in these experimental stations, the farmer is less exposed to the danger of buying varieties of plants not well suited to the climate and soil of this country. In the 'Journal d'Agriculture' of the 15th September, 1910, I find a report of Mr. Ruddick, from which I quote the following extract:

Up to this day, cold storage warehouses have not been generally availed of for the preservation of fruits. During the season 1909-1910, only 60,000 barrels of apples went into cold storage. This abstention in the use of cold storage is due partly to the absence of cold storage plants at suitable points and partly to a lack of knowledge on the part of the producer and the merchant, as to the advantages they could get from those plants.

Co-operation should be the basis of the aspirations of our horticultural societies. Mr. McNeil, chief of the fruit service, has published a bulletin in which he shows the importance of co-operation in the fruit trade. Those co-operative societies might be under the direction of a competent officer of the Department of Agriculture. Our farmers need assistance for the buying of the fruit trees, and for the packing and the sale of fruits.

In 1908, the Agricultural Society of the province of Quebec was being organized. We have in the county of l'Islet a society whose progress is remarkable. I have already called the attention of the hon. minister to the utility of stations for the breeding of bees. The fruit station of the Aulnaie village contributes to the progress of horticulture in our region. That locality is well situated for the establishment of a station for bee-breeding. There, again, co-operation is important. With the help of the government, the farmers who would be desirous to go into that industry could buy their bee-hives at a moderate price. By giving extension to that industry, the hon. minister could contribute to increase the revenues of the farmers.

The necessity of a practical agricultural instruction is generally admitted. The European governments have organized in that respect systems which are worth being carefully studied. France is wonderfully organized for agriculture. In the first place, France possesses its National Agronomic Institute. And then, there are the national schools of agriculture, the practical schools and the training-farms.

We have to compete on the English market with the farmers of Denmark, Australia, New Zealand and the Argentine Republic. We may be called to compete tomorrow on the American market with our powerful neighbours. We will come out victors, if we adopt the agricultural methods which are the most efficacious.

I must acknowledge the beneficient and patriotic work which has been accomplished by our schools of agriculture. But we must reach all our farmers, and give them a practical instruction. The Agricultural lecturers of the United States and Canada who have convened in Washington on November 14, 1910, have given their approbation to the system inaugurated in Ontario. I mean the nomination of a lecturer for each county. The hon. minister might follow that example. The lecturers could organize the co-operative agricultural societies, and look after their working.

In our agricultural publications, in our conferences, let us always encourage our rural population to remain on the farm. Let us develop a taste for rural life and agriculture, and we will then have assured the constant progress of the agricultural classes.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). In the main, I think, the amendment of the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Gilbert) is in the right direction. Of course, it is well recognized that there is a great deal of the public expenditure which cannot be particularized as agricultural expenditure, but which, directly or indirectly, benefits agriculture. For instance, you cannot improve transportation without assisting the agricultural class. I am not one to advocate the necessity of putting the farmer to bed at night and waking him up in the morning. He will take care of himself. But we should expend more freely in leading and instructing the farmer—not carrying him round in a handbasket, but leading and instructing him. In this way, you would not only get his co-operation, but you would get his effort as well. We must look our problems squarely in the face. Any man who has studied the agricultural interest of this country must realize that we are simply on the fringe of what is possible with our resources. We are in a half wakeful, dreamy sleep, towards the morning, merely guessing at what nature is willing to do for us. We are not doing what we should do, for there is nothing that will give so much back to the people for something given to her as good old mother earth. The trouble is, the farmer has been stealing all his life—that is a pretty strong statement to make—stealing all his life from mother earth, and giving back very little to her. That is where the necessity comes in for instruction and assistance through our Department of Agriculture. It is possible, through co-operation with the farmers, and with the necessary instruction to double the yield of every acre of crop in this country. I do not say that the scientific man can do this. The scien-

tific man alone cannot do it; he has to mix his science with the common sense of the every-day life of the farmer. But science and common sense in co-operation will do more than either can do singly. Some things referred to in this resolution may be of rather a local nature for the Dominion government to deal with. Drainage, for instance, is, perhaps, local in its nature and should be more under the control of the province. But I think it is possible to so arrange our machinery with that of the provinces that, with the federal assistance, much more might be done through the machinery controlled by the province than is now done. The reason I use that argument is this: I believe the federal government should be the colonizers in this country. If you increase the population of a country, you of necessity increase the federal revenues, but you also of necessity increase the expenditures of the province upon schools, administration of justice and other things which are properly the function of the province, and without increasing the provincial revenue. For that reason, the federal authorities should get down to the necessity of assisting the provinces to carry out through their machinery, which is more directly in touch with the people, many things that are in the interest not only of the agriculturists, but of the people generally. This resolution, on the whole, is in the right direction, and ought to receive recognition on the part of the authorities which will lead to some results other than those we have already achieved.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). The thanks of this House, to a certain extent, are due to the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska for bringing forward this resolution. The resolution is worthy of our consideration, and many of the points in it are of direct interest to the people of Canada at this time. I was surprised indeed to hear the hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) state that the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska had brought forward this motion with a political purpose in view. If I understood the hon. member correctly, that is the statement he made. I should be sorry to come to the conclusion that a resolution of this kind was brought forward for such a purpose, and I am satisfied that the hon. member (Mr. Gilbert) had not any such purpose in mind. The hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville also asked whether the mover of this resolution had a mandate from the farmers to ask for these reforms. So far as the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska is concerned, I am sure he has brought forward the resolution believing and knowing that he represents the views of his people, and he is deserving of credit for bringing it forward. The hon. member (Mr. Lanctot) said also that the government were improving our harbours and waterways and referred to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the wonderful advantage it will be to the farmers. We cannot but feel of course, that the money expended in harbours, in waterways and in railways facilitates the transportation to market of the products of the farm. But we must not forget that many other interests are assisted by these improvements in transportation, and it is not fair to charge up to the farming industry all the money that is being spent in this way. The figures show that 72 or 73 per cent of the people of Canada live in rural districts while about 27 per cent live in urban centres. This fact alone shows that the farming interests of Canada should have much greater consideration than it has received at the hands of this government, or, I might say, of any previous government. Certainly, Canada is a farming country, and will be for generations to come, and it behooves us, as representatives of the people, to see to it that the expenditures made in aid of agriculture by authority of this House are of a liberal nature, and are granted in favour of propositions that will really assist in the development of this great industry.

Let us see what this resolution contains. The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska asks us to look with favour on a greater amount of money being expended for agriculture and the practice of agricultural industry in Canada, having, among other, the following objects: The spreading of a wider scale of agricultural science amongst the farming community. The distributing of literature throughout the country to the farmers, and the establishment of experimental farms throughout the provinces of the Dominion.

Worthy objects, surely, for this House of Commons to promote. Let us see what the Minister of Agriculture has done with reference to experimental farms in our Dominion. That is a question worthy the consideration of the House. In 1884 there were five experimental farms in Canada and to-day there are only nine, although year after year members on this side of the House have been urging on the Minister of Agriculture to establish more experimental farms and to increase the expenditure for the purpose of educating our agriculturalists. In reply to a question which I recently put to the Minister of Agriculture he replied that during the fiscal year there were nine experimental farms and stations operated by the Dominion government, and that the total expenditure on them was $120,000, of which $53,000 was expended on the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I am not criticising the expenditure at the Central Experimental Farm, but at the same time it seems re-

markable that more than half the total expenditure should be made at the one farm in Ottawa, and that only about $65,000 is expended for this purpose throughout the rest of the Dominion.

Mr. GAUVREAU. Is it not a fact that when 10 years ago the present Minister of Agriculture laid a project before the House for the establishment of experimental farms throughout Canada the whole opposition was against it?

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I had not the honour of being a member of the House at that time, but I would be very much surprised if the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Gauvreau) was correct. Can the hon. gentleman prove his statement?

Mr. GAUVREAU. I will leave that to the Minister of Agriculture himself.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to say—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will be considered as having spoken if he makes a statement now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that tens of thousands of newcomers are entering our great west and that practically nine-tenths of them are without definite knowledge of the mode in which farming operations should be carried on in this country, and I state to the minister that long ago he should have established experimental stations in many districts of our western country. In the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan there is no agricultural college and only a few experimental stations of any kind, and recently the province of Saskatchewan had to take of its means to establish small experimental stations. It was stated in the legislature on that occasion that the province had not the means to carry on the work as they would like to carry it on and that an agricultural college should be established. There is no question in my mind but that it is the duty of this government to hand over to the different provincial governments a large amount of the revenue of this country to assist the provincial governments to educate the farmers up to the standard of intensive farming, as is done in many of the states of the United States. I point out to the Minister of Agriculture that $12,000,000 annually are expended in the United States for the purpose of developing intensive farming, and unless we carry on education of that kind amongst our farming people we will certainly lag behind in the march of progress. Let me remind the Minister of Agriculture that our butter industry, our cheese industry, our sheep industry, our cattle industry, our poultry industry, and our egg industry are declining, and that the product of grain per acre in Canada is less to-day than it was a few years ago. When you consider the development of the Dominion generally in the last few years you have to deplore all the more the fact that the products of the orchards of the fair province of Ontario have been greatly reduced of recent years. Then again our rural population is drifting into the cities, and this and other defects in our system is brought about by the want of aid to advance agriculture in Canada. Then, the important question of the transportation facilities is unattended to and we have the fact staring us in the face that the ocean freight rates from American ports are far less than from Canadian ports, and that in shipping produce from the port of Montreal the farmers are obliged to pay large amounts to the shippers, and do not receive the advantages which it is reasonable to expect they should receive. Yesterday we saw the position taken by the Minister of Agriculture in reference to the question of appointing a government weigher to the port of Montreal. The minister gave the House to understand that the exporters of dairy products out of the port of Montreal were being fleeced right and left, and that tens of thousands of dollars are being taken out of the pockets of the farmers by the large exporters. But he held up his hands and told the House he was helpless to deal with the matter. And why was he helpless? Simply because, he said that the exporters had one man who did all the weighing of the dairy products that went out of the port of Montreal, and that if the dairy men did not consider that they were being fairly treated by that weigher they could appeal to the Montreal Board of Trade, or if necessary go into the courts to obtain justice. And yet, we have been asking the Minister of Agriculture year after year for the last 10 years to appoint a government weigher at the port of Montreal, who would weigh impartially all the butter and cheese and dairy products that are exported to Europe. But it is impossible to get the minister to appoint such an officer. We find that he is not dealing with other questions in the way we would like. For instance, what has he done to bring about the removal of the cattle embargo? He knows that a few years ago the Committee on Agriculture passed a resolution asking him to call upon the Ministers of Agriculture in the various provinces of the Dominion to go as a body to Great Britain and urge upon the government there the removal of the embargo; but the Minister of Agriculture ignored the wishes of the Committee on Agriculture and also the position taken by members of this House on that important question.

Mr. NESBITT. Why does the hon. member want the cattle embargo removed?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is easily seen that the hon. gentleman has been paying more attention to his law practice than to the interests of the farming community.

Mr. NESBITT. Never mind my law practice; just answer the question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am surprised to hear the hon. member ask such a question. Does he not know that the farmers throughout the Dominion are anxious to have that cattle embargo removed?

Mr. NESBITT. I know they are not. That is not answering the question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman knows very little about it. Canadian cattle shipped to England have to be killed within nine days after landing. If they were allowed to remain for a month, to be fed upon the rich grasses and other feed of England, our meats would sell for at least a cent a pound more in the British market, and not only so, but our cattle would increase in weight, and the advantage to the farmers of this Dominion would be enormous. The Minister of Agriculture will not say that it would not be to the advantage of the farmers of the Dominion to have that cattle embargo removed. There is no doubt that it would materially assist the cattle interests of the country, and that the farmers of the Dominion desire it to be removed. We have been asking the Minister of Agriculture to assist materially in the dead meat trade which is being carried on to a small extent in this country. In 20 years the dead meat exports of Australia and New Zealand have increased from nothing to $25,000,000. The trade of the Argentine Republic in chilled and frozen meat has grown from $1,700,000 to $17,000,000 in 10 years, while the exports of live cattle have declined in the same years from $7,000,000 to $3,000,000. In the United States the dressed meat trade from 1890 to 1907 increased from $12,860,000 to $26,000,000, not counting the packing industry of that country. They exported in 1907, $203,500,000. Compare this with the Canadian trade. Canada alone, of all meat exporting countries, exports solely on the hoof. In 1889 she exported 211,847 cattle, in 1908 this number had declined to 150,993. Our packing house trade, which in 1900, amounted to $13,400,000, dropped, in 1907, to $9,900,000, and to-day the Minister of Agriculture knows that that trade is materially less than it was a few years ago. These are important statements, which go to show that unless the Department of Agriculture wakes up to a sense of its duty, Canada is going to hold a position in regard to our export trade that is anything but advantageous to our farmers

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct a statement that he has made? In referring to the hon. member for South Oxford the hon. gentleman pilloried him as a lawyer. As a member of that profession, I know that we have a lot to answer for, but I want to correct that statement. The hon. member for South Oxford is not a lawyer. There must be a limit to the sins of the legal profession.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will leave that to the hon. member. There is another matter in this resolution worthy of the consideration of the members of this House. The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska calls attention to the fact that the advantages of drainage of the farm lands of this country are being curtailed to a great extent owing to the fact that the drainage laws of the Dominion and of the provinces conflict. The Dominion parliament seems to take the position that rivers must be navigable in order to be dredged and opened up by this government, while the provinces claim that they have not sufficient money to open up the rivers that should be opened up in many parts of the country. In a district convenient to my riding we have a river that is not what might be called navigable for a large portion of the year; but if that river were dredged and the lands near by were opened up for agricultural purposes, these lands would be most valuable and would make large returns to that district; but the local government say they have not sufficient money to do the necessary dredging. This is a matter that should receive the attention of the Minister of Agriculture—as to whether the Dominion government should not set aside a sum of money for the purpose of dredging rivers in the different provinces, thereby draining large areas of land, which could be placed on the market and become an important source of revenue to those provinces. So that I think if you take into consideration the many matters that are dealt with in this resolution, we cannot help but feel that it is in the best interests of our people, and I hope the Minister of Agriculture will see his way clear to give it his support.

Mr. JOSEPH GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to offer a few remarks on the proposition now before this House.

I have the honour to represent a constituency which is practically an absolutely agricultural one, and the conclusions of this motion require special attention on the part of farmers as well as of those who represent them here.

I have the honour to be, and to have always been a professional farmer and, of course, I have listened with great interest to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska. I have noted down some of the most important remarks he has made.

According to the hon. gentleman's contention, our Canadian farmers are not sufficiently prepared for entering into competition with European farmers on European markets. He is probably right, because in the old world farming is not on the same footing as in this country, being much more intensive and, consequently, requiring from those who engage in it an amount of knowledge which we do not possess in this country. I would not even dare to advise the government to give the Canadian farming at this moment an impulse in that direction.

The hon. member has referred to experimental farms. As well as I can remember a dozen of years ago the question of experimental farms has been discussed here. The House, I think, was far from being of one mind as to the proposal then made by the Hon. Mr. Fisher who asked for the multiplication of those experimental farms. Yet his proposal was based upon substantial reasons. The opponents of that measure contended that it was virtually needless and that it would entail an excessive expenditure. However, the minister went on and increased the number of experimental farms in proportion of the funds which the House agreed to put at his disposal. Thus he has established two experimental stations in the province of Quebec last year, and I should like to think that these will not be the last ones.

The province of Quebec has its agricultural schools, but side by side with those schools and in order to perfect the practical training, we must have experimental stations where experiments are resorted to so as to help these schools in increasing the efficiency of the teaching. The province on account of its limited means cannot establish a sufficient number of schools to answer the requirements of the different districts within its territory. I represent a constituency which lies north of the Laurentian mountains, and which is the farthest inhabited northern region of the province. Its geological formation, its climate during spring and autumn and several other circumstances are different from those prevailing south of these mountains. The settlers and farmers must, therefore, overcome the peculiar impediments existing in the district. Then as our agricultural schools and the Dominion experimental stations are established south of these mountains they cannot teach the farmers the best methods of overcoming the impediments I have just mentioned.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture has visited Lake St. John and Chicoutimi; he has been able to ascertain whether I tell the truth and by all means he is a good judge in such a matter. On account of its peculiar geographic situation which I have just mentioned I think it is absolutely necessary to have there an experimental station under the control of the federal government. After having studied and realized the conditions, that station could make experiments which would enable it to point to the farmers the best methods to be resorted to and the most efficient means of surmounting the obstacles and the difficulties characteristic of that district. Such a powerful help would create confidence among the local farmers and would encourage colonization and the growth of agricultural industry. Owing to the achievments of the local experimental station, our settlers and farmers would be confident of success, whereas nowadays the people are always afraid of failure when it is a question of applying outside methods and theories, on account of the disparity existing between this district and the rest of the province.

Moreover, we must not forget that that vast territory is inhabited by settlers who are unavoidably poor and that its population will always be destitute, as it is a region of colonization; now, those impecunious people living under the circumstances characteristic of that district cannot afford to make the necessary disbursements in order to visit experimental farms or agronomic stations established elsewhere. Not being able to incur large travelling expenses they will stay at home and will derive no benefit from these experimental farms. But suppose even that they could visit them, those visits would not be as profitable to them as to the other farmers, because those farmers are under climatic and other conditions different from the conditions which prevail in our district. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary in the best interest of colonization, consequently for the public weal and agricultural development, that the government set up an experimental station there. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will be pleased to grant such a station for he is well acquainted with that country and with its peculiar needs.

The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska has referred to the desertion of farm lands. He seemed to lay blame for it upon the bad policy of the Minister of Agriculture. First, is this evil as great as he intimated? I dont think so. It exists, but we must not overstate it for it is far less predominant than heretofore.

The question is not a new one and it has absorbed the thoughts of public men for a long while. What are the real sources of

that evil? It cannot be seriously asserted that farming is not remunerative enough to retain upon the farms the agricultural community. That farming is more paying than it was formerly is unquestionable. Therefore the cause of the evil does not lie there. Inclinations have changed since twenty or thirty years, the time of comfort is not the same as it was formerly and we consider as indispensable things we did not think of twenty or thirty years ago. Some people call it progress, but such a progress costs dear since it is manifested by an increased daily expenditure whence the insufficiency of the resources which farming, although more paying, puts within the reach of the farmers. I am speaking of the incomprehensible luxury and of the false notions which are created among the agricultural community by every kind of deceptive delusions. People are only told of industries, of manufactures, of large trade, of all kinds of speculations which are far more remunerative than farming and which increase the comforts of life, so they say at least. Are we then to be surprised that the farmers living in such an atmosphere are attracted towards the industrial and commercial centres and inclined to desert the noble profession of their ancestors? It sometimes happens that children imbued with such notions have their parents to share in their delusions, and the desertion is complete. Fortunately these are exceptional cases which cannot be generalized. Is it conceivable that a government could devise a policy which would prevent the effects of such causes. Certainly not, because they are utterly uncontrollable. Therefore, it is not fair to hold the government or the minister responsible for these lamentable events.

The unbearable conditions now imposed upon colonization are another cause which accounts for the desertion of farm lands. Formerly the ancient parishes sent settlers into the colonization districts, and these settlers did come because they expected to succeed. The regulations as to the sale of lands and the terms of settlement were such that the most destitute person had an even chance to establish a comfortable home for himself and his family by industry and perseverance. It is under such propitious circumstances that my district was opened up and settled. Since then, the regulations as to the sale of lands have been often amended, always in a way inimical to colonization, and, on account of the regulations passed during the two last years, I can assert that at present in the province of Quebec colonization has become impossible. This is so true that an officer of the land branch at Quebec told me less than a fortnight ago in a train going from Ottawa to Montreal that colonization was no more possible, as far as he knew, and that as soon as a settler who intends to buy public lands is shown the new law, he puts on his hat and leaves.

It is understood that a settler in order to clear his land must light a fire. Under the present regulations, properly speaking, he can light a fire for his clearings only when rain is pouring down. If such regulations had been in force in the days of Champlain, how many Canadians, I ask you, would there be in this country? I cite this example among a score of others so as to show that a settler cannot live nowadays. I hold in my hands the provincial law of Quebec to prove my statements, and I challenge anybody who will study its details to show that they are exaggerated. Since five years, in the district I have the honour of representing, colonization which was so marked in the previous years is at a standstill, being entrammelled by the regulations I have just mentioned.

I hold myself responsible for the statements I now make. I speak in the presence of the Prime Minister of Canada who listens to me. I believe that I am serving the people of my province and the interested government by disclosing the facts as they are known to me, and I hope that before long all well-meaning people will join hands in order to improve these conditions.

Mr. DEVLIN (Wright.) Am I to understand that the hon. member for Chicoutimi has asserted that the Quebec government have done nothing to promote colonization in his district?

Mr. GIRARD. I did not say that. I am willing to admit that the Quebec government have done their utmost to promote colonization, but the settlement of the district is prevented by the iniquitous land law.

The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska has contended that the dairy industry does not give to the farmers all the revenue it ought to give them, and that farming in general is not as remunerative as it should be. That is conceded, we all know. The question is to remedy this evil. The question came before the House yesterday and has been sufficiently threshed out. Every one admits that the agricultural industry in general and the dairy industry do not return what they should return. For instance, some speak of Denmark.

In order to cover the deficiency which confronts us, the first practicable means is the one mentioned by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that is to say, the selection of the herds through the milch cows testing associations. The question has been discussed yesterday and I shall not go over what has been said. The successful work undertaken by the Hon. Mr. Fisher is not very apparent yet, but the

fault is not his, nor his officers, who have displayed all the necessary earnestness and industry.

Denmark is to-day cited as an example, but it must not be forgotten that it took the work of years to achieve the perfection that is found in that country. It is perseverance and constant efforts which saved Denmark and which will produce the same results in Canada. In my county they tried these societies. The Minister of Agriculture sent lecturers in all the parishes; he paid the expense for organization, the inspectors' salaries, and did all the law allowed him to do to incite the farmers to follow more closely the regulations of the associations in question. On account of the apparent trouble this implied and of the want of confidence in the results, the farmers got tired and gradually went out of those associations without realizing the harm they were doing to themselves.

They talk about co-operative associations and their advantages; they also talk about roads. I understand that at the time of the establishment of confederation it was understood the provinces were to take charge of certain things and the federal government was to be charged with other special obligations, each side in its own sphere of action to exercise its best judgment. Concerning the improvement of roads, that question was raised long ago. I remember about 1894 there came from my district a delegation to Ottawa to request assistance for the improvement of colonization roads, because the provincial government did not then have at its disposal sufficient resources to meet all needs. The answer which was then given us was that the federal government did not have the right to grant our request. But the federal government was then, as it is to-day, paying the provinces a subsidy. On account of the increase in provincial expenditures, the present government gave what is called 'better terms,' that is, a large increase in the subsidy to each province, the expenditure of which is absolutely under the control of the government of each of them. Under the law, the federal government may be brought about to give new 'better terms,' from which the provincial governments will find a way to facilitate the improvement of the roads spoken of. It is in my opinion the only legal way for the federal government to meet the request of the hon. member for Arthabaska.

Let us now return to co-operative associations. But, according to the constitution, they seem rather to be depending on the provincial legislatures. I would, however, be perfectly satisfied to see a federal law passed to that intent, as that would allow the central government to help out these societies created under its own law. The Quebec government passed a law allowing the formation of various co-operative societies. I would particularly draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to the one which it has created under the name of 'Société co-operative des veurreries et formagenis de la province de Québec.' Last year that society busied itself with cheese factories only. The object of the society is to succeed, through a classification of the products, in compelling the producers to improve their manufacturing process, and to bring about, as a consequence, the putting on the market of an absolutely uniform and superior product, which will allow it to command higher products. The basis of classification is a scale of 100 points, and they call 'finest' a cheese which does not keep less than 95 points out of 100, which means an almost perfect cheese. The society also imposes upon its members the obligation to have model buildings in which they receive an average of not less than 4,000 pounds of milk per day. The Quebec government has advertised that new organization throughout the province. Prizes have been promised for the best cheese and the best buildings. Sixty-five factories throughout the province have consented, with fears at first, to join the society. In my district sixteen cheese factories joined with full confidence The reason for that feeling of confidence was the improvement brought about in the buildings as well as in the methods of labour in the factories, thanks to the impetus previously given by Hon. Mr. Fisher. Through lecturers chosen by him from among the best agricultural authorities in his department, and instructed to visit in detail every factory in the county so as to meet the farmers at home and to be able to point out to them the defects in the buildings and in the manufacture of cheese, the care of milk, &c., and the way to improve everything; through building model maturing rooms, the cost of which he paid for, and by sending these principal lecturers each year to see again the same farmers and incite them to continue their work of improvement with perseverance and energy, he has succeeded in preparing the following result secured through the work of the co-operative society. The first four prizes for cheese in a six-months' competition were secured by cheesemakers in my district, the highest prize being awarded to a cheesemaker who kept 97·07 points out of 100, and the lowest 95. Which means coming very near perfection. Out of ten prizes awarded for the best buildings, four were secured in my district, including the first and third prize. Which explains why our farmers confidently joined the movement.

Mr. MONK. If I understand right, the hon. member is in favour of co-operation?

Mr. GIRARD. Certainly, and I have been for a long time. That co-operation movement started long ago, and long before the motion of the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska. That society was organized by the provincial government. Those who joined it in my district have received indirectly from the federal government all the assistance they needed. It is, thanks to the valuable help of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who, foreseeing the future, had prepared the minds of the people through his own work and that of his lecturers, it is owing to this that we have secured so many adhesions to that society, which accounts for the fact that our region is ahead of the whole province as far as buildings and the quality of cheese are concerned.

Mr. MONK. In what did the Minister of Agriculture favour the formation of agricultural co-operative societies in my hon. friend's county? Which were the means he used to help that formation?

Mr. GIRARD. The minister did not directly contribute to the formation of a provincial society, but he had prepared the ground so well that those who wished to get on with him reached the goal first, as I have just shown.

In pursuance of his work of agricultural improvement, uniting his efforts to those of the Quebec and the Quebec Dairy Society, it affords me great pleasure to say that last year, when we secured the first co-operation prizes in the provincial agricultural merit competition, the gold medal was awarded to a young farmer in my county, and twenty-four other farmers received the silver medal, making a total of one hundred decorations of that kind awarded to as many farmers in my county during the last twelve years. If the fact is taken into account that we live in a region which is only sixty-five years old, the facts I have just recalled clearly show that the work of the Minister of Agriculture necessarily produced good results when people were willing to bring themselves into connection with him.

While I am speaking about the co-operative I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that it is necessary to have in my district and elsewhere, at certain railway stations, cold storage plants in order to complete the organization for the transportation of the cheese from the factory to the great warehouses in Montreal. Dairy products kept in cold rooms in the factory are likely to be damaged by the heat at shipping points if cold storage cars are not there in advance to receive them. Cold storage plants are then necessarily needed at the stations. It has been claimed the farmers themselves should undertake that organization. I think it is better that the federal government should complete the system by undertaking itself the building and maintaining of those establishments, as it alone is able to have an effective control of that service.

There has been some talk of weighing dairy products. This question has come before the House already. There is a complaint about the method followed by the present weighers, and I believe the farmers are right. If it is wanted to weigh from five to ten boxes alone in a lot, why not put the number of boxes you want to weigh together on the scales in order to have the total weight instead of weighing one box at a time in the hope of detecting some error in the weight marked on each of them, and then of making a general reduction on the lot. That is not fair, and that sometimes cause the producers considerable loss. I draw the attention of the hon. minister to that fact and beg of him to be kind enough to see to it with a view to improve the conditions if possible.

It is said cheese and butter production is decreasing. That is well known, but it is not the minister's fault. It is true exports of butter have decreased enormously and those of cheese have somewhat decreased. But that does not mean milk production has decreased, for it goes increasing year by year. But local consumption has increased in such a way that exports have suffered therefrom. The sale of cream in its natural state is another cause of the seeming decrease in the production of butter as well as the sale of milk in the natural state in the cities, a sale which is increasing considerably each year. That does not mean that the farmers' income has decreased; quite the contrary, as the price of cream and milk sold in the natural state is higher than when the milk is manufactured into butter or cheese. In other places farmers thought it best to give up the dairy industry in order to go into the raising of cattle for the production of meat, where it appears they can get a higher income than in the dairy industry. It is another seeming cause of the decrease in our dairy products, but it is far from showing that the farmers' income has decreased. Now, how can the minister or the government be responsible for those facts?

According to the motion before us, it is attempted to have the government give members of the proposed co-operative societies a grant of $5 per head.

The motion submitted to the House proposes that the government should grant to the members of the proposed co-operative association a bonus of $5 a head. Has the hon. member duly thought the matter over previous to making such a proposal? Of course I am in favour of granting aid to such associations, but it

should be done in the way that the Quebec government grants moneys in aid of farmers' clubs, which are entitled to $50 per annum, and to agricultural societies, which are entitled to $800. It seems to me that the proposal as it is made would tend, if it were carried out, to reduce the standing of such associations.

As far as I am concerned, I agree with the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), that the main point is to educate our farmers as regards certain matters so as to instil into their minds the idea that their calling is a noble and profitable one, and that they should be proud of it. The only way in which such a result may be reached is by sending out practical lecturers, experts if necessary, who would meet the farmers as often as possible to talk over with them matters relating to the improvement of agriculture, and induce them to keep up with the times. Heretofore, unfortunately, lecturers have not always been the best that could have been selected. Farmers do not care to go long distances to listen to a professional man dealing with agricultural questions. They take a particular interest in lectures given by men whom they know to be farmers themselves. I have been requested by farmers in my district to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the good work done by Mr. Clément and to have him sent out once more to my district as soon as possible. As a judge in the competitions of standing field crops he succeeded in interesting the farmers whom he met at these lectures, which were of a practical character and were readily understood. Of course, among the lecturers which the public appreciate I wish to include the leading officers of the department, such as Mr. Grisdale and others.

The motion which is submitted to us is, of course, one that appeals to the farming community, since it calls on parliament to make an increased expenditure in the interest of that class. Being a farmer myself, and having the honour to represent a strictly agricultural constituency, I am in full sympathy with the proposal. I sincerely believe that a much larger appropriation should be put at the disposal of the Minister of Agriculture in the interests of agriculture, and I suggest that the government should at once consider the desirability of complying with such a request. However, the proposal being made in the shape of a motion of non-confidence in the government, despite all the help which the Minister of Agriculture has given to the farming interests in my constituency and elsewhere, I do not think it would be fair to give my support to it, which I would be glad to do if it were put in the shape of a resolution of the House.

Mr. GIRARD.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) said that in 1884 there were five experimental farms and that now there are only nine. He is incorrect in that statement. The first experimental farm was established in 1886, five were established in the beginning, and there are now 13. Eight of these have been established within the last five years. The hon. gentleman challenged the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) when the latter said that the government had proposed some years ago to establish experimental and illustration stations all over the Dominion. He asked for the proof. I find it in the 'Hansard' of 1899. I then proposed a vote of $20,000 to commence the establishment of illustration stations. I explained that while that was a beginning, I hoped to go on and establish one in every county in the Dominion just as the hon. member for Drummondville now complains the government have not done. That vote was stopped by ferocious opposition from the other side of the House. Had it been carried at that time I believe that to-day nearly every electoral division in the country would have had an illustration station. Mr. Clancy who was then the acknowledged critic of agriculture for the opposition said immediately after I had explained what I proposed to do:

> I have no hesitation in saying at the outset that this is a highly visionary scheme and one without foundation, and as applied to Canadian agriculture utterly worthless.

A little later on in the same debate Sir Charles Tupper, then the leader of the opposition, said:

> So far as the farming stations are concerned, I have heard nothing in their favour approaching to an argument from anybody. . . . I hope my hon. friend will see his way clear to drop the other portion of the vote and let the committee divide so as to show who are in favour of and who are opposed to this large and absolutely useless expenditure.

In view of the lateness of the session at that time, and the determined opposition of the other side of the House my colleagues asked me to withdraw the vote. I did so and the result is that to-day my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska complains that that was not done.

Mr. MONK. What part of the motion has reference to illustration stations?

Mr. FISHER. In the early part of his address the hon. gentleman said that there ought to be an agricultural experimental station in every county in the Dominion. I attempted to lay the foundation for that kind of work, and hon. gentlemen opposite blocked and stopped my efforts.

Mr. MONK. I was asking to what part of the motion it referred?

Mr. FISHER. I think the motion indicates that, but I was speaking of what my hon. friend said, not the actual words of the motion.

Mr. LENNOX. Did the minister ever renew the effort to establish these stations?

Mr. FISHER. No, I did not. I appreciate the compliment paid me by the hon. member (Mr. Gilbert) in quoting over and over again sayings of mine in regard to the necessities of agriculture, and how it could be improved. I gathered that he quoted those sayings with approval. I have no objection to that, it is a tribute, partial it may be, but still a tribute to what the department has been doing.

I have no fault to find with the statements made in support of expenditure in regard to agriculture. I find on both sides of the House a disposition to spend on agriculture whatever is asked. I have over and over again stated that I had no fault to find in that respect, but that on the contrary parliament has been generous in support of my votes for agricultural development and assistance. I have also said that whenever there seems to be a clear indication that money could be spent successfully and usefully I have not hesitated to ask for it. I am prepared to do that today, and the evidence of it is that in the votes for the next ensuing fiscal year I am asking considerably more than I asked last year. This is in consequence of the fact that we have been able to work out, by the co-operation of my chief officers details of work which we think will be advantageous to the agriculture of the country.

This motion calls for the devoting of one-tenth of the whole expenditure of the Dominion of Canada to agriculture. I think that any such statement or principle adopted in our expenditure would be vicious. Our expenditure is supposed to be, and I believe is in accordance with the needs and the demands of the different services carried out by the government of Canada in the interests of the people. These services may at one time be most important in relation to the development of railways, at another time in relation to the development of canals, at another time in the administration of one department or another, or in the development of certain branches of agriculture. This is the principle, an absolute principle in our estimates, that the money shall be applied to what is considered to be the necessities of the administration of affairs of the country; and to lay down a principle that one-tenth of all the money so voted should always go to agriculture would be to introduce a vicious principle, an improper principle to apply, just as it would be improper to say that another one-tenth or one-fifteenth or one twenty-fifth should be devoted to railroads or to canals, or to the collection of revenue or to anything else. It is a vicious principle and I could not agree for a moment to its being introduced into the preparation of the estimates for the services and administration of the country.

I notice that nobody on the other side of House has supported that principle. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) took exception to it himself, and I think my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) did also, though I am not certain. I think nobody on the other side has supported it, any yet that is the essence of the whole proposition. Nobody is objecting to a proposition that more money should be spent on agriculture when it is shown to be necessary or advisable. We would be ready to accept a general resolution of that kind. But a formal resolution that a certain definite proportion of the revenue of this country should be applied to any part or any division of the expenditure is a principle which I cannot accept, and which I must call upon the House to vote down.

Now, my hon. friends say, we want more money spent. I think they do; but I am sorry to see that they do not exhibit much eagerness to pass the estimates on agriculture. They have a right to criticise, and they exercise that right to the full; but I think sometimes they go a little further in criticising the agricultural estimates than they do most other expenditures. I have frequently seen votes of millions, ten, fifteen and twenty million at a time, proposed by some other department of the government, and they pass in five minutes. But when a vote for agriculture comes up it generally takes five hours to get through a single item. I am not complaining of that, hon. gentlemen opposite are quite within their rights, but I do not think it is a proof of their eagerness to see public money expended on agriculture. I want to say to my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) that I appreciate the request he has made in relation to one or two points. I am prepared at any time to meet the views and the requests of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House who represent agricultural constituencies. I have always been willing to take advice from those hon. members on either side of the House, I want to get all the assistance I can, and I am ready to acknowledge now that I have usually been generously supported by the House. True, the criticisms that are freely indulged in sometimes look very much like obstruction, but on the whole I am well supported in the work I am doing. The Department of Agriculture has been created in the interest of the farmers of this country. It often happens that hon. gentlemen are much inclined to make appeals to the department with a view of obtaining the support of the farmers, and

the trouble is that they do not know often what the farmers want, and therefore when they go back for re-election they do not get the farmers' support.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure the House has been much edified by the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture, particularly with his concluding remark that the representatives of the farmers on this side of the House do not know what they want, and therefore when they go back for re-election they are defeated. Well, other men have been defeated, and the Minister of Agriculture himself is well aware of that. I was amused to listen to the remarks of the minister in defending his department and giving reasons why we have not an experimental station in every county in Canada. My hon. friend says that at one time when he was Minister of Agriculture, away back in 1899, he introduced a broad scheme for the benefit of the agriculturalists of Canada, and when it came to a vote in committee, Mr. Clancy rose in his place and made some criticism of it; then Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party at that time, also offered some slight criticism, and because of these two criticisms that item proposed in the interest of the farmers disappeared and has never been heard of since. Did ever any one hear such a defence as that in this House? My hon. friend has been Minister of Agriculture from that moment down to the present, and if that was a good thing in the interest of the farmers why has he not, with the great majority at his back, reintroduced it? Why he has not called upon his majority to pass that or a similar resolution in the interest of the farmers? But after all these years, he now comes forward and says that the reason why we have not an experimental station in every county is because Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Clancy, many years ago, opposed a similar resolution in this House. Was the Minister of Agriculture in earnest when he introduced that item in his estimates and asked the committee to adopt it, or was he trifling with the agricultural interest of Canada? At a previous date in this session he paid a compliment to this House, as we find on 'Hansard', page 1250, after making reference to some recommendations he had made to his colleagues:

> Judging by past experience, my colleagues will enable me to present its claims to parliament; and I must say for both sides of the House that they have been ready and willing to give me the opportunity to carry out these recommendations.

That is a statement of the minister, made this session. This afternoon he made a similar statement, he complimented both sides of the House for their willingness to vote every item that he recommended in the interest of the agricultural development of Canada. In discussing this very motion a few minutes ago, he said that if a recommendation was made by the House to the government for the expenditure of a large sum of money in the interest of agriculture, he did not know but he would support it. Am I right in what my hon. friend said?

Mr. FISHER. I said something of that kind.

Mr. BLAIN. Therefore, my hon. friend feels that the agricultural interest of Canada has not been very well taken care of in the expenditure of money in their interest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BLAIN. Hon. gentlemen laugh at that. I am not surprised. They are willing, of course, to oppose this, I would like to say, right or wrong. But that is the criticism we have on this side of the House with regard to the Minister of Agriculture. He has such a ready lot of supporters, why does not he bring forward the resolution which he says he might support if it came from this side of the House for the expenditure of money?

Mr. FISHER. The estimates show that we are doing that.

Mr. BLAIN. But the hon. gentleman gets support in any case. However, I did not rise to discuss the matter, but to correct the statement to which I have referred and to quote the minister's own statement that, whenever he brought forward a proposition in the interest of the farmers he received ready and willing support from this side of the House as well as from his own.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BRUNO NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the motion now before the House is of real importance. It may, perhaps, be said to be imperfect, and I admit its limitations in certain respects, but, as a whole, it is acceptable. I should prefer it if the amount of one-tenth of the public revenue were not mentioned, but, on the other hand, is it not unjust that out of a budget of over one hundred millions the agricultural class, which is the most numerous and important in this country, should be benefited to the extent of only about one million; that is to say, of one per cent. Now, it will be admitted that between one and ten per cent there is a wide margin. We are told that had the hon. member been content simply to ask for a larger grant for agricultural purposes,

without mentioning any special amount, his motion would have been accepted. This appears to me merely a pretext for setting aside a motion which it is thought advisable not to oppose directly. The argument rests upon no firmer basis than a syllogistic circle.

In the course of the debate it has been stated that a few years ago the Minister of Agriculture had requested the House to authorize him to carry out a portion of the reforms mentioned in this motion. For instance, the establishment of experimental stations, and that his request was not entertained, which made him reluctant to renew it.

I believe that in that respect the motion of the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska is quite right; it is most important at the present time to educate our agricultural classes if we desire to come out ahead in our competition with other countries. If nothing is done we shall remain in a condition of inferiority.

The hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) acknowledged that farmers were deserting the rural districts. Why so? To me the reason appears quite clear. It is because in this country the agriculturist is, so to speak, an outcast. Would it not be most desirable to raise the agricultural profession in public estimation and place it on a par with trade, industry and the liberal professions? That is the remedy to be applied. If the farmer was educated he would not leave his farm. Were the highest positions in the land open to him the farmer would not give up his calling as he is at present doing.

Although farming seems to pay better to-day than formerly, yet farmers are still leaving the land, and one is surprised to meet constantly in factories, on the trains, and elsewhere, young farmer lads full of health and strength who have abandoned their father's calling to earn what appears to them an easier living and with the hope of improving their social standing.

The hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) surprised me when he expressed his fear that these demands on behalf of the agricultural community might give rise to other demands of other classes of the community. When have the latter ever been known to remain in the background? Has not the labouring class, for instance, no later than in the course of the present session, demanded an exceptive law, fixing the labour day at eight hours with a ten hours' wage.

These people do not hang back. There can be no doubt that if the agricultural class is so badly treated it is because farmers are too timid and not properly organized. Farmers are generally easy going, but if they had followed the lead of the labour unions—who keep the government thinking—had they claimed exceptive legislation as do other classes, they would soon have secured their rights. It seems to me that the day is not far off when farmers, following the example of workmen will form unions, and when they do their demands will have to be attended to. One easily perceives to-day that labour unions carry more weight with the government than do the agricultural classes; that is why farmers are deserting their farms for the cities, where they enter the unions in order to enjoy the benefits of their influence.

It is clear that the farmers are leaving the land. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture admitted it himself. Is it not strange and deplorable that in an agricultural country like Canada the rural population should dwindle and nothing be done to arrest the evil. The least that should be done, in my opinion, would be to appoint a commission to inquire into the matter and suggest remedies. This fact being established, the government, if they were to appoint a commission, would be doing good work from a national standpoint.

The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska demands, amongst other things, a refrigerator car service. Such a service should be established by the government at once; its usefulness would be very great on railways. For my part, I frequently travel between St. Jérome and Montreal, and I am always surprised to see the conditions under which the milk trade, for instance, is carried on. On the station platforms may be seen in enormous numbers cans of milk to be shipped for consumption in Montreal. No care is taken of these cans, nor is there any cold place in which they can be stored. Children die by thousands in the cities; their loss is due to this state of things, and the government should oblige the railway companies to provide cold storage on trains carrying milk. Milk, as everybody knows, requires more careful handling than butter or cheese. The consequences of any negligence are more serious and the improvement would cost little.

I do not wish to blame the minister. In my opinion, he has not enough money at his disposal. Out of a total budget of over one hundred millions, he receives $1,492,500. Deducting from this $351,337 for the salaries and other expenses of his department, there remains scarcely one million for agriculture. Under the head of agriculture are, moreover, to be found a number of items which are not agricultural at all. For instance, archives, statistics, trade marks, matters in which the farmer has no direct interest and from which he derives no advantage. If instead of one per cent the minister were to receive, if not ten per cent, at least a larger proportion of public funds than at

present, he might establish a cold storage service on ships and railways, and the public, especially in the city of Montreal, would reap the benefit.

The hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) is of opinion that a good way of helping the farming community would be to send out agricultural lecturers. I agree with him. But such lecturers should be competent, and not be, as have been the greater number of those sent out heretofore, simply political agents sounding the praises of the government employing them. Specialists would be required; men able to speak to farmers in such a manner as to be understood by them; practical men able to teach practical things, not mere theorists getting their ideas from books, which they themselves imperfectly understand. They might be selected in Canada, as the thing is sometimes done in the case of other special work, or, if they cannot be found here in sufficient numbers, young agricultural instructors might be obtained from abroad. Take, for instance, the example of Denmark. That small country is one of the most advanced from an agricultural point of view in consequence of the educational facilities given the farmers, land produces over 41 bushels per acre. Experts for the education of our farmers might be obtained from Belgium, which is one of the most advanced countries in the agricultural science. Once more I say that if our farmers were better educated I am convinced that young Canadians would not desert the land as they have been doing. They are acting as they do because they are ashamed of their profession. The occupation of farming should enable the person exercising it to aspire to any position, political or otherwise, which he may reasonably expect to fill. The farmer should not be neglected. Generally, however, he is thought of only at election time.

If farmers formed unions and claimed their rights as workmen do not hesitate to——

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's.) Do you blame them for that?

Mr. NANTEL. I do not wish to blame them, as I would not blame the farmers if they did the same thing. The labour unions and their strikes have given, as I said before, a good deal of trouble to the government. They have often defied the municipal authorities and even obliged the government to interfere with armed force. However, they are tenderly treated. Why so? Because they insist upon obtaining their rights. They are, therefore, respected by the authorities, while the agricultural class, which forms two-thirds of the population, is neglected in many respects. There are many ways in which agriculture might be encouraged. Take, for instance, the postal service. When we leave the city to visit the country parts and outlying townships, we find that a number of farmers receive their mail only once or twice a week, and that they must travel several miles to obtain it. And yet we are asked why young educated Canadians desert the farms for the cities. I have no intention of casting any reflection upon the Postmaster General, but it seems to me that the same advantages should be granted to the agricultural community as to other classes in the country.

We have now incurred all the great expenditures necessary for the opening up of the country, and it is time, I think, that the farmers should get their share. They have no doubt benefited by the building of canals and railways, but it must not be forgotten that these works have also benefited other classes besides the farmers who are the most numerous and who have paid their proportionate share of the expenditure incurred for such undertakings.

Still more will have to be done in behalf of the farmers, with a view to creating conditions which will render their calling a more profitable one, and thereby keeping them at home. For that purpose, it will be necessary to do away with slipshod methods and to impart a knowledge of the most approved practices of intensive agriculture. I would like to see a knowledge of scientific agriculture disseminated in such measure that we would no longer hear expounded in this House, astounding, not to say preposterous, theories, as that according to which satisfactory crops of hay may be obtained in uninterrupted succession from the same land. That is, to my mind, an agricultural heresay. To teach to the people that they may go in for hay cropping for periods of fifty, seventy-five and even two hundred years in succession on the same land, that is, I repeat it, something that smacks of heresy. I would like farmers to be sufficiently well posted that they might detect at once the falsity of such contentions.

I am satisfied that hon. members who have stated this fact would not repeat it before an audience of farmers, or in the presence of professors of the Guelph or Macdonald colleges. At any rate, if they did so, they would be in direct opposition to the teaching of professor Robertson.

Mr. WILSON. (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Yes, certainly.

Mr. WILSON. (Translation.) The hon. member stated a moment ago that some one in this House had asserted the possibility of growing hay for fifty, seventy-five and even two hundred years in succession on the same land; I would like to know who

made such a statement. Let the hon. member just give out the name.

Mr. NANTEL (Translation.) I shall give the quotation, it will be still better. For instance the hon. Minister of Agriculture on February 28 last, expressed himself as follows in answer to the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton):

But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) is not aware of the fact that there are areas of land in the province of Quebec from which hay has been sold to the American and the English market for from 50 to 75 years steadily, and the crop of hay on these lands is just as abundant and as excellent in quality as it was half a century ago. These hay-growing lands are lands which are frequently flooded, and on which there is a constant succession of alluvial deposits, and the land is in that way specially adapted for the growing of hay.

Further on the hon. minister remarked:

So, in some part of Nova Scotia on the dyke lands around the Bay of Fundy, hay has been grown for I do not know how many years.
Mr. BLACK. Two hundred years.

Following suit, the right hon. Prime Minister a few days later, made practically the same statement. I shall quote his very words, which to my mind embody an agricultural heresy:

I can tell my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) that no hay will be exported from the hillsides of the eastern townships of the province of Quebec, but as the Minister of Agriculture reminded my hon. friend from Brandon, we have in the province of Quebec natural meadows, which require no tillage, and upon which the best of timothy has been grown, not for 50 years, but for 100 years. Along the two shores of Lake St. Peter there are natural meadows a few inches only above the level of the water which are yearly flooded, and which, to the knowedge of every one in the province, have been for a hundred years or more growing hay and nothing else. The counties of Berthier, Montmagny and St. Maurice, on the north shore, and the counties of Nicolet, Yamaska and Richelieu on the south, are so situated that they have a population of, perhaps, 1,000, who are growers of hay and for whom this treaty, if it becomes law, will be the most positive boon.

I challenge any hon. gentleman in this House to say that timothy may be grown in this way. For blue grass and red top, or low meadow, or marsh hay that would be possible; but as regards clover or timothy, which constitute the hay of commerce. I will not admit that. Clover runs out every two or three years, and must be seeded down anew; timothy fields must be turned over every seventh or eigth year. Marsh hay is not an exportable product.

Here is what Dr. Robertson states in a speech which I find reported in the yearly publication of the Conservation for 1910 at page 63:

It will be seen in the reports that in 1909 the quantities of butter imported from Denmark into the United Kingdom reached a total of 197,571,024 pounds, having a value of about $49,802,400, and that the quantity of butter thus representing a value of $50,000,000, takes away from Denmark a smaller proportion of fertilizing elements than do a thousand tons of hay shipped from Quebec. There is a contrast in the national management of agriculture, 50,000,000 pounds of butter impoverishes the soil less than does the exportation of a thousand tons of hay worth at most $14,000.

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to say a word in answer to the challenge which he made as to the possibility of growing timothy for more than a certain number of years?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Do you mean to say that it can be grown for fifty years without ploughing the land?

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will state that on the farm where I was born, which my father owned but which has since been sold—I left it thirty years ago—on that farm, as well as in the neighbourhood, timothy grows luxuriantly, although the land has never been ploughed.

Mr. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata.) (Translation.) It is a practical farmer who says so.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) If I had the right to take the hon. gentleman at his word, I would be willing to wager a fair amount on the truth of my contention. In any case, I would wish people to be sufficiently grounded on the principles of agriculture to be in a position to judge the credibility of such theories.

My hon. friend from Temiscouata has just said, referring to the member for Chicoutimi: It is a farmer who says so. Well, as far as that goes I may say that I have for many years taken an interest in agriculture. I own land which every spring is submerged by the overflow of the North river. These freshets carry with them humus and alluvial soil material as does the St. Lawrence. Neverthless, if I neglected putting in new seed every three or four years I would soon have only low meadow grasses and weeds. I might quote other authorities, but that will be enough in regard to this matter.

To contend that the farmers of Manitoba would be depriving themselves of a source of revenue by giving up the repeated cropping of wheat from the same land, is a mistake. Were there ever more fertile fields than those bordering on the Nile, and nevertheless was not that soil depleted of its fertility and ruined by such a system of repeated cropping. Originally fertile, these lands became impoverished to such a point that in order to restore their former productive power it was necessary

to have recourse to scientific agriculture. Plants require certain nutritive elements, in greater or smaller quantity. That is readily understood. Some, like clover, for instance, return to the soil a part of the food material which they have consumed. That is all very well explained by Dr. Robertson. I shall not discuss this theory at any greater length, and shall be content with saying that it is a very risky business to keep on growing the same plant on the same soil in the expectation that the yield will be maintained. No such doctrine is taught, and were farmers to take seriously to it, I believe it would be most unfortunate.

We should endeavour, by means of a sound and healthful policy, to retain our young men on the farms; in that way will they be of greater service to the country. Particular pains are taken to turn out good sailors and soldiers; why not show as much activity and energy towards turning out efficient teachers and agricultural leaders who would be of greater service to the country than officers for the army or the navy?

If the proposal of the hon. member for Drummond is lacking in certain respects, it cannot be gainsaid that there is in it much that is good, for it deals with all these questions. I fail to see why the House should not accept it.

It will be objected that it is in the shape of a non-confidence motion. Well, retain whatever in it is good in order that the farming class may be dealt with according to their merits. Such is the rule which should be followed under the circumstances.

The hon. member for Chicoutimi acknowledges the desirability of most of the changes asked for in this motion. Unfortunately he is quite willing to stultify himself by voting for its rejection. He thinks the principle is right, but the consequences he will not accept.. A practical farmer himself, he refuses to join with us, and inquires from the member for Drummond whether he holds a brief for introducing such a motion. Well, the member for Drummond may be said practically to hold a brief for this purpose. He is a farmer; he has gone to the polls against a candidate belonging to the liberal professions, and had he not been a farmer it is likely he would have had greater difficulty in winning his election. I say, therefore, he holds a special mandate and he is anxious to do something for the farming community.

Some time ago I voted in favour of the motion submitted by the hon. member for North Grey asking that further steps be taken for the improvement of the cold storage service. I did so believing that such a proposal was a fair and equitable one from the standpoint of the farming class. The same principle is at stake in the present instance. As already stated, there are certain things in this motion which are not approvable, but on the whole, it is beneficial and should be endorsed by this House, and I deem it my duty to support it by my vote.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec County.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not know what will be the fate of the motion introduced by the member for Drummond and Arthabaska. He is at liberty to withdraw it with the consent of the House. If he insists on a vote a decision will soon be reached. I for one am satisfied that it is not in the interest of the farming class. I intend to vote against this motion, not through any ill-will towards the member for Drummond, for I know he has done his duty in submitting it. He is a practical farmer, he was elected as such, and he holds a seat here as a representative of the farming class; it is then incumbent on him to forward the interests of that class. From that standpoint, he is in a position to put before the House the results of his own experience. On the other hand, it must be admitted that such experience is a rather brief one. As years go by, owing to his more mature judgment and to his wider knowledge of parliamentary practice, he will satisfy himself that in submitting this motion as it is worded, he has injured rather than forwarded the interests of the farming class, since he proposes to restrict the expenditure of the Dominion government in connection with agriculture to one-tenth of the total yearly revenue. But, Sir, if the government, any government, in this country should apply only one-tenth of the annual revenue for the benefit of that class, it would not be fulfilling its duty. Such a government would be wiped out of existence at the general election.

The farming class is entitled to a great deal more than ten per cent or fifty per cent. When the hon. member endeavours to cut down the benefits direct or indirect which accrue to the farming community through the action of a bountiful government, it is incumbent on us to protest and to intimate to the hon. member that he does not represent properly the interests of the class to which he belongs.

No government contributes in a direct manner a single dollar for the benefit of the farmers. No contributions whatever are made direct to individuals or to families. All benefactions originating with the government reach individuals in an indirect way; they are available to all classes of society, whether labouring, manufacturing or farming. They are for the benefit of the population as a whole. The larger the number of persons making up a class of the

population, the larger its quota of favours, and the farming class is on a par with the others in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe a single member of this House has ever voted or has even thought of voting against a measure proposed in the interest of the agricultural class. Hon. gentlemen are at one in acknowledging that whatever profits to the farming class profits to the people as a whole. We are all agreed as to that on both sides of the House; but the real point at issue is the modus operandi whereby such a result should be effected. Now, I think for my part that the means suggested is not acceptable.

Mr. GILBERT. (Translation.) The hon. member says that the motion is contrary to the interests of the farming community, because it proposes that at least one tenth of the public revenue be appropriated towards promoting the interests of that class. May I inquire from him what proportion of the public revenue has been appropriated directly for the benefit of the farming class since confederation?

Mr. TURCOTTE (Translation.) A similar question has already been put by the hon. member and has been answered, as may be ascertained by referring to 'Hansard.' What need is there of reverting once more to the matter?

Mr. GILBERT. (Translation.) I am referring to the amounts which have been expended in the interest of agriculture proper. In the estimates of the Department of Agriculture there are included amounts for matters which are foreign to agriculture, such as immigration and arts. To build up a great country, it is necessary as in the case of any structure, to begin at the foundation.

Some hon. MEMBERS—Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman should confine himself to asking a question, he has no right to argue.

Mr. GILBERT. (Translation.) I consider as being appropriated for agriculture such amounts only as are expended directly for the benefit of the agricultural class. Whatever sums are appropriated towards the building of railways or canals are not of any more advantage to that particular class than to the remainder of the people.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) That is all right, we are exactly of the same opinion, and the hon. member would certainly be justified in considering himself as one of the majority in this House, had he not thought fit to join the minority and share the erroneous views of his leader the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

In Canada, we should in a certan measure consider ourselves as being all of one family, of one household, and I am satisfied that anything which is being done in the interest of Canada is in a general way and to a large extent beneficial to the farming class. Much is being said in reference to railways, canals, the administration of justice; but ultimately all such matters turn out to the benefit of the rural classes. Why are these great highways of trade being built and maintained, if not to transport to the large centres of population and to the shipping ports the products of the farm?

Sir, that is all I have to say to the hon. member for Drummond; but since the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has seconded this motion I wish briefly to consider with him the legal side of this question. One sure fact is that we are all desirous of promoting the interest of the farming class. On the other hand, I claim that the means suggested by this motion are contrary to the interests of that class. What is the object of restricting the expenditure? Certain requirements are pointed to; in the first place, a wider dissemination of agricultural science is asked for. Well, I flatly contradict the assumption on which this plea is made, as well as that for the free circulation of an agricultural journal for the use of members of co-operative associations. Two means are proposed for the wider dissemination of knowledge in matters agricultural among our people. The first consists in the publication and free circulation of a paper devoted to imparting to the country people information already contained in publications issued and distributed at this very day by the Department of Agriculture. I have endeavoured to discover another educational agency outside the school, but failed. We have our experiment stations which are giving results, but they do not go in for teaching in the strict sense of the word, save through object lessons. Are there any other means? In looking into this proposal, I am led to the conclusion that the hon. member would have this government undertake to start schools for the teaching of agriculture, and I am dubious whether that would not be infringing on provincial rights which are paramount in such matters; for, to my mind, there is really no difference between the teaching of agriculture and that of any other technical subject.

Then, there is behind this proposal an effort to put under the control of this government, schools—public or sectarian, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will no doubt explain—schools which, to my mind, come within the scope of provincial rights. I say that is a misinterpretation of the constitution. I hope that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who holds a chair in the university, will dispel my fears in this regard.

Another object for which, according to the promoters of this motion, this tithe of our public revenue might be employed is the drainage of lands as indicated in the following lines:

Through the effective draining of large areas of land insufficiently drained at the present time and the cultivation of which would become twice as profitable through improvements requiring the aid of the government.

Should this proposition be adopted, the effect would be to induce the government to take hold of the drainage of land not only as regards the public domain, but of lands privately owned. Thus would the government be transformed into a contractor of public works. In respect to such undertakings as the building of the Transcontinental or the Intercolonial, which the government has started as links between the various provinces, or in respect to works of irrigation which are being effected in the Canadian west by private holders with the aid of the government, it is quite a different matter. But I am not aware that the Canadian government has ever in the ordinary course of events undertaken to carry out such works of farm draining. Even in the event of the government being recuperated of the expenditure made, the proposal of the member for Drummond is to my mind fanciful and one which no government should take to. This government is made up of business men who are not willing to engage in neck-breaking schemes.

The motion winds up in three paragraphs, the last of which is as follows: 'Through the founding and subsidizing of agriculture co-operative associations, the bonusing of cold storage warehouses established by these associations in compliance with statutory requirements, the publication and free circulation of an agricultural paper for the use of members of these associations.'

Well, I contend that this is another glaring mistake. It is desired that the government should establish co-operative associations; that is, should establish, maintain and operate business institutions made up of farmers and run in their interest. I claim that such a proposal is contrary to the letter and spirit of our constitution. I cannot conceive that any one having the slightest knowledge of constitutional law should introduce a motion calling on the government to subsidize agricultural co-operative associations. There is no sense in that. I look with great favour on co-operative associations, but I hold that they should be self-governing institutions independent of the government. I submit, therefore, that these suggestions as to the means of helping on the farming community through governmental aid are vitiated by serious errors.

I think I said enough. I represent an agricultural constituency; I am cognizant of what the government has accomplished for the rural population as a whole, and especially for that of the province of Quebec. I am aware that until the present year in the province of Quebec we had no experiment station under the control of the Dominion government, while such stations were in existence in the other provinces. I am glad to find that we now have two of these stations—one in close proximity to Quebec, at Cap Rouge, and another at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, in the coutny of Kamouraska, not far from the county line of l'Islet.

For all this it is only fair that we should be thankful to the Minister of Agriculture, and it is with pleasure that on this occasion, on behalf of the province of Quebec, I express my gratitude for the fair treatment now accorded and which for so long had been denied it. Thereby has the government settled a difficult question and shown its sympathy for the farming class. Why should we be called upon today to vote in support of a motion which, while stating a fact true in itself, is in reality such as to do the government great harm? I for one think it my duty to state right here my intention to vote against this motion as it is worded, reserving my right to listen and give due consideration to the arguments which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier may bring forth.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to say a few words on this important question which has been so ably brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Gilbert). My hon. friend (Mr. Gilbert) has implemented the promise he made to the electors of his county in submitting to the House this motion, which, if adopted, is bound to result in the greatest good to the agricultural interests of this country. I am glad to hear my hon. friends opposite, who during the election in Drummond and Arthabaska cast a certain amount of ridicule on my hon. friend (Mr. Gilbert), now admit that on the present occasion he has amply implemented the promises he made to his electors. These hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that after that election they themselves, and their organs in the province of Quebec, endeavoured to cast ridicule on the role which the hon. member (Mr. Gilbert) was called upon to play in this House. My hon. friend, during his candidature declared he was the representative of the agricultural classes, and that if elected he would move in favour of an increased annual appropriation for the advancement of agri-

culture and to-day the hon. gentleman has in a highly creditable manner carried out that promise. We have heard a great deal to-day as to the means which we ought to adopt to further the interests of our agricultural classes, and I was surprised to hear my hon. friend from Quebec county (Mr. Turcotte) finding fault with the motion moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Gilbert) because it did not go far enough. I may say that the thought has occurred to me, that while a fair sprinkling of lawyers is essential in this House, we have not perhaps a sufficient representation from amongst the agricultural classes themselves in this House. The hon. gentleman from Quebec county (Mr. Turcotte) tortured his system of reasoning to an extent which appeared to me almost pitiful, and I would like to know from him if he did say that a very much larger proportion than one-tenth of our entire revenue should be spent by the Dominion on the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec County). I said there is much more than that spent.

Mr. MONK. How does my hon. friend support that contention in view of the fact that out of the hundreds and hundreds of millions of revenue we have received since confederation, we have scarcely spent $8,000,000 all told on agriculture. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turcotte) say that out of our present annual revenue of $100,000,000 and with a surplus that is boasted to be $18,000,000, we spent more than $500,000 upon the cause of agriculture? Is that expenditure sufficient? Is it not fair that in view of the importance that should be given to educating our people towards the advancement of the largest industry in this Dominion, we should define, as my hon. friend (Mr. Gilbert) has asked us to define, what proportion we shall consecrate to that purpose. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turcotte) criticised the quantum mentioned in the motion, but if we should adopt that motion we are not bound to an exact amount of $10,000,000 for we might spend a little more or a little less. It is however a fair proposition to place before the House —and I believe it will be endorsed throughout the country by our agricultural population—that we should lay down the principle that at least that proportion of our revenue should be devoted to agriculture. I was present at the meeting of the Conservation Commission held recently in the city of Quebec, and at that meeting I heard from Mr. James, deputy Minister of Agriculture for the province of Ontario, one of the most admirable addresses that has even been delivered in Canada, upon the present condition of our agricultural community. Mr. James presented to that meeting the idea that while we had experimental farms and experimental stations, and agricultural colleges, yet, the last word in agricultural science, as the experience of the most advanced countries in the world has proved, is that in order to reach the farmer we must go to him and teach him in his own district. Better than all the other forms of teaching, according to this eminent authority is to send down to an agricultural district an expert who will live with the people, who will find out the crops most suitable to a particular locality, and who will then teach them how best to farm these crops. I was much pleased to hear last night my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) an experienced man in these matters, advocate just the policy that Mr. James advocated before the Conservation Commission at Quebec. And, if that is the best system, what have we been doing in the past to carry it out, and if we are going to adopt it in the future is it not a fact that we will require a very much larger expenditure on agriculture than we have hitherto devoted to it. Until the year 1882 there was no Department of Agriculture in France, but in that year such a department was organized upon the principle of sending experienced men into different localities and teaching the cultivators of the soil how best to make it productive. Recently the most eminent occupants of the different departments of the administration in France have undertaken to publish articles in a popular review descriptive of the working of their departments, and the very first article is devoted to a description of the work of the Department of Agriculture in France, by Mr. Meline who is one of the most eminent authorities on the subject in Europe. That article shows that by adopting the methods advocated by Mr. James the results achieved have been marvellous, that France has become the first agricultural country in Europe, and at present she not only supplies her own wants, but is able to export largely of agricultural products. Is it not time that there was an improvement in our methods in this country. I was glad to hear from my hon. friend (Mr. Turcotte) that there are experimental farms in the province of Quebec, because I was not previously aware that there were any in actual operation. I knew that some property had been purchased for the purpose, but I did not know that an experimental farm was actually in operation in the province of Quebec at the present time. But, if agricultural colleges and experimental stations are good, there is this still better system of teaching the farmers throughout the country which gets nearer to the people actually engaged on the land, and if we are to make Canada the great agricultural country that nature has destined her to be, it is not too much to ask that one-tenth of our national revenue should be

appropriated to that object. I do not wish to follow my hon. friend from Quebec county in his analysis of the different motives of the motion of my hon. friend. My hon. friend prepared that motion himself alone; no one word of it but emanated from himself. I hear laughter on the other side, and I think it proceeds from some of that numerous class of professional men who almost exclusively represent in this House the province of Quebec. I find no objection to that. My hon. friend from Quebec county, with the true nature of the legal gentleman, has endeavoured to pick flaws in this very motion on constitutional grounds. My hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska is not a constitutional lawyer; but the question is not whether he is a constitutional lawyer, but whether he is a farmer fully informed of the wants of those he represents. If he has erred to any extent from a strictly constitutional standpoint, if he has not conformed to May or Bourinot, or other great writers on constitutional law in regard to the means he suggests, I do not think it is quite fair for my hon. friend, who is himself a great constitutional authority, to find fault with his motion.

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec County). I would like an answer.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows that even on the clearest constitutional points lawyers as well as doctors will differ, and I am afraid that my answer would not satisfy my hon. friend. But one point raised by my hon. friend from Quebec County was that the school rights of the minority of the population of Quebec were invaded by the terms of this motion. He feared for the minority, and on what grounds? Because he said the motion implied teaching, which was strictly reserved to the provincial jurisdiction. Will my hon. friend go so far as to say that the Department of Agriculture must absolutely abstain from giving any instruction whatever to the farmers as to the best means of improving their agriculture?

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec County). Is it in the schools that this teaching will be given?

Mr. MONK. The word 'schools' is not mentioned in the motion. Having jurisdiction over agriculture, we must impart to the farmer all the instruction necessary for him to succeed in the important work in which he is engaged, and, therefore, it seems to me that my hon. friend's objection on constitutional grounds cannot be maintained. There is a point in the motion of my hon. friend which should receive the consideration of the House. The progress of agriculture throughout the world, particularly in Europe, has been advanced by the introduction and encouragement of co-operative societies; and in the United States a short time ago President Roosevelt instituted an inquiry as to the most appropriate remedies for that desertion of farm lands and country life which has been so unanimously deplored in the House to-day. One of the principal means of reviving interest in agriculture is the foundation and encouragement of co-operative societies. My hon. friend from Quebec County objects particularly to any such movement on the part of the government. In that he is in contradiction with the experience of every country in the world. For years I have endeavoured to secure in this House legislation which would permit of the incorporation of co-operative societies. It is the way out of most of the difficulties that have been pointed out in this House to-day, and my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) was the first to agree to that proposition. Why is it that we have not been able, during the five or six years that this subject has been before this House, to secure the passage of a law authorizing, as has been done in every other country in the world, the formation of co-operative societies to advance the cause of agriculture—to permit our country people to meet together, work together and combine together, as all other classes of society do to-day, to advance their interests? Members of the House who have taken some interest in these attempts at legislation know that all such attempts hitherto have failed through the action of a most powerful association, the Retail Dealers' Association, who have vowed and determined that the farmers and the workingmen of this country shall not have that privilege, granted everywhere else and to all other classes, to organize their modest efforts together. They have succeeded in blocking that legislation, although many members of this government and a great many members of this House are in favour of it, and from the selfish motive, that while they themselves can obtain legislation to organize and co-operate together, they will not allow these numerous and influential classes to enjoy the same privilege. I hope the discussion had here to-day, and the statements made by several members who are more conversant than myself with agricultural matters, will advance that cause, which has been in the hands of the House and in abeyance for such a long time, so that the two Bills in favour of co-operation now before the House, will receive the encouragement of the government, and be carried into law. Those who have read up the matter will agree with me that it is useless for us to hope for co-operation unless we have a general law governing these societies, applicable throughout the entire Dominion, and unless we do what has been done in

every country in the world, have a natural propaganda in favour of co-operation. We should have a department for the special purpose of encouraging, organizing and overseeing co-operative societies, and I think it was with very good reason that my hon. friend proposed and advocated a regular publication to advance the cause of co-operation throughout the country, as we have in the Department of Labour a publication in the interest of the labouring classes.

My own belief is that we should separate the Department of Agriculture from all alien or foreign matter. It is said that we spend a million dollars in that department. That is true, but we have there the Archives and the Census and other departments which should be separated from it, and have the Department of Agriculture devoted exclusively to agriculture. My hon. friend from Laprairie (Mr. Lanctot)—and we have very few representatives of agriculture in this House from the province of Quebec, fewer by far than from the other provinces, I regret to say—thought he met the argument of the mover of this resolution by saying that we spend a great deal of money in the port of Montreal. But that is not an answer. These expenditures, to which the hon. member from Laprairie (Mr. Lanctot) refers, are for the general benefit of the country, and do not come within the purview of the resolution before the House. The object of the resolution is that we should here express an opinion as to what proportion of our national revenue should be devoted exclusively to agriculture by the Department of Agriculture as a national annual expenditure; and it is idle for an agriculturist to say that the expenditures we are making on railways and other public works are expenditures of the nature referred to by my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska.

I hope that my hon. friend is gratified at any rate with the result of the discussion he has brought before the House. For my part I see no reason why we should not accept his motion. It is in favour of the agricultural classes, it represents with extreme fairness justice and common sense the contentions of the agricultural class in the province of Quebec and throughout this country, and the refusal to entertain it comes with bad grace from this government.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in closing his speech the hon. member for Terrebonne in mellowing tones apprised the House of the fact that the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska owed to his occupation as a farmer the seat which he holds here. There is something humourous in this statement to my mind, for I have always been under the impression that the battle in that constituency had been fought on an altogether different issue—an issue, to a certain extent, concerned with the creation of a Canadian navy.

I am glad to be able to congratulate the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska on the speech which he delivered at this afternoon's sitting in support of his motion.

I recognize he deserves much credit for the preparation of his work, but I cannot share his opinion as to the way of increasing on agricultural grants, but I agree with him on the main idea of his motion, viz: that we ought to do more as regards agriculture.

The hon. members who spoke in turn this afternoon were glad to recognize that agriculture had considerably extended in this country during the last two decades, especially during the last. Meanwhile some had grounds to complain stating that our progress is too slow and they make comparisons between our statistics and those of the European countries.

Are we able, Sir, to reasonably bring about such comparisons? I do not believe it. Is it possible to speak of Denmark, for instance which is a country where the main industry is butter making; an ideal country, whose people are astonishing the world? The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska has given us statistics showing that the Danish thoroughbred cow or a native cow of that country is able to furnish 9,000 pounds of milk annually, as against 3,000 for the average Canadian cow no matter of what breed she would be.

The hon. member for Terrebonne, supporting his statement with statistics, has told us that the yield of wheat to the acre was higher in Europe than in Canada.

I say once more, is there any comparison to set forth between European countries and Canada? Those statements have, of course, been made with a view to throw blame on the government on account of our inferiority. It might be true that we could make use of those figures to point out what we have still to do in order to get from our agricultural industry all the benefits obtainable. We could acquaint the farmers with the statistics so as to show them how resourceful is the farming industry when wisely conducted. That such results as mentioned by the hon. members, be obtained, in Europe is not a matter of surprise, if we take into consideration that scientific farming is applied there so extensively. France, England, Belgium, Italy, Austria, etc., have agricultural colleges which might truly be called universities. Moreover, all over those countries are established farming institutes and farm instructors.

We readily understand the urgent needs prevailing amongst those people. Population is dense and land area is limited; there is not an inch of it to be spared. In order to supply food to so many million inhabitants, it is necessary to grow all possible crops. People try to draw from the soil all what is available. It is for them a vital question. The governments of those countries have spared nothing for the establishment of agricultural schools in their territories together with farmers institutes; in brief all possible means to provide information and extend agricultural science. Amongst all, France is splendidly equipped for the teaching of agriculture. She has an agricultural college, national in its scope, where students are taught scientific farming; she has also experimental and demonstrative stations. Besides the two abovementioned schools, France has established national schools, agricultural training schools, model farms and special teaching of some branches of crop growing suitable for every part of the country.

I summarize that enumeration showing to what extent have results been obtained in that country.

Such an organization involves a great expenditure of money, but the numerous population and its urgent needs justify the cost.

Here, in Canada, we may say that we have valuable farming organization. There is a federal department of agriculture and nine provincial departments of agriculture, all of which deal exclusively with the farmers' interests; we own thirteen experimental farms established in various parts of the country; in every province, there are one or more agricultural schools, moreover, a number of farmers' institutes, clubs or organizations have been formed in different localities, all of which aim at the development of the resources of the soil.

I would not pretend that our teaching staff is all up to date nor sufficient in number, but I am certain that, if all the farming people would take advantage of those organizations, the results would be, by any means, far different.

In Europe the scientific teaching of farming is appreciated; it is needed and its extention is felt. The conditions as regards the immediate needs are different from those in Canada. Our farms being nearly as large as a domain in Europe. Our climate cannot be compared with southern Europe, but we may say that we are able to make use of the land for either crop growing or pasture during an average of seven months a year. Finally we can live on the farm quite cheaply and without working too hard.

Now, to find the cause of the inactivity, if we may use such term, or rather to find out the real cause of the slow progress as regards agriculture, on which subject some hon. members of the opposition have passed critical remarks. The government should not be blamed for that, the Department of Agriculture and the sums needed for the carrying out of its works are not to be blamed. No, Sir, the cause is to be found at the hand of all interested parties. We must confess that the carelessness of a great number of farmers in each region tends to paralyze the efforts of those who mean to be earnest.

Supposing that our budget for agriculture should be the largest in the world, if we can not succeed to change that state of apathy, we will spend our millions in vain. For, unfortunately, the great success that costs very little toil induces the farmers to till their lands as they did long ago when the routine was ahead of science.

I do not say that this state of affairs is existing all through the country, but it is to be noticed in these provinces where more elementary instruction is lacking.

The motion of the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska is too general to receive my support. I should have liked more specific. To ask the government to spend the tenth part of our national revenue, that is, from ten to twelve millions a year, without giving a definite method of applying these sums, gives much ground to discuss this motion.

Whilst some of the hon. member's propositions may be admitted, others give rise to complicated studies of the subject which, from my standpoint, makes it impossible to pass this motion.

The hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska complains of the fact that our farms are deserted and wants to remedy this by the expenditure of millions for agricultural purposes. I say, Sir, that this flow of people towards the manufacturing cities, especially as regards the young country people, is not as much due to the apathy regarding agriculture as to the wish of those young people to go and live in those cities where the activity and the money in circulation seem to them, at sight, a promise that they will get their share of riches. Very often they are very miserable at the start, but others will, nevertheless, follow. Love, greed for salary, money after each week is preferred to the quiet life of the fields which is more free from anxiety. But what would be the cause of the desertion of our farms, which, in the whole, is not so extraordinary as all that? One of the chief causes would be found in connection with protection—I was going to say over production—which was granted manufacturing industry.

Numerous manufactures were constructed. These structures are huge and millions of employees are needed for their

operations. Workmen were needed and had to come from somewhere, so the country put in the largest share of working hands. But I declare, Sir, that it is a thousand fold preferable to see this rush take place towards the Canadian cities, if this flow is more considerable than the emigration towards the American republic such as we had to deplore under the Conservative government.

The country man who goes to the city, within his own country, is at home, whilst he who passes the frontier runs 99 chances against 100 of never coming back home.

The subject of co-operative societies was discussed. My hon. friend said a lot on the matter. No man understands better than I do the importance of co-operation, for I know that the success of the farmer is based upon collectiveness. Left to himself, the farmer can do very little, but if his efforts and those of his neighbours are collective, the greatest enterprises may be successfully brought to an end and fine results may be obtained. I know that the provincial laws, those of Quebec, for instance, authorize the farmers to unite in different enterprises to suit their conveniences. But I would be in favour of such a law by the federal if it were equally advantageous to all and be in force in all the Canadian territory, but not only to help a certain group or class and that in a certain part of the country only. On this question I have the same views as the hon. member, but I differ with him on another subject. It is when he proposes the creation of those societies and would have the government encourage them by paying $5 premium to each member joining them.

At this point, Sir, I can not admit this principle, which I consider dangerous. At the present time we have, in the province of Quebec, some agricultural societies whose members receive a certain allocation from the government besides the agricultural publication. I always wondered if this was the best policy to encourage the farmers to join their own societies.

At all events, this institution is already old enough that I would not grant my approval to a measure whose object would be to pay the farmer in order to encourage him to join a society in which he finds an immediate advantage. I would consider this measure as lowering to the farmer. Rather an effort should be made to educate the farmers in this respect.

The hon. member for Terrebonne exclaimed a moment ago: Beware, if you do not grant to the farming community their fair quota of the public moneys, they will form unions like the workingmen in cities have done, and have recourse to forceful means for getting what they want. I may not recollect the very words he used, but that is at any rate the purport of his appeal.

I may answer my hon. friend from Terrebonne. Pray to God that such an idea, which I consider as most excellent, be taken up by the farming class; it will help them on in many ways. But if this is to come about, the farmer should take after the city workmen and go in for closer solidarity with his fellow-workers. The city workman joins an association which is expected to look after his interests, to promote his general welfare. Through it he has succeeded in having his salary increased and in keeping within more reasonable bounds the hours of daily toil. Through its efforts he has secured a better ventilation of his workshop, the carrying out of sanitary measures, as well as protection against fire and all manners of accident. And all will admit that had the individual workman striven single-handed to improve matters, he would have failed. It was through united effort that the workingmen obtained a fair and equitable consideration of their claims. I may state for the information of the hon. members for Terrebonne and Drummond and Arthabaska that these people, far from being bonused for the purpose of inducing them to join these associations, contribute largely, from week to week, from month to month, from year to year, towards their maintenance. The prospect of seeing farmers form unions such as workingmen have formed has no fears for me; I rather wish they would do so in their own interest. Many a time have I urged on them the necessity of co-operation and good-will to ensure permanent success.

The hon. member for Terrebonne referred to agricultural lecturers, and claimed that many of them were not qualified for the work which they were expected to do. I will not deny that, but I may point out to my hon. friend that there is not in Canada any institution for turning out expert lecturers on such subjects, that such as are to be found have become so through their own efforts solely, and this accounts for the great inequalities in the result. However, I am in sympathy with the views he expressed, and I only hope that the educational campaign in matters agricultural will be carried on by competent men. A move which I would favour, even if it were to cost several thousand dollars, is the appointment of practical teachers in agriculture for each county. A leader who would be in constant touch with a given community would be in a position to guide them effectively in the management of their farms and the carrying on of the various branches of agriculture, and might also reveal to them the benefit of co-operative working and trading processes. Lastly, if our model farms,

our schools, our agricultural periodicals and papers do not suffice, let the government knock at the door of the farmer's home and teach him on the spot the most profitable and most up-to-date methods. Sir, I would strongly favour such a proposal. For, to my mind, one of the most sensible and rapid means of educating the farmers and improving their methods is teaching them at home. The toiler of the fields is a close observer of nature, his insight into its phenomena is most remarkable, and oftentimes he attains results which would seem to us beyond his grasp without the help of science and scientific training. Consequently, it would seem to me an easy matter, by means of technical instruction imparted at home, to bring about a rapid and fruitful dissemination throughout a parish, a township, a whole province, of improved methods in crop growing, breeding, &c. The immediate outcome of such a training would be the carrying out of such improvements as experiments effected on a model farm would have shown to be profitable in connection with cultivation of the soil, dairying and other branches of farm work.

I regret that the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska has not included such a proposal in his motion, for I certainly would have given it my support. Instead, the hon. member calls for the publication of a paper to be distributed free of charge throughout the country.

Sir, the matter of greatest importance just now is not the starting of a new journal of agriculture, but impressing on the minds of farmers the importance of carefully reading those publications which are now circulated in their midst. The province of Quebec has to-day a journal of agriculture very well edited and full of valuable pointers in regard to farming. The province of Ontario, on the other hand, is favoured with several agricultural periodicals and papers which are objects of general admiration.

Unlike my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska, I would rather be inclined to favour a proposal for an increase of the provincial subsidies, with the understanding that this surplus endowment would be applied to the promotion of agriculture. Whatever the amount this government would be ready to grant in this way, and even if it were as much as the amount suggested by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska, I would favour the proposal. I am satisfied that such moneys would be expended to better effect by the various provincial governments, they being in a better position to know exactly what are the requirements for the time being, considering the status of the community at the time.

When my hon. friend complains that the federal government do not spend enough for agricultural purposes and when he bases his statements on the few hundred thousand dollars which appear in the public accounts for these purposes, he is not fair, or his investigations and researches are prejudiced. However, I don't care to lay such a blame upon him.

For my part I have always understood that under the constitution which governs us, the federal government have prerogatives and the local governments quite different ones, but that all these are combined so that each government have their own responsibilities and advantages.

The federal government attend to large public works, railways, canals, rivers, to the opening of unexplored districts, to the settlement of the surveyed domain, to the development of the country, to the making of treaties relating to trade, to the improvement of our transportation. These are the general outlines, and it seems to me that each finally tends towards agriculture. Indeed, how could you sell your products if you could not remove them by rail or water and if there were no profitable commercial intercourse.

In short, that argument is so simple that I shall not detain the House any longer. But in concluding, Mr Speaker, let me tell you that the government have just found a great remedy for the evil of which the hon. member from Drummond and Arthabaska complains, and I will let you know what it is. It will not make necessary at present any notable change in the agricultural estimates although its results shall be quick and astounding.

Following the example of the hon. member from Terrebonne and of the hon. member from Jacques Cartier and others who have addressed the House upon this question, I love the farmer, I love the brave and laborious man who follows this calling, and no one more than I wishes him happiness and prosperity. And I am sure that all the members of this House are of the same mind. Therefore, I invite the member from Drummond and Arthabaska when he shall meet his constituents to speak to them in the following terms: 'My friends, I had promised you to take an interest in you. I have kept my word. I have moved in the House that the tenth part of the public revenue be expended for agricultural purposes, but the government have found the means of rendering farming still more prosperous without such an expenditure. Thus we will be enabled to save ten per cent of the public revenue and to spend the amount. This means, my friends, is the commercial agreement which they are about to enter upon with the United States for the marketing of our natural products.' When this agreement is sanctioned, we shall see our agriculture taking an expansion unexampled in our history,

and agriculture has in store for the farming community the most brilliant possibilities.

The hon. member from Drummond and Arthabaska did not say in his speech that agriculture was not thriving in his country, but he wants to render it more flourishing. This aim is not a legitimate one, since, according to a maxim, all men must tend towards perfection. Now, I verily believe that the new policy of the government towards the United States will satisfy not only his own desires, but the wishes of thousands and thousands of farmers in this country.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Chairman, when the estimates of the House of Commons were under discussion the other day, I inadvertently made an incorrect statement in reference to the supply of stationery to the Senate. I stated that the members of the Senate were still supplied with trunks of stationery as the members of the House of Commons were formerly supplied. I had been misinformed on that point. The Speaker of the Upper Chamber, having called my attention to the matter, I think it only right to state that the stationery trunk was done away with in the Senate about the same time it was done away with in this House, and their system of supplying stationery is now the same as ours. A misapprehension has also arisen in connection with another statement of mine, in which I said that the Senate being an independent chamber, disbursed their funds as they thought best. A more correct method of stating the case would be that the Senate disburse their moneys in accordance with the estimates they have made up for necessary expenditures.

Mr. HENDERSON. I made certain criticisms of the stationery supplied to the Senate, stating that they should not be treated differently from the members of the House of Commons. As I understand some criticism was made in the Senate of our comments in this House, and I wish to explain that I was led astray by Mr. Speaker in the manner he has just explained.

Mr. SPEAKER. They have a stationery office in the Senate distinct from ours, and I was informed that the old system was in vogue there when in reality it had been changed. I must apologize to the committee for making the statement; I made it in good faith.

Mr. MILLER. While we are discussing these matters, some ladies, wives of members of the Senate and of the House of Commons both, think they might be supplied with a telephone and clock in the ladies' sitting room near the parliamentary restaurant. That would not be too much to do for the ladies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Railways and canals collection of revenue Intercolonial Railway, $9,500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the working expenses of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. SPROULE. We understood that the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture would go on to-night, and the members who wish to discuss them are present. Some of those who wish to discuss the Intercolonial railway are not present, and if we allow items to pass one item should be kept open on which members may discuss any of these matters.

Mr. GRAHAM. There will be no objection to keeping an item over for general discussion. This is the annual vote for the working expenses of the Intercolonial railway. We had a vote last year of $9,000,000. Of course the vote is only approximate because the greater the amount of business the more expenses we have. We took a supplementary vote the other day of $250,000, and possibly before the 31st of March we may have to take another. We are increasing the vote this year by half a million which we hope will cover our requirements, but it depends on the amount of business we do. Within the last couple of months we have added to the salaries of the employees of the Intercolonial railway to the amount approximately $300,000 for next year.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister expect that the revenue in the coming year will be over $9,500,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. We estimate that this year the income will approximate $10,000,000.

Mr. DANIEL. And the working expenses?

Mr. GRAHAM. The working expenses proper will be about $9,250,000. The reason I say we may have to ask another supplementary is that we want to pay $76,000 out of revenue for the loss at Campbellton. We also want to take out $200,000 from the revenue in addition to the $25,000 a month to put in the equipment renewal account. I have the money, but I cannot take it out unless I get a vote for it. This is merely giving authority to use it for that purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. What portion of the Intercolonial railway does the minister expect to double track this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a piece in connection with the yard at St. John and some at Stellarton and at New Glasgow. We have not taken up the matter of double tracking the through line, that would be a capital vote.

Mr. DANIEL. There is a portion double tracked between Moncton and Port Duchene. I understood that when the hon. member for Westmorland was Minister of Railways he took a vote for double tracking from Moncton to St. John. Have the department given up the idea of double tracking in that direction?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not find any record of a vote to double track there. We double tracked to Painsec Junction. As I understand, if the Intercolonial railway undertakes to handle the trade of the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific and in future the Canadian Northern, as a government road, it will have to be double tracked from St. John all the way through to Halifax. It is part of a big problem the government now have under consideration.

Mr. HUGHES. What about changing the route of the Intercolonial railway around the Folly Heights?

Mr. GRAHAM. We had a survey made, and my information is that we may not get a better grade by diverting the road than by double tracking the present road.

Mr. STANFIELD. The engineers tell me quite different.

Mr. GRAHAM. My information was received within a week. It is a big question. I do not vouch for its accuracy. To go around by the other side of Cobequid mountain means a double number of stations and double overhead expenses for that district, but it might serve a territory. The question of double tracking is a big one, and will have to be solved in some way. The Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern must eventually have a way more independent than the Canadian Pacific railway now has of getting into Halifax. It is part of a big scheme. It means eventually a double track and larger terminal facilities at Halifax. We have not taken any vote for it this year, possibly next year we will be in a better position to deal with it on a large scale. In the meantime, I believe the Intercolonial can handle at the present time the traffic that is offered from the other roads.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would like to point out one little injustice that is being done to a certain class of employees on the Intercolonial, I mean the porters. It is a small matter to the railroad, but it means a good deal to the men. A new man, we will say, is taken on as porter at Montreal and put in charge of a dead-head car running from Montreal to Halifax and return, and he has to pay for his own meals at Halifax, while getting a small salary. I would like to suggest to the minister that the Intercolonial do as other roads do, when a man is in charge of a dead-head car he should be allowed a certain amount of pay per day for meals and expenses. I think where men are kept over in Halifax for two or three days they should be allowed a certain amount for expenses.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question is surrounded with difficulty. A man may live in Montreal, when it would be far better for him to live in Halifax; and vice versa. Of course, I am speaking generally. We have some men now on our dining and sleeping cars who, the management says, ought to live in Halifax, but the men prefer to to live in Montreal. It is difficult for the management to pay for that man living in Montreal when he ought to live in Halifax.

Mr. HUGHES. If a man who is in the service of the company is held off from a terminal point, and has to stop over, why not give him a stop over allowance?

Mr. GRAHAM. The roads do not do that. The men board themselves. On the dining cars I think they are given a very low rate for any meals they take.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister was to produce a statement showing the amount of money paid for car rent, and the revenue.

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount received for cars last year was $454,035, and the amount paid out $246,212, on car transfers.

Mr. DANIEL. How many cars has the Intercolonial running on other railway lines?. I think a large number of them are used by the Grand Trunk railway, and a number of other railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. The number varies. We load a car on the Intercolonial and this car goes somewhere on the Grand Trunk. Of course the Grand Trunk takes it. Under the arrangement, the Grand Trunk must start it eastward again and not westward when they get through with it. They do not want to start it eastward unless they can get something to put into it, and they will bring it back to us by easy stages. If they keep it over a certain length of time they pay us 35 cents a day, and we receive the same as they pay other roads. But our trouble is this: We are not an international railway, and we do not get nearly the same number of American cars that they get of ours. For instance, a man in Quebec the other day wanted 30 cars. We could only give him 20 cars the next day. These cars will be loaded and started off, and we must get them back after two months. These cars cross the line with pulpwood, and we may only get two or three cars in exchange when they come back, because pulpwood is very bulky and they are waiting for return freight. It is difficult for us to get those cars back. As a matter of fact, with that arrangement the Intercolonial gets the worst of it. We send men to look after these

cars and try to hurry them back, but it is difficult to get them back.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a regular system in looking up these cars.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a regular system of exchange; they are supposed to report where they are. We send to see why they do not get started on their way back according to our exchange arrangement. A car starts back, it will be put off the main line and be started back three or four miles from some other station, and be handed on to a branch line, and be exchanged with another line that is not theirs, and be kept a couple of weeks, and then come back on their line again. I may say at the present time there are about 3,000 cars away. The number varies.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion is that of the total number of cars on the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. About twenty-five per cent.

Mr. DANIEL. Is 30 cents a day a paying rent for the use of the car?

Mr. GRAHAM. In that arrangement I think the Intercolonial gets the worst of it. The difficulty is that this is a government road. There is an association of the various railways, and that association meets and fixes the price that each company pays the other, and the conditions.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the value of one of these big box freight cars?

Mr. GRAHAM. $1,100 or $1,200.

Mr. HUGHES. Supposing one of the Intercolonial cars is wrecked on another line, what then?

Mr. GRAHAM. They repair the car, I understand.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the Intercolonial railway a member of this association the minister speaks of?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the government compelled to submit to that kind of thing? In railway legislation we except the Intercolonial railway. The minister points out that this is an exceptional position, and that the Intercolonial does not get a corresponding benefit by this exchange of cars. I do not see why the government should submit to paying 25 cents per diem for cars that cost $1,200 apiece. Assuming that Sunday is included, that would not represent more than $90 a year, scarcely more than enough to pay the interest on the cost of the car. I think if we got 30 cents a day it would not be more than enough. The minister is not bound to submit to this very unfair arrangement.

Mr. GRAHAM. If you did not make that kind of an arrangement, you could not send pulp wood in cars out of Canada, for the American roads would not haul your cars.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the 25 cents a day paid from the time the loaded car is taken over by another road on its way to its destination, or is it only when it commences to return?

Mr. GRAHAM. The per diem allowance is not paid for the car going. The other road is allowed a certain time to send it back to us—I think two weeks on the average distance. If the car is not back in that time, the charge commences to run.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a large vote, and if the minister would make a statement of the purposes for which it was required we should have a better understanding of what we are asked to vote.

Mr. DANIEL. And the minister might also state whether there has been any increase in the rate for passengers or freight on the Intercolonial railway since the management came under the commission, and also whether, in the opinion of the minister, the management by commission is an advantage over the former method.

Mr. GRAHAM. According to the last report, our expenses for the fiscal year ending March, 1910, were as follows:

Maintenance of way and structures	$1,622,279 75
Maintenance of equipment..	1,851,792 68
Traffic expenses	179,882 61
Transportation expenses	4,784,667 76
General expenses	206,447 53

Maintenance of way and structures includes the pay of section men, maintenance of bridges and of the line in general. Maintenance of equipment includes repairs to rolling stock. General expenses includes office expenses. We have at the head of the mechanical branch Mr. Joughins; maintenance of way and structures, Mr. Burpee; traffic manager, Mr. Tiffin, and general superintendent, Mr. Brady. Mr. Pottinger has immediate supervision of the offices at Moncton.

Mr. HUGHES. He is head of the whole concern?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, Mr. Campbell, the deputy minister, is chairman of the board. And each member of the board has his own department to oversee. The appropriation this year will be approximately the same as last.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there an increase in the number of men?

Mr. GRAHAM. Quite a large increase this year.

Mr. STANFIELD. How much is spent in ballasting?

Mr. GRAHAM. For eleven months last year, $21,000, and this year for eleven months, $58,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. My advice to the minister would be to spend a good deal more than that in the coming year.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are spending more in ballasting now than has been spent in any previous year.

Mr. HUGHES. What class of ties is being used?

Mr. GRAHAM. Princess, pine and cedar.

Mr. STANFIELD. Quite a number of night operators have been laid off recently. On Monday evening, coming up on the train, two passengers wanted to buy tickets at College Bridge, but, as there was no night operator there, they could not get their tickets. In some of the newspapers it is indicated that accidents occurring have been due to the absence of night operators.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not agree that that is the case. A number of night operators have been dropped along the Intercolonial railway, but only from places where they would not have been stationed at all on a company road. This is not economy at the expense of safety. I looked into some of these things that were said in the newspapers on this subject, and I do not think that the absence of night operators has had anything to do with accidents on the road.

Mr. STANFIELD. What about the tickets?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will leave it to any members of the House who are in a position to compare the Intercolonial railway in this matter with any company road. It would not pay to keep a man on at night because now and again a couple of men want to get tickets. Tickets can be got on the train.

Mr. STANFIELD. But these men wanted return tickets to Riviére du Loup, you cannot buy a return ticket from the conductor.

Mr. GRAHAM. But night operators cannot be kept on at such points if we are to run the line on anything like business principles. The other night I was criticised because it was said the line was not run on business principles. No company road would keep a night man at such a point as that referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Stanfield). In fact, I think no other road would stop a train there. But we stop the train, and, instead of getting credit for it, we get discredit because we do not do still more. In answer to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I have here the figures for the eleven months ending March last, as follows:

Maintenance of way and structures	$1,687,000
Maintenance of equipment	1,875,000
Traffic expenses	172,000
Transportation expenses	4,552,000
General expenses	201,000

Mr. STANFIELD. What amount has been stopped from the men for leaving their positions without notice?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are about 6,000 men, and I could not tell that offhand.

Mr. STANFIELD. Has the minister a legal right to stop a man's pay for a month or six weeks?

Mr. GRAHAM. Our arrangement with the men is absolutely under union rules, and we have to abide by it.

Mr. STANFIELD. I know one case where the board agreed to pay a man's wages to his wife, but found that the man had gone to some other road and would not pay him.

Mr. GRAHAM. The arrangement with the union men is that when a man leaves the employ of the Intercolonial railway and takes employment somewhere else, he is not entitled to his pay.

Mr. STANFIELD. It should not be five or six weeks, though; that is the way you get your surplus.

Mr. BLAIN. How do wages on the Intercolonial railway compare with wages on other Canadian railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. They compare very favourably with the wages on other railways. The Grand Trunk pays a minimum of $1.40 per day to maintenance of way men, the Canadian Pacific railway pays $1.55, unless it was changed by the last adjustment, and the Intercolonial railway recently adjusted the wages to $1.60 per day.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that proportion apply all along the line to the different employees?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so. We have within the last few weeks adjusted the salaries of practically all the employees on the Intercolonial railway and the adjustment is acceptable to them, but it will mean an increase of about $300,000 a year to the road.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you spending more in the betterment of the road this year than you did last?

Mr. GRAHAM. On maintenance of way we spent this year out of revenue about $260,000 more than we did last year. We expect to spend at least as much as that

in the coming year, and I have a Bill before the House making it legal to take an amount of $200,000 in excess of our present taking of $300,000 out of revenue for the purchase of rolling stock.

Mr. STANFIELD. Does the minister think his traffic department is aggressive enough in looking after business? In our district we see the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway travelling traffic men much oftener than we do the Intercolonial men.

Mr. GRAHAM. That should not be so. I did not know that was the case. I will bring that remark of my hon. friend to the attention of the head of our traffic department.

Mr. STANFIELD. It might be no harm to speak to him about it.

Mr. GRAHAM. He is well equipped with a good staff, and we ought to get around as well as the other railroads do.

Mr. HUGHES. Perhaps he does not do any more than draw his salary.

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, yes he does. Of course, it is a disadvantage to us that our road ends at Montreal and we are handicapped in getting traffic for west of Montreal.

Mr. STANFIELD. The Canadian Pacific railway is now carrying freight from St. John to Halifax across the bay. I would recommend the minister to advise his men in Ontario to try and procure all the traffic they could for the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. HUGHES. In shipping freight from a point on the Intercolonial east of Moncton to Vancouver, is it delivered to the Canadian Pacific railway at St. John or Montreal?

Mr. GRAHAM. At Montreal.

Mr. STANFIELD. At. St. Rosalie?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, 40 miles east of Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. Does your traffic manager make any special effort to induce the establishment of industries along the road? and does he confer with people along the line to that end? I remember once being on a western United States road and I found they issued a very interesting circular to all the business men along the line asking them if there was any natural resource in their locality that could be developed such as mines or quarries, or if there was any industry that might profitably be established. The traffic manager, when he got these replies, went along the road and consulted with the people. This gentleman was a Canadian whom I knew very well, and he told me that for the three years he had been with the company they succeeded in almost doubling the traffic of that road by that means. Employment was given to a great many people in this way and additional traffic came to the road. I often wonder that our Canadian railways do not do more of that kind of work. Does the Intercolonial railway follow that practice?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Intercolonial railway is supposed to do through its traffic department anything that any railway would do, but we are handicapped in this way, that some of the men connected with other roads assist with their capital in forming subsidiary companies which develop traffic along the road, and of course the government could not do that. I am glad these observations are made by hon. gentlemen, because they are helpful rather than hurtful to us, and I will make a synopsis of them and draw them at once to the attention of our traffic manager. We want to make the Intercolonial railway self-sustaining as nearly as we possibly can while at the same time we serve the public well.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like the minister to give me the rate on plain brick, cement blocks for building, and building tiles for say 100 miles, 200 miles, 300 miles, and so on in carload lots.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will wire and get my hon. friend that information.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister will find in the Manitoba 'Free Press' of March 27, page 4, a very interesting table which gives the rate on the Canadian Pacific railway and on the Great Northern in North Dakota for carload lots on these three commodities. We hear a great deal about low rates on the Intercolonial railway, and I would like to compare them with these rates.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get that information.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the present condition of the Intercolonial railway in the matter of stone or cement culverts, steel bridges, and other details of modern construction?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that practically all the bridges are now of modern construction, and we expect this year to have the culverts in the same condition, approximately at least; I am speaking of the main line.

Mr. DANIEL. Can the minister state whether the Canada Eastern, now a part of the Intercolonial, is paying its expenses, and doing as well as was expected when it was taken over?

Mr. GRAHAM. The accounts have not been kept separate, and therefore it is difficult to say. While the Canada Eastern as a separate line might not pay, the in-

creased traffic which it hands over to the Intercolonial might make up the difference.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the policy of the minister with regard to taking over any of the other branches?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a large order. The Act passed last year was a very restricted Act, and I am not sure that under it we could take over a branch line.

Mr. DANIEL. That was the object of the Act, was it not?

Mr. GRAHAM. That was not my object

Mr. HUGHES. Were there not plans to take over some of them?

Mr. GRAHAM. There were not plans for taking over any particular one. If the Intercolonial were controlled by a company, it might take over a number of these branch lines which are beneficial to the Intercolonial, even though in themselves they do not pay, in order to control the traffic. I am having a close investigation made of all the branch lines in New Brunswick and various lines in Nova Scotia, and I have had one or two reports on them, and I am quite frankly prospective of constructing some more in Nova Scotia, and also in Prince Edward Island. I am getting a report of that kind for my own digestion, and I hope to be able to say something on branch lines before the end of the session.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there any reason why the accounts of this branch line should not be kept separate? I think the understanding at the time it was taken over was that they should be kept separate, so as to test the representations made at that time.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would prefer to have the accounts kept separate, both for the good of the Intercolonial railway, and to test the branch lines. I think they add to the revenue of the Intercolonial, so that any deficit there might be in the separate branch lines would be made up by the increased traffic on the Intercolonial. It is my intention to have the accounts kept separate.

Mr. HUGHES. I see that Judge Barron has been down in the maritime provinces, and I noticed an article from him practically condemning the present management of the Intercolonial railway, and recommending that it should be handed over to the Canadian Northern. Was he inspired by the minister?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly he was not inspired, if he hinted that the Intercolonial railway was not well managed, and not if he hinted further that it should be given to the Canadian Northern.

Mr. STANFIELD. If it is not too great a secret, will the minister tell us what branch lines in Nova Scotia he contemplates taking over?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not be prepared to do that.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend's predecessor on one or two occasions in the committee made the statement that the freight rates on the Intercolonial were only about 50 per cent of those of the other leading railways of Canada. How is that now?

Mr. GRAHAM. I took a great deal of pains, before I made my statement to the House this year, at the request of the leader of the opposition made last year, to have made up a comparative statement of the rates of the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway, the Temiscaming and Northern Ontario, and the Canadian Northern, from five miles up to 200 or 300. That shows, generally speaking that above 15 or 20 miles the Intercolonial rates per ton per mile are much lower than those of any other road in Canada. That statement will be found in 'Hansard'.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not a fact that the local rates on the Intercolonial are about as high as those on any other railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will find the full comparison in my statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember some years ago seeing the rate for hauling grain 800 miles on the Intercolonial railway, and it was about the same as the Grand Trunk railway charge for hauling 200 miles.

Mr. STANFIELD. Hon. gentlemen opposite will see that there is not much in this talk of low rates if they will look into the conditions. Where there is water competition, the Intercolonial railway has to lower its rate to meet that competition, but inland the rates are higher. I can speak from personal experience as I am one of those who indirectly contribute a good deal towards the revenue of the Intercolonial railway. What we object to is having to pay such high rates on inland traffic. Take from Stellarton to Truro, Nova Scotia, some 40 miles, we have to pay 80 cents per ton on coal, whereas to Halifax, which is 60 miles further, the coal is carried at the same rate. If hon. gentlemen will take into consideration the fact that there is water competition where the rates are low, they will understand the case more readily.

Mr. BLAIN. That applies to all parts of Canada. Take my own section of country, the illustration which my hon. friend has given would apply there with equal force. But that is not the essence of the question. I am not making any complaint or any criticism, but I am simply seeking information, and I understand that the rates on the Intercolonial railway are very

much lower than those on any other railway in Canada. I could cite in proof of that statement the Minister of Railways of to-day and also the Minister of Railways of many years ago.

Mr. STANFIELD. The rates have been raised since.

Mr. BLAIN. Nevertheless I understand that they are lower. The minister tells us that the Intercolonial railway pays wages equal to those paid by any other railway in Canada, but the fact remain that it does not collect anything like the rates that are collected on other lines.

Mr. GRAHAM. Take the province of New Brunswick, and compare the rates. I take this table which will be found in 'Hansard' page 5196:

	Classes.									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
C.P.R. 84 miles	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
I.C.R. 89 "	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10	8
C.P.R. 137 "	40	35	30	25	20	18	15	16	16	13
I.C.R. 137 "	29	26	22	18	15	14	11	12	11	9
C.P.R. 223 "	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	19	16
I.C.R. 223 "	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12

Mr. STANFIELD. Were these rates taken under similar conditions? Take from Stellarton to Halifax, a distance of 106 miles, and compare the rates on that distance with the rate on the Canadian Pacific railway where they have not such competition.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot take any particular locality, but these rates are taken from the tariff in the province of New Brunswick, where the conditions in the case of each railway are practically the same.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice in the Auditor General's Report, page W—22, that the locomotive power works at Moncton cost $220,905.17. What does that include?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is capital expenditure on the new shops, largely on machinery for the new locomotives and car shops. In addition we are taking an appropriation this year for the yards.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they now completely fitted up?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that our new shops are practically completed, but the yards are not.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it expected that the Intercolonial railway will be able to have its locomotives made in these shops?

Mr. GRAHAM. These shops are largely for the purpose of repairing locomotives. The large number of locomotives requiring repairs keeps us busy without our constructing new ones. Of course some of the repairs are practically reconstruction. At present we have arranged to equip 50 steel frame box cars, and build 50 new cars in our shops there in addition to the repairs.

Mr. DANIEL. How much does the minister calculate it will take to complete and fit up these car works?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that the present capacity of the shops is practically sufficient to keep our locomotives in repair. We shall not add any machinery at present. We will not be adding any material machinery at present.

Mr. DANIEL. What did the buildings and machinery cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. The shops, lands and machinery have cost approximately $3,000,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. Are the engines put in thorough repair at Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM. As on other railways, there are always some engines out of commission.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the percentage?

Mr. GRAHAM. About 10 per cent.

Mr. HUGHES. That is pretty low?

Mr. STANFIELD. Have you sufficient engines at Moncton to do the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. It depends on the work. This has been a very heavy traffic year. We have bought a number this year, we purchased three a short time ago, and we intend to add more. That is why I am asking for $200,000 to remain in my hands instead of going into the revenue as part of the surplus.

Mr. HUGHES. From whom are they being ordered?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are only two firms in Canada, at Montreal and Kingston. I think this contract goes to the Kingston one.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the minister make comparisons with what outside contractors would ask?

Mr. GRAHAM. I did that once or twice, but did not make anything by it. Their prices are a little higher than the Canadian prices and I always buy in Canada where I can. I have compared the prices and I think we buy our locomotives as cheaply as any person.

Mr. STANFIELD. Last fall I happened to be travelling towards Montreal on a train to which some special cars were at-

tached. We should have run in two sections, but they had only one engine at Moncton for that train. The minister is quite right in saying that the Intercolonial railway should have more engines.

Mr. BLAIN. How are the passenger rates on the Intercolonial railway as compared with other roads?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave that information in my speech the other day. The comparison was as follows:

	Per pasenger per mile.
Intercolonial	1·691 cents.
Canadian Pacific	1·821 "
Grand Trunk	1·767 "
Canadian Northern	2·184 "

Our receipts per passenger per mile were thus the lowest of any railway in Canada.

Mr. DANIEL. The sleeping car rate from Montreal to St. John has been increased by 50 cents. I do not know whether there has been any conspiracy between the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Pacific railway and the Railway Commission, but I would think that since the matter had been before the board the rates would be lower.

Mr. GRAHAM. The order of the Board of Railway Commissioners is being obeyed by the railway companies. The charge for the upper berth is lower, but the rate is based on distance.

Mr. DANIEL. On other runs the lower berth has also been reduced in price, for instance between here and Toronto there is a reduction of 50 cents on the lower berth.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister a statement of the number of grades on the Intercolonial railway from Montreal east that exceed four-tenths per cent per mile?

Mr. GRAHAM. I can get that profile.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the minister taking any steps to reduce the grades? It is not possible to haul freight over a one per cent grade.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be necessary to make the Intercolonial part of a through line, as we hope to do, and reduce some of the grades, and make pusher grades where necessary. I think myself that the grades could be reduced. In some places a pusher grade would be cheaper than to reduce the grade.

Mr. DANIEL. Returning to the Pullman car rates, I think there must be some misapprehension. I have just learned from one of the British Columbia members that the rates out to the coast are really a few cents less than they were before, so it cannot be the distance. I also understand that the rates for the same mileage going west are somewhat lower than the rates coming east. Now why it should cost more to come east than it does to go west, is something that perhaps the minister can explain.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister considered the question of giving on that road a second-class rate, the same as they are giving on the Grand Trunk or rather a third-class rate on the Grand Trunk between Toronto and Montreal? A two cent rate has often been advocated by the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean). I heard the minister quoting a rate per mile, which was a good deal below a two cent rate on some of the roads. It would be interesting to know how much of that is made up out of excursion rates, and how much out of regular travel.

Mr. GRAHAM. If you put on a regular two cent rate the result might be the same as it is on some of the United States railways where they have cut out all excursion rates of every class, and have gone back to the old system. We run a second class car, but not a third class. The judgment of the court I think only compelled the Grand Trunk to run a third class between Toronto and Montreal, and nowhere else, and only one train a day.

Windsor branch, $35,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a branch over which the Dominion Atlantic railway has running rights. They give us a third of the gross proceeds. Last year we made on this branch $37,000.

Prince Edward Island railway, $450,000.

Mr. FRASER. I would like some information from the minister concerning this branch line from Harmony to Elmira, what is the amount of the contract, who are the contractors, and when they expect to finish this road? This is a branch line of about 10 miles, and they have been at work on it for three years, and it is only half done yet. I would like to ask the minister when he expects this line will be finished and running?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not surprised at my hon. friend's complaint about the slowness of the contractors. This contract was let to the Whitehead Bros. at schedule prices. As our department figured their schedule prices, they amounted to $135,000, that was only for comparative purposes. Our estimates showed $315,000. The Whitehead Bros. took this contract and got into some difficulty. There were some claims made against them, and we held up their estimates until their claims were settled. These claims were settled. But you can understand in what position the young contractors would be in. They have been very

slow, but I think they have got things straightened out. It has been suggested to me that a strong contractor is about to take hold and help them.

Mr. FRASER. What is his name?

Mr. GRAHAM. Kitchen. A good deal of the road is graded. The man who had the contract for building the station built it very rapidly, it is nearly completed. The grading is pretty well along. The rails have been ordered from the Intercolonial, we are selling them Canada Eastern rails, 56 lbs. to the yard. These rails will be shipped immediately to the branch line. They are second-hand rails, but in good condition, and were used on the Canada Eastern for heavy traffic. We are charging them $27.50 per ton, $32 is the price of new rails. We sell the old rails that are useable at $27.50 a ton We expect the road will be completed this year. The rails, I think, cost $40,000. The total cost of the road as estimated by the engineer is $315,000.

Mr. FRASER. How much has been spent on that road up to the present time?

Mr. GRAHAM. $128,000.

Mr. FRASER. The minister says it will be completed this year. Does he mean before the end of 1911?

Mr. GRAHAM. The year I have reference to was during this season, that is before the winter sets in.

Mr. FRASER. The minister says the stations are all finished along that line. I do not think that is quite correct. For one of the stations a tender was accepted, but I do not think any work has been done on it, and that is the principal station on the road, at the terminus. I understand that the contractor has no intention of accepting the contract now.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not heard anything in the department, I am sure. I was pointing out that a good deal of work had been done on the station buildings.

Mr. HUGHES. How many stations are there on this ten-mile road?

Mr. GRAHAM. Three. The reason that I made the remark about the buildings is that the complaint is made that the stations are so far advanced and could be completed, but there was no railway for them.

Mr. FRASER. On one station no work has been done yet. Has the department paid for the stations as finished? They ought to know whether they are finished or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have paid accounts for buildings, I think, of about $14,000 up to date.

Mr. FRASER. I do not know now whether the department is aware that one of the stations has not been touched yet.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will make inquiry, and will let my hon. friend know privately how they stand before I ask for Supply again.

Mr. FRASER. As to the operation of this road, I wish to say that for the last few years it has not been giving the satisfaction to the public that it formerly did. Complaint is made of cheeseparing in the operation, and the trouble that the people have in getting redress of their grievances. I do not wish to find fault with the officers, but I believe if some of these things were brought to the attention of the minister they would be remedied. To the road running east from Charlottetown, there are two branches, one to the town of Souris, 60 miles, and the other to Murray harbour, a distance south of 46 miles. About the end of last December one train was taken off the Souris branch, and from that time and until now there has not been as good accommodation on the road as we had thirty years ago. All the freight and passengers have to go on one train a day from Charlottetown to Souris. Every second day they call it an express train for the carriage of passengers only. The next day it is an accommodation or mixed train. There is a certain timetable, but the freight is all left until the mixed is going through, and consequently the train comes in from an hour to two and a half hours late both ways. The road is not earning what it ought to be because any one living within fifteen or twenty miles of Charlottetown will drive rather than use the railway because of the uncertainty of the train. I have gone to a station within seventeen miles of Charlottetown and have had to wait an hour and a half for the train. One could almost drive in that time. The same may be said of the Murray harbour branch. During the winter, there is a great deal of traffic on these roads. I would suggest to the minister and his deputy, who, I understand, is willing to listen to reason and do what is right for the people, that a freight train should be put on these roads every second day—run to Murray harbour one day and to Souris the second day. This would keep the freight cleaned up, and would allow the express to carry the passengers and mail on regular time. And there would be no great expenditure involved. There would be three freight trains a week to Souris and three to Murray harbour. The effect would be to increase the revenue. Another thing in relation to this matter is one that I brought to the attention of the department when

Mr. Butler was deputy minister. The road stopped running one train right in the middle of the Christmas holidays, when students were travelling and the general movement of passengers was heavy. Many passengers went on return tickets, and, one train being taken off before they returned, they had to be satisfied with the accommodation afforded them by one freight train. Mr. Butler said he would have the matter rectified, but, in the meantime, he was transferred to other work. I did not bring the matter up again, because I thought it would be attended to. Last Christmas, the very same thing happened. At the end of December, and in the middle of the holidays this train was taken off. Had the train been run, let us say, until the 12th of January to accommodate the Christmas travel—students home for the holidays and others—it would not have been so unreasonable. If the department can put this freight train on three days a week in each place, and occupy the time of the crew I do not think it would be very much extra expense, and it would give a great deal of satisfaction to the people. This matter has been brought before the superintendent time and again by different persons, but I regret he has not seen fit to make a recommendation to the department. There are several other complaints I might make against the superintendent, but I do not wish to find fault with him in his absence. I may state that the management of the road at present is not satisfactory to the people, and I think there are other members from the island present to-night who can say the same thing.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some suggestion was made as to the autumn time-table, and the board has that under consideration. Mr. Campbell, the chairman of the board, drew my attention to the matter yesterday, but I was very busy, and had not time to discuss it with him. We will take these representations of my hon. friend and see if we cannot work out something a little more satisfactory to the people of the island. I may say to the House, and to the country, for that matter, that I have a great deal of sympathy with the situation of Prince Edward Island, and I never made any pretense to make the Prince Edward Island railway pay. Last year the deficit was $108,000 and this year it will be $85,000. The conditions are such there that the railway cannot pay, but I, nevertheless think it is the duty of the Dominion of Canada to give fair transportation for the products of the people of Prince Edward Island without regard to the fact that there must be an annual deficit in the operation of that road.

Mr. FRASER. Does the Act passed last year to provide for the adjudication of small claims against the government railways, include claims arising on the Prince Edward Island railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. During the last few years especially, the people have found a great deal of difficulty in getting these claims adjusted. I can tell the minister that in some places the railway fences have been allowed to tumble down, and animals have been killed, and the owners consider it waste of time and money to attempt to get compensation.

Mr. GRAHAM. That Act applies to the Prince Edward Island railway, and the general Railway Act applying to other railways has been changed to apply to the Intercolonial railway so far as damages are concerned. These small cases can be tried in the local courts of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FRASER. The Act does not say the Prince Edward Island railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is called the government railway.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, but it refers to the Intercolonial railway all through the Act, although it says 'government owned railways.'

Mr. GRAHAM. It is intended to apply to the Prince Edward Island railway.

Mr. STANFIELD. A good many shippers lost considerably by the fire which took place in the freight shed at Truro last Thursday. Will the minister issue orders to have all just claims settled immediately?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the agent is down there now.

Mr. STANFIELD. I know, but is he empowered to settle at once?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, and the new member of the board will assist. I do not think there will be any trouble in getting settlements promptly made.

Mr. LENNOX. Before you come to the item for the National Transcontinental railway I would like the returns all completed, especially that one with reference to the itemized expenditures, and estimates of further expenditures on contract No. 21. The minister sent one of his officials round to see me in reference to it, and I think it is under way.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the hon. gentleman give me a memorandum?

Mr. LENNOX. I shall, to-morrow.

Chambly canal—bridge between Iberville and St. John's, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The bridge is being constructed over the river and the canal, and we have come to an arrangement by which

we are combining in the construction, and our share will be four-tenths of the cost amounting to about $52,000.

Mr. HUGHES. Who pays the other share?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the town and the provincial legislature.

Mr. DANIEL. What is supposed to be the entire cost of the bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. $130,000. On account of the improvements made there by the government, it has to be a more expensive bridge than would otherwise have been the case. Our engineers went into the matter and reported that four-tenths would be our fair share of the cost.

Chambly canal—new machinery, $31,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have completed the power house, and this is to install the new machinery to light the canal by electricity.

Mr. HUGHES. Why don't you do that on the Trent canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will eventually.

Mr. HUGHES. I want it now.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this machinery belong to the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. STANFIELD. How do you get the power—by steam or water?

Mr. GRAHAM. By power from the dam.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there reciprocity in canal traffic? Do we allow the Yankee boats, when laden, to come through our canal to Montreal, and why does the minister not see that our boats are allowed to go through their canal to Albany?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they do.

Mr. HUGHES. I have a memorandum from the Minister of Customs stating that it is not so.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) last year brought up the matter in the House, and I wrote to Albany and was informed in reply that Canadian boats had not been charged in recent years if they went through the canal.

Mr. HUGHES. It is not a question of charges. They are not allowed to go any further than Whitehall. The minister might look into that matter.

Mr. DANIEL. I think what turned out to be the case was that the American Canal was so small that the Canadian barges could not go through.

Lachine canal—concrete vertical wall, $250,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This work has been going on for some years. It is to provide against leaks.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the present bank?

Mr. GRAHAM. A kind of riprap.

Mr. HUGHES. Is not some of it timbered?

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose there is some crib work. After full consideration, we came to the conclusion that we would have to build concrete walls to protect the banks.

Mr. BOYCE. Are you going to concrete the Sault Ste. Marie canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think it is necessary there.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is this work on the Lachine canal going on?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is practically in Montreal. It was completed last year up to about the car works, and the work is now going on from there west.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is it proposed to do of this the present year?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to build a wall on the south side of the canal. It will cost approximately $350,000 and the amount required this year is $250,000. This concrete wall is to be similar to that already constructed on the north side. The foundation of this vertical wall is on a sloping underneath.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the minister advised that that will be a permanent and safe structure—a vertical wall on top of a sloping wall?

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineers say there is no doubt it will.

Mr. LENNOX. I would think that very doubtful.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the foundation for the sloping wall, stone or clay?

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineers' report that they have a good solid foundation. In some places the foundation will be rock and in others probably hard pan.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the dimensions of this sloping wall?

Mr. GRAHAM. Two feet thick at the bottom and about 18 inches at the top.

Mr. HUGHES. When was that built?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some five or six years ago.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the width of the vertical wall?

Mr. GRAHAM. About 18 inches. The bank will be filled in up to this wall, and thus have greater strength.

New tug $6,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this the total cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not ordered yet. We hire one now, for which we are paying $15 per day.

Towards completion of wharfs and basins, Lachine, $35,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This will complete the wharf and basins on the north side of the Lachine. This is an old work.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the nature of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. Dredging and completion of the wharf. The items are: Land, $75,000, earth excavation $37,500; covering old stone wall, concrete, iron posts, life ladders, diversion of a river and engineering expenses. The estimate was $318,000. This $35,000 is expected to complete it.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. In Supply we will continue the estimates of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. HUGHES. When is the reciprocity debate coming on again?

Mr. FIELDING. In good time.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it true the government has withdrawn it?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not heard of that.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.49 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 30, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. BOYCE.

On the order of the day being called:

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. A few days ago I called to the attention of the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), as I thought in a reasonable and moderate manner, an incipient labour excitement at Sault Ste. Marie. I explained to the hon. gentleman fully the circumstances and quoted certain newspapers and reminded him of what had been promised by his predecessor in office from his place in the House with regard to similar conditions about three years ago. The hon. gentleman (Mr. King) himself at the time, I think, did not accuse me of having in any way violated the rules of parliamentary etiquette, or of having gone beyond what might be done by public men in a representative capacity. In the issue of the 'Sault Express', published at Sault Ste. Marie, March 24th instant, and edited by a gentleman who has occupied more or less a notorious position in this country, Mr. C. N. Smith, I find the following article:

MR. BOYCE TO BLAME.

In the House of Commons last Friday Mr. Boyce, the celebrated muckraker from this constituency, endeavoured to place upon the shoulders of the Labour Department responsibility for the labour difficulties at the steel plant, and the 'Express' has taken the trouble to make some inquiries regarding the phase of the subject to which the member refers, with the result that we find Mr. Boyce himself and his political friends in the Soo and in Toronto are the real culprits. An interview with Mr. Armstrong, the senior immigration inspector at this point, throws a new light on this subject which will be of general interest to the workmen directly concerned. In speaking of the importation of so many aliens who have come in and crowded Canadian workmen out of their employment, Mr. Armstrong stated that in every instance he had insisted upon the requirements of his department being complied with, but he pointed out that the immigration inspectors had no authority to enforce the Alien Labour law. The enforcement of that law, he said, was in the hands of the provincial authorities whose consent had to be obtained before a prosecution could be effective. Mr. Armstrong was asked if he had ever made an effort to get consent to prosecute under the law from the provincial authorities, and his reply was: 'Yes, I have much evidence of violations of the labour law at this port, and so far the Attorney General has not granted the consent asked for.'

What reason could there be for refusing to grant your request?

'I attribute it to the utter lack of interest in the workingmen's cause on the part of our local member in Toronto, who does not seem to have any sympathy at all for the cause of the poor man. One word from Mr. Hearst and the Alien Labour law would have been put into operation long ago,' replied the inspector. 'And the present trouble at the steel plant would have been avoided.'

Under the circumstances, were you surprised at the attack which Mr. Boyce made upon the Dominion government the other day in this connection? was asked.

Inspector Armstrong's reply was: 'Yes, I was very much surprised, because what I know makes it clear that Mr. Boyce was trying to deceive the public, pure and simple. But in this case he is caught right in the act, for let me tell you that it was right in Mr. Boyce's law office where the legal application was made to the district judge to whom I had

been referred by the Attorney General when asking for consent to prosecute under the Alien Labour law. That application was refused, and Mr. Boyce knows it. If the workmen want to know who are directly responsible for their troubles all they have to do is look in the direction of the two members of this riding at Ottawa and Toronto and they will find out. And I think by this time the men concerned know this as well as I do.'

As to the first part, that 'Mr. Boyce, the celebrated muckraker from this constituency' having made certain attacks upon the government, I am not here to vindicate myself against such a charge from such a quarter. Considering that the man who makes it was the hero of the 'Minnie M.' expedition in 1903, and a gentleman whom, I believe, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has specially endeavoured to persuade to become a candidate in West Algoma at the next election—(I do not want to put that into the mouth of my hon. friend, but the gentleman himself advertises it as a fact)— I believe that I could not have a better testimonial of efficiency in the representation of the interests of my constituents than in such a phrase coming from a gentleman with the notorious reputation which this gentleman bears. But it is a pity that where one does endeavour to do his public duty in the way which honestly seems best to himself, and in what I consider a moderate manner—though possibly, at times a forcible manner—appeals such as this are to be directed against a public man absolutely without ground, as the Minister of Labour, I am sure, in this instance, will testify. But let that go for what it is worth. My shoulders are strong enough to bear it. I am quite willing to take knocks; —I give them sometimes, but I endeavour to give them, as well as I can and according to the breeding I have had, in as gentlemanly a way as possible, having regard to the feelings of those involved. But, with regard to the interview with this immigration officer, I desire to have the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) for a moment. Since when has it been proper or seemly for an officer of this government to engage in political discussion and to give interviews saddling responsibility for grievances such as the importation of labour from abroad upon the members of parliament absolutely without cause and in the most ridiculous manner as in this case?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) is speaking to a question of privilege as I understand. In that case, he must confine himself to the question of privilege.

Mr. BOYCE. I am confining myself to the fact that I have been absolutely misrepresented. This interview states that the member for West Algoma is responsible for deceiving this House. I resent that, and I ask the Minister of the Interior to look into the facts and ascertain whether such an interview has been had with the senior immigration agent, and if so to tell the House whether such an officer should be permitted to give interviews criticising members absolutely without justification.

UNITED STATES WARSHIPS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

On the order of the day being called:

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some days ago I called attention to a newspaper report alluding to the nine war vessels of the United States now located at various places on the Great Lakes. The Prime Minister seemed to be uncertain at that time as to whether or not these vessels were armed. I should certainly infer from the description contained in this report that they are armed. I wish to inquire whether the government has any information in its possession on that point and if so, what is the armament of each of these vessels. If the government have not that information will they procure it? It seems to be information that should be in the possession of the House and of the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These vessels were passed through the canals from the ocean on the application of the American government to be used as training ships, that was the official information that we had. As to their subsequently becoming training ships or not I think we have some confidential information; I am not sure that we have anything else on the subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I asked the question because I did not very well understand how these vessels could undertake and be engaged in a peaceful bombardment of the city of Chicago unless they were armed in some way. I think that very circumstance would indicate that they are armed vessels to all intents and purposes.

COAL STRIKES IN NOVA SCOTIA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the Minister of Labour as to the present situation at Springhill with regard to the strike which has been continuing there for a very long time. I have not brought to the House a great many communications I have received on the subject, but I would be glad if the Minister of Labour would give a brief statement of the actual conditions and how long that strike has been in progress. I have refrained from bringing these communications to the attention of the minister or of the House for the reason that it did not seem to me that any good object could be served by doing so, but they are becoming somewhat pressing

and insistent and I would like to have a brief statement on the subject.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). Speaking from memory, I think the strike at Springhill has been on for something like 16 or 18 months, over a year and a half. Before the strike took place the whole subject was fully investigated, first of all by a board under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and later by the Deputy Minister of Labour. The board, I think, were unanimous, in the statement that the conditions did not seem to be such as would justify a strike. The circumstances at Springhill were of a nature which would not admit of the company granting the concessions asked by the men and the board expressed the hope that under the circumstances the miners would see the wisdom of not pressing their demands, and of continuing at work. However, they did not accept the finding and they were then at liberty to strike. When the Deputy Minister of Labour investigated the conditions generally he made a similar report saying that from full and careful investigation, if the demands of the men were persisted in, he could not see that there could be anything other than a fight of great length between the parties. I think the main difference is the question of the recognition of the union. The company took the position that they wished to be at liberty to employ any one they desired, whether he was a member of a particular union or not. The men out on strike belonged to an organization and insisted that this organization should be recognized. The company owning the mines is not willing to recognize the organization, and the men say they will not go back to work until the organization is recognized. I do not know any power that can settle a difference of that kind except by one party or the other changing its position. The position has been frankly stated to the parties, they have known it for a year and a half, and notwithstanding that the personnel of the management has changed recently, and a secondary grievance ended in this way, the trouble has continued; the new manager has made his position plain, that the company does not see its way to any change. I am afraid that as long as the present attitude is maintained by each of the parties the present struggle will continue.

Mr. HERRON. Have there been any later developments in the situation in southern Alberta and British Columbia?

Mr. KING. As I mentioned when the subject was brought up the other day the operators and miners had a conference at Calgary to see if it was possible to reach a new agreement. The agreement which they have been working under terminates on Friday of this week. The result of that conference unfortunately was not what the country generally hoped it might have been. The parties were unable to reach an agreement. Then a meeting was held yesterday at Fernie to receive the report of the committee that went to attend this conference. Knowing that this meeting was about to take place I sent the following telegram to the president, the vice-president and the secretary of the district union of the United Mine Workers, thinking it desirable that the country generally should know exactly the position in British Columbia and Alberta and that the parties should be in full possession of the facts:

(Telegram)

Ottawa, March 29, 1911.

W. B. Powell,
President District Union,
United Mine Works of America,
Fernie, B. C.

Am informed there is a possibility of a strike taking place in consequence of dispute between operators and miners in Southern British Columbia and Alberta, without said dispute being referred in first instance under provisions of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, which applies to mines, and that this course may be taken with the knowledge and sanction of the officers of the unions to which the miners concerned belong.

As the matter has already been made the subject of a question in parliament and is likely to be further discussed at any moment, will you kindly telegraph me at your earliest convenience for the information of the government, if this report is or is not correct; also whether as one of the officers of the District union you are prepared to do all in your power to secure a compliance with existing laws on the part of those whom you represent.

The government is prepared to do all in its power to secure to the miners of British Columbia and Alberta fair play and justice in the consideration of any of their demands, and to facilitate in every way possible the means necessary to this end, and in the public interest, not less than the interest of the miners, it is hoped that those in positions of responsibility and authority will co-operate with the government in its endeavour to prevent any step being taken which might prove of serious injury to the general public as well as prejudicially affect the cause of either of the parties.

I understand a mass meeting of the miners is to be held at Fernie this afternoon to receive the report of delegates to the Calgary conference and that there is a possibility of this meeting declaring for a strike. Should such prove to be the case, I much hope that with the assurance given that everything possible to expedite the inquiry required by the Act will be done, the meeting will agree to defer this step until it is seen if some settlement of the difference cannot yet be effected by legislation which parliament has

enacted with the express purpose of aiding in the furtherance of industrial peace.

(Sgd) W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
Minister of Labour.

This telegram was also sent to C. Stubbs, vice-president district union, United Mine Workers of America, Fernie, and A. J. Carter, Secretary district union United Mine Workers of America, Fernie, B.C.

Mr. HERRON. May I ask the hon. minister if he has a reply to that telegram?

Mr. KING. I received last night a reply from Mr. Carter, secretary of the district union, who was at Fernie. The reply was simply an acknowledgment but he stated that he would send further information this morning. Up to the present time I have not received further reply. The other two officers did not reply and I have asked the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company to find out if my message has been delivered to them. I received a wire saying that my message had reached Mr. Stubbs, vice-president, at Michel this morning, but that Mr. Powell had not as yet been located. I expect that probably some time during the day I will get a further reply from these officers. I might say that the Department of Labour has one of its officers out in the Crowsnest Pass at the present time with the object of endeavouring to point out to those concerned the advisability of having this dispute referred to a board of investigation, and of being on hand to expedite matters and to lend the good offices of the government in any way which may be possible. We are doing whatever we can but I must confess that I regard the whole matter as being in a very critical position at the present moment.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the Minister of Labour if he has any new information with reference to the little labour trouble up at Sault Ste. Marie, and whether he will bring down the correspondence with reference to it and lay it on the table.

Mr. KING. I shall certainly be pleased to bring the correspondence down.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, I presume the minister is aware that two years ago we had a strike in British Columbia, in the same district, that is affected by this threatened strike. That an agreement was made then for two years, and that the strike commenced then in March and continued until July. Is the minister aware that at that time the leading men amongst the strikers published a statement in the papers defying the Labour Department and the Hon. Mr. Lemieux to interfere with them in their strike? I could give the Minister of Labour the statement published over the signatures of these gentlemen at that time. The strike was carried on until a settlement was arranged, I was interested in a mine in that district at that time, I was on the ground, I read that statement in the papers defying the government and the Department of Labour and I sent the papers to the minister.

Mr. KING. I think I remember the correspondence to which my hon. friend refers. If I recall the matter correctly the mine with which the hon. gentleman was connected was the Hillcrest mine.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Yes.

Mr. KING. Some time ago the company locked out the men, the men brought an action against the company under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and the company was fined for having locked them out in violation of the provisions of that Act. I mention that incident to show that the provisions of the Act respecting penalties for non-compliance with the Act have been tested and found effective when applied to a company. Now, the law is on the statute-book and it is open to the company with which my hon. friend is connected, or to any person who believes that his interests are going to be prejudicially affected, to take similar action.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am not now connected with that mine and I never heard of a lockout. It may have happened under the new company that is in charge of the mine.

Mr. KING. It was the Hillcrest Company and I can assure my hon. friend that the facts as stated are correct. Should there be any violation of the Act in this particular instance the same means of redress would be open to the parties affected as were open at that time.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If there is a strike, is it the intention of the government to enforce the law, as my hon. friend has read it, against the strikers?

Mr. KING. The law is there and any citizen of the Dominion who wishes to lay information may do so.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What is the Department of Labour for but to enforce the law? They would not enforce it when the strike was on two years ago and the strikers defied them to do it.

Mr. BLAIN. Listening to the answers given by the hon. Minister of Labour about strikes in different parts of Canada, we learn that the conflict is between organized and free labour. May I ask my hon. friend if the policy of his department is to favour organized or free labour?

Mr. KING. I would answer the hon. gentleman by saying that the policy of the department in that particular is the same as the policy of every other department of the government—to watch the general interests of the public and not to take sides with one or the other.

Mr. BLAIN. No policy there at all.

Mr. KING. I think I have indicated the policy.

SUPPLY—HEALTH CONDITIONS IN CITY OF OTTAWA.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, I desire to move an amendment to the motion to go into Supply on a matter which is of vital interest to this House and the country. I do so entirely of my own motion, because I have thought over this question with considerable anxiety for some time and I would not have brought it to the attention of the House did I not consider it in the interest of the people of the country that I should do so, and that I would not be doing my duty if I did not do so. Before presenting the motion I wish to make a few remarks and especially to draw the attention of the government and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), to certain facts bearing out and supporting the amendment which I desire to lay before the House. Many members agree with my motion although they may not say so. The credit of any town or municipality is founded upon the character of the citizens which inhabit that town and of the buildings which are located within its bounds. The credit of any country is based upon the character of the people living within its borders and of its cities and towns and other municipalities. But, the capital of any country is in an entirely different position from that occupied by an ordinary city or town. While the honour of this House is largely in the hands of the government and of the opposition the credit of the capital of the country is, to a far greater extent than that of other cities or towns, in the hands of the government and especially of the Prime Minister. If hon. members will look into the tomes that are in the library of parliament, if they will turn up the records of the British War Office, that office which had stations in every section of the world they will find that Gibraltar occupies the proud distinction of being the healthiest station of any possessed by the mother country and that second to the fortress of Gibraltar in that respect is the city of Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion of Canada, second to only one in the whole world. I do not desire to besmirch the character of Ottawa, but I ask the government and the Prime Minister to take careful note of what I am going to say. Whether it is that we have here two overgrown villages belonging to people speaking different languages, or, that the city is still a lumber town except for the government part of it, whether it is because of the authority which directs the affairs of the capital is divided, different powers being exercised by the municipal body and by the Ottawa Improvement Commission, I cannot say, but I do assert without fear of contradiction that the administration of this city is a municipal hodge-podge.

I say without fear of contradiction that the administration of this city is nothing but a municipal hodge-podge, in fact there is no valid administration at all. I desire to call attention to the statutes of the province of Ontario which have been in vogue during the last twenty years, and in chapter 223, section 541, &c., of the Municipal Statutes, are set out some of the duties of municipal officers. I do not know whether the municipal officers in this city are appointed as they should be under this municipal law, but there is hardly an officer who is carrying out the duties which are carried out in any small town of four or five thousand inhabitants in Canada. Take, for instance, the construction of public buildings, a matter which has been called to our attention by the terrible holocaust which took place in New York city the other day. There are public buildings in this city which are absolutely unsafe. There is sitting before me in this House a gentleman who left a public place of amusement in this city the other night because he was afraid something would happen. Every seat was occupied and the aisles all crowded, there were only two small doors of egress possible. Now in section 541 of the Municipal Act of Ontario it is laid down that the police officer, or some inspector, shall see that no place of public entertainment, church, or amusement hall shall be constructed without the doors opening outwards, and in certain ways, and that the aisles are free. That is not carried out in this city. As to fire escapes, I know there are public buildings in this city four or five stories high which have not even an ordinary rope for the purpose of a fire escape. There is no inspector of buildings looking after this matter as he should. Within five hundred yards of this parliament House there are buildings put up within the last few years, to my own knowledge, which are stored with inflammable material, and which cannot be described as anything less than fire traps, wood, covered with tin and others of wood alone. Across the Rideau canal I have seen myself

numbers of buildings being put up in a congested street, frame brick veneer which are absolutely fire traps. No town of the size of Ottawa should allow such things. It is something disgraceful that in a city of this size a sewerage system should be allowed to exist such as we know exists in Ottawa. There are outside closets in use which no other town in Canada of four or five thousand would allow to exist. Worse that that. We read that a man living on Douglas Avenue was fined $10 for having filthy conditions in his premises without any closet at all. That item is going the rounds of the press, and it is a disgrace to Ottawa and to Canada. While Sparks street is a white way, Queen is a dark way, and dangerous, not a light between Elgin and Metcalf. I do not single out any particular person as being to blame, I only say that it is all part of gross mismanagement or rather it shows no management at all. Perhaps it is owing to divided responsibility. The First Minister is trying to make of Ottawa the Washington of the north, and he deserves credit for it. At the present time we may look forward to a great influx of visitors during the coming year. When these visitors have come and have looked over our city, we want them to go away with a green memory of the city of Ottawa and not a gangrene memory.

Now with regard to the typhoid epidemic in Ottawa, I want to bring also to the notice of the government the fact that there is a public institution in this city, in which there are eighty persons, which has been quarantined for small-pox. A small-pox hospital has been established on an Island called Porter's Island, and after the patients were taken there they were allowed to be interviewed and visited by other people of this city, thus offering more opportunities for contagion and spreading the disease than they would have offered if they had remained in their own homes. I say the time has come when the government should take charge of this city. The fever epidemic started over three months ago, and there is no question now where it arose. We know now that the intake pipe of the city of Hull has its mouth almost opposite the place where the intake pipe of the city of Ottawa is placed, and that Hull has had no typhoid epidemic. There is no doubt in the world that the typhoid epidemic started through the opening of a valve of that intake pipe. I have been there personally and examined the situation, and I leave it to any hon. gentleman to say if the difficulty has not arisen where that valve was opened. It is on the bottom of the bed of a shallow bay of the river in absolutely dead water, no current whatsoever. If the corporation had tried for ten years they could not have found a place better fitted, owing to the stagnant and filthy water there, to originate a typhoid epidemic. If proper precautions had been taken to sterilize that water no doubt the epidemic could have been prevented. Why, we know that for two months after the epidemic began the sewers were not flushed until last week. I say this shows great neglect on the part of the corporation. When the warm weather comes, and the flies begin to travel, and the water gets low, there will be still more liability to an epidemic. I had forgotten to state that there are meat shops in this city where meat absolutely uneatable is offered for sale. These should be looked after. The people of Ottawa are in great danger still. The members of this House are in great danger. I see before me in this House men so eminent that it would be a great loss to this country if they were removed. I see before me men who have suffered sickness from this cause. There is hardly a man in this house who has not had trouble one way or another, either personally or through relatives or friends, from this epidemic. I say, therefore, that it is the duty of the government to prorogue this House until this epidemic of sickness has abated. While it might be somewhat expensive to prorogue temporarily, I think it would be justifiable owing to the mismanagement of the city of Ottawa that Ottawa should pay the extra expense thus incurred, that the amount we pay to this city ought to be diminished until conditions are improved. I, therefore, beg to move that:

That owing to the epidemic of typhoid fever and the frequency of small-pox and other contagious diseases now prevalent in Ottawa, this parliament should immediately after voting enough supply to carry on the government, prorogue and that the government call a special session in the early fall to close up this session's unfinished business providing said sickness has abated.

I make this motion in all earnestness. The condition of affairs is more serious than my forensic powers enable me to portray. And I call upon the medical men in this House to support my motion, and to say if it is not true that after warm weather comes and the rivers are open the condition will be worse than it is to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. Moved by Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Daniel—

Mr. DANIEL. No. While I am agreeable to some parts of that motion, I cannot agree with all of it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall have to declare the amendment lost for want of a seconder. Lost.

Amendment negatived.

TRADE WITH THE WEST INDIES.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House and of the government for a short time to the trade situation between Canada and the West India Islands. Not very long ago a Royal Commission was appointed, consisting of the Right Hon. Lord Balfour, of Burleigh, Sir John Poynder Dixon-Poynder, and Sir Edwin Morris, K. C.M.G., on behalf of Great Britain, and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs of Canada, on behalf of this country, the duties of which were to inquire into the conditions of trade and communication between Canada and the West Indies, and to suggest means for their improvement. That commission commenced its work in the city of Ottawa, and spent some time in different cities in Canada, afterwards went to the West Indies, where it travelled through all the large groups of islands and held meetings for investigation and the taking of evidence, and then adjourned to London, where it finally prepared its report. This report was given in on the 19th of August of last year. As presented to the British parliament, it is in two parts—one, the report of the commission, and the other, the report of evidence with certain statistical tables. I am not aware that any report has been issued by the Dominion government. If I am wrong in that, the Finance Minister can set me right.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the official report was laid on the table by the Minister of Customs at an early stage of the session, and we obtained a supply of copies which were accessible to any hon. member who wished them.

Mr. FOSTER. The British report?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be useful to make a very short historical review of the subject. This commission had its initiative from Canada, and not from the British government. An order in council was passed on a report of the Finance Minister, in which, after the recitation of certain conditions that existed and certain things that had been done, it was suggested as advisable, in order to facilitate arrangements for more extended and better trade relations between the two countries, that it would be well to enlist the co-operation of the British government, and it was upon the adoption of that report, which was responded to at once by the British government, that we had the Joint Commission. I have no hesitation in saying that it was a wise thing to have that Joint Commission, and to enlist the co-operation of the British government in its purpose. For a great many years, of course, better trade relations with the British West India Islands have been a topic of discussion in this parliament, and there have been several tentative endeavours of more or less importance to bring them about, but up to that time these endeavours had not proved successful, for various reasons. In 1890 I had the pleasure myself of making a short tour through the West Indies, and of conversing with business men and with officials of the different islands; and whilst I found, what has always been found there, I think, a favourable and friendly feeling towards this country, the conditions were such as to make it seem to the people there inadvisable to undertake any preferential or treaty relations with the Dominion of Canada. In 1898 the Dominion of Canada extended the preference to the West India Islands, giving them, I think, a preference of 25 per cent upon their exports to this country. That was given without any compensation on their part. It was given by way of good-will and friendliness, and was given at a time when the fortunes of the West Indies were not looking particularly bright. I have never heard in this House, from either side of it, any dissent from that act of good-will and neighbourliness to the West Indies from ourselves. But eleven years after that uncompensated preference had been granted, the Dominion government, I think, felt that the time had come when there ought to be more equitable relations between the West Indies and ourselves, and when we might very well look for a compensation from the West India Islands for the preference in our markets. That, I imagine, was the prime motive which actuated the government in the appointment of this commission. Well, the commission came to its conclusions, and we now have before us what I must say is a very full and at the same time not overloaded report, in which all the members of the commission agree, which is very explicit in its recommendations, and which is very friendly towards the extension of preferential relations between the West Indies and Canada.

Now, it is well to have in mind the changes which have taken place in the situation between, we will say 1897, and the later periods. There were previously two obstacles to making preferential arrangements with the West India Islands: first, that they had had long and comparatively easy access to the United States markets, which had absorbed a very large proportion of their products, and secondly, that in regard to their chief product, sugar, the Dominion of Canada was not in a position if it gave the whole of its market to the West Indies, to take more than a fractional part of their whole sugar product. They, therefore, naturally hesitated to make preferential relations which would be

operative against the United States market, when the consumptive demand in this country was not sufficient to take more than a comparatively small share of their chief product. The first preference given by the Minister of Finance had not very much effect for a number of years, and there were many reasons why it did not. Chief among these was the countervailing duty which the United States placed upon the importations of beet root sugar from Germany, which practically nullified the attraction of the preferential reduction made by Canada in favour of sugar from the West Indies. So long as that countervailing duty existed there was, therefore, very little effect in the way of diverting sugar from its old channels to Canada.

But several occurrences took place. The Brussels convention resultled in a reduction of the bounties in continental Europe. That removed at once a great handicap from the shoulders of the sugar producers in the West Indies. It also completely nullified the countervailing duty which had existed in the United States, so that the results of the sugar convention in 1903, or thereabouts effectually changed the conditions of things and made the situation very different. In the next place the German surtax was imposed in 1903, and that operated very powerfully in making the Canadian a favoured market for the West Indies. What was also a very large item in the factors that changed the situation was the fact that the consumption in Canada was rapidly overcoming production in the West India islands.

Then again the difficulty which took place between the United States and Spain resulted in sugar from the Philippines and Porto Rico and Cuba getting free or favoured entrance into the American market. All those four factors had the effect of almost absolutely changing the situation, and these factors, aided by the preference given by Canada, operated to turn the sugar trade almost completely towards Canada. As an evidence of this, while in 1897 only 11,000 tons of West Indies raw sugar came into Canada, in 1909 that quantity had increased to 133,000 tons. If we take British Guiana alone, the production of raw sugar in 1900 went to the United States to the extent of £782,500, and only £3,860 to Canada. In 1908 the export to the United States was nil, and to Canada £858,800. In 1909 there seems to have been some change, but even then the product of Guiana went to the United States to the amount of £268,960, and to Canada £756,306 in value. If you take the average of five years, it will be found that the West Indies exports of raw sugar averaged 198,300 tons; and the imports into Canada, deducting what came in at Vancouver, and a small quantity which was let in at a preference for the refiners, had increased to 151,410 tons. Thus our imports had mounted up very considerably towards an equality with the production in the West Indies, and if these arrangements which the Finance Minister made with the sugar refiners in this country were counted out, that would bring our market up from 151,410 tons to about 190,000 or, 195,000 tons, which shows that our market requirements for raw sugar are at the present time equal to the whole production of raw sugars in the British West Indies.

Any one can easily see what an important effect that had upon the whole situation and how much easier it makes the effecting of preferential arrangements between that country and our own. The disposition of the people of the West India islands is shown strongly in that matter. We know that in 1908 there was a convention at Barbados to which we sent two delegates, and the West Indian convention, at that time, through its delegate, passed a resolution in favour of preferential arrangements with the Dominion. And shortly afterwards the legislature of Barbados passed resolutions authorizing preferential arrangements on certain conditions with this country. From that time up to this, tentative efforts have ben made by other West India colonies, looking to the same end. Probaly one of the most significant of those is that which has lately been made by the legislature of the Bahamas. So strong is the favourable sentiment there that they passed a resolution advising the undertaking of negotiations with Canada, either for preferential arrangements, or for annexation to this country. I cite these facts as undoubted proof of the improved situation and the improved sentiment in the West Indian islands with reference to this matter.

Now there have been two flies in the ointment, or possibly one of double dimensions, which has made a little difficulty. That was the arrangement made, in consequence of a dispute between the refiners of Canada and the planters of the West Indies as to who were getting the best share of the preference. The Finance Minister introduced legislation by which a certain percentage of the foreign sugars—one-fifth I think it was of the amount refined in this country—should be allowed in under the conditions of the British preference. Another derangement was the concession made to the manufacturers of sugar from the beet in this country, by which they were allowed to bring in two tons of foreign sugar under British preference rates for every ton of Canadian beet root sugar they refined. Now, the dispute between the refiners and the planters and the government, and the method by which it is attempted to arrange

that dispute has introduced into the situation an element of some difficulty, but not one which it is impossible to overcome.

The opinion of the commission is very decided in that respect, and they point out means by which they think it can be overcome, and to which I will refer later. The commission is of opinion that, whilst there are difficulties in the way, they are not insuperable, but can be overcome by conference, and they lay down certain lines upon which they think they could be fairly easily overcome. One difficulty that arises is that these several groups of islands, or, in some cases, single islands, have different tariffs, and it seems impossible, stretched as they are over such a wide extent and with their different sectional and revenue necessities, for all to come together and agree upon a uniform tariff. The commission unanimously propose that, instead of attempting the impossible, the principle be laid down that, on a selected list of articles, the exports from Canada—or, if you put it that way, the imports into these islands—shall be brought under the plan of allowing a preference to Canada of 20 per cent upon whatever duties are deemed necessary upon imports into their several islands—and the same, of course to Great Britain, for Great Britain follows in this arrangement in the line of concessions they would make to Canada;—and further that they be allowed to make that preference either by adding to the imports from other countries or by reducing the duties on goods from Canada, or by combining these two. That gives a great deal of freedom and makes it comparatively easy to come to an arrangement. It is the opinion of the commission that a twenty per cent preference given by the West India Islands could be brought about, and it would be a preference to be given in compensation for a preference from Canada. But they also say that, uncertainty and indefiniteness arises out of the breach which is made every year in the preference as granted by Canada of allowing a percentage of foreign raw sugar to be imported at a lower rate or under the preference, and, unless that could be eliminated, it will be difficult to bring about the desired end; and the suggestion is made, based upon evidence gathered in the West India Islands themselves, that they would be satisfied with a preference of 15 per cent as compared with the present 25 per cent, provided they had the assurance of permanence and knew that it would not be broken in upon by the arrangement that at present exists for the refiners. This is the conclusion, the unanimous conclusion, I take it, of the commission.

Then, in reference to the Canadian side, there is to be either a free list as compared with duties charged when imported from other countries, or a reduction upon the import duties upon dutiable goods. And the commission suggest that, in view of the fact of the diversity of opinion and the difficulty of getting all these colonies together and concluding an arrangement with all at once, it would be better policy to make an arrangement with, say, three of the largest groups, and then allow adherence to that arrangement by the other colonies and groups as they might wish to come in. Apparently it is their view that it would not be difficult to make an arrangement with British Guiana, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, these being the three—outside of Jamaica—of the most importance. Others could be allowed to adhere to the arrangement from time to time. And the commission suggest that, in the meantime, while a reasonable time is allowed for adherence, they be not deprived of their present entrance on a preferential basis into the Canadian market, that, as the Canadian market has afforded an uncompensated preference for a considerable length of time, it would not be a hardship for Canada, nor would it be difficult, to continue it for a period of time in order to give them an opportunity to acquiesce.

Jamaica, the commission put upon a different plane, and for sufficient reasons. The troubles that I have hinted at pretty well broke up the sugar trade in the island of Jamaica, and turned the attention of the people chiefly to fruits, in the cultivation of which they have made great progress, and a very large market for which they have in the United States of America. They have still the fear that Canada would not consume fruits to the extent of taking their whole production, and that they might incur the ill-will of the United States, and might invite reprisals if they were to form a preferential arrangement with this country. I think it is a pity that our government and the British government did not take efficient means to set this fear at rest. The commission touched that subject and argued inferentially that there are no grounds for any such fear that, as in the negotiations between the United States and Canada, objection was not made to the Canadian tariff because of preference granted either to Great Britain or to sister colonies, therefore, the United States has waived that objection and would not raise it in the case of new preferential arrangements entered into between ourselves and the West India Islands. That may be a fair inference, and time may prove it to be a correct inference; but it seems a thousand pities that, when these negotiations were going on, it was not settled once and for all with the United States of America that they would not press the claim—and, if pressed, it would not be reasonable to allow it—that arrangements which were made between the colonies within the empire, or between the

colonies and the mother country, should be liable to objection by the United States on the ground of compensating rights. However, that has not been authoritatively settled, and the only thing that remains is the inference I have referred to, an inference which, I am bound to admit, rests upon pretty substantial ground, but is not sufficient to take away the fear from the people of the West Indies who are in a position with reference to their production and our consumption, that our consumption, if they bound themselves up with a preferential treaty, would be insufficient to take their supply in whole or in larger part.

Another point that was brought out very clearly was the necessity for increased facilities of transport. The commission were very decided upon that, and the evidence that they took both in Canada and in the West Indies ran very strongly upon the inefficiency of the transport system in two respects, lack of punctuality and frequency of service. For instance, there is no strict schedule time upon which the present services, starting out from Canada, operate either going or coming and of course the disabilities connected with that are very marked and operate to the great disadvantage of Canadian trade, particularly when we recollect that the United States services are both shorter in distance and are managed with greater regularity and frequency. A man wishing to embark goods or to receive them from a Canadian ship cannot tell in advance when it will reach a particular island. This lack of punctuality operates strongly against the success of the service.

They wish a more frequent service and the proposition unanimously put forth by the commission is what is called the St. Vincent plan or some modification of it by which the services should be run outwards stopping at three or four of the principal island, and then on the return should call at all the various islands on that route. It is also proposed to have the voyages start so that the boats sailing from St. John fortnightly and the others sailing from Halifax fortnightly should run in alternate weeks which would make a weekly service instead of the present fortnightly service. It is recommended that in summer the service shall start from Montreal and Quebec. That, in brief, is the plan they recommend and it is gratifying to see that the British members of the commission were very heartily and very strongly in favour of the continuation of the co-operation by actual subsidy which is at present given by Great Britain and even suggested methods by which that co-operation could be made even stronger and more fruitful of effect. In connection with that they recommend that there be commission houses such as the United States dealers have and that is highly recommended also in the evidence of merchants and shippers at the various points where evidence was taken in Canada. The advantage of having storehouses or commission houses, so that collected consignments might be made, is of course apparent to every one and in the competition between two countries like the United States and ourselves, the lack of such accommodation for traders on our part would tell very strongly in favour of our competitors.

I wish in conclusion to drive home, if I can, the conclusions reached and to dwell for a moment upon the present favourable situation and to ask the question why we are not taking advantage of that situation and of the present favourable opinion. If I am not wrongly informed, every legislature of the West Indies, with the exception of Jamaica, have pronounced themselves in favour of preferential arrangements with the Dominion of Canada. There can be no doubt that we who have given the non-compensated preference for so long are in favour of its being continued and enlarged. After the labours of a commission which has placed its evidence and its recommendations so clearly and so completely before our country and the West Indies, after that preliminary work has been done and in the face of the present favourable situation and the favourable sentiment, it seems to me that more ought to be doing than so far as I can find out has been done or is being done in order to strike this iron while it is hot, and to have these arrangements made while both parties, and the situation are favourable thereto. I am not going to say that the government has done nothing, but so far as the newspaper prints go, so far as we can gather from any general lines of knowledge, so far as we have any information from the government itself since this report was tabled, nothing has been done, at least if anything has been done, nothing has up to the present time resulted, and nothing is apparent to the public mind.

This is not by any means a slight matter. In the first place, as between the West Indies and ourselves these are the permanent favourable conditions for reciprocity in trade. The West India Islands, on account of their geographical situation, is a country whose population need to-day, need next year and will need so long as they live, just the kind of products that we have to sell abroad. That, as everybody knows, is a splendid condition for reciprocal trade. For exchange we can take from them their tropical produce. That is something we can never raise, but will always want, and as our population increases our demand will increase year by year. It is a mistake to think that the West India Islands have reached the limit of their development. The opposite is the fact and under proper

stimulus there is tremendous development in store for the West India Islands themselves so that as our needs increase—and they will continually increase by leaps and bounds for tropical products—the stimulus of that demand will impel the people of the West Indies to greater production. So that, my first point is that here if anywhere in the wide world, Canada has a field open for herself to procure an arrangement by which true, real reciprocity can be carried on, by means of a preferential tariff, and it must be the only means which give us an advantage permanently in the market of the West Indies, and which gives the West Indies a preference, and an advantage permanently in the market that we afford to them. In both of these respects then the conditions are ideal for reciprocity.

Well, there is another reason. It was probably the milk of human kindness, the impulse of brotherhood, the desire to lend a helping hand to colonies in trouble at the time, that led the Dominion government to give an uncompensated preference, because these islands were a part of the British Empire, and because they were in that sense brethren of our own. Very well, do we remember the strong sentiment with regard to what I have stated. Here there is a collection of countries in regard to which we might, whilst we are doing good to ourselves and good to them also, help to develop and bind together the empire of which we form a part. Then, there is what seems to be so favourable in the situation, and so desirable as to result, added now to the fact that men's minds are turned towards it, and if all the conditions are so favourable it seems to me as almost throwing back the opportunity which has been thurst upon us for the development of our trade in this permanent and very advantageous way not to avail ourselves of it. The trade is not a small one. I have just totalled up the imports for 1909, with these different islands, and they amount to $46,000,000. Now, we must bear in mind that under the preference that would be a trade of $46,000,000, almost all of which could be supplied by Canada, and could be supplied under the preference in competition with any other country in the world, because it would be a competition which would be shielded by preference. It is a market which never varies in the way of an influx of home products coming to meet our exports because they do not, and can not raise the articles that they need, and which their climate makes it impossible for them to raise. Therefore, in this particular it is a very eligible market of $46,000,000 worth which could be easily developed in a few years of stimulating prosperity in the West Indies, until it ran up to $90,000,000 or $100,000,000. It is worth seeking for, it is worth bending a great deal of energy to get and maintain—a population of 2,000,000 at present with the chances for a growth of that population, all of them consumers of what we have to sell, and which, I cannot say it too often, they find it impossible to raise there. What do they need? They need fish, flour, lumber, boots and shoes, condensed milk, machinery, hardware and cutlery, soaps, and all the agricultural and animal products. These are the great bulk of the things that they consume. They give us just what we ourselves cannot raise, what we need, what we are consuming large quantities of, and what we will consume in increasing quantities as our population increases. I think I have made that plain enough to make it unnecessary to spend any more time upon it.

Now, comes my criticism, and it is that with this opportunity before us we undertake a compact with another country. How does that affect the situation as regards a preference with the West Indies? To my mind it cuts squarely across it. Incentive is one thing. If we raise more potatoes than we find a home market for we are impelled to seek foreign markets. After we have met the home market demands there is a pressure from within for a market outside to which to send these products. If we have opened, or do open a market to the south of us by means of which we get for fish, and for all those agricultural and animal products free entrance, the incentive which would press us forward in the line of forming a preferential arrangement with the West Indies is to that extent diminished. This is the side of it from the Canadian point of view. By weakening the desire it takes away a large part of the incentive, and there is consequent inaction in that respect. As to the other side of it, what have we done? The sugar trade is one of the largest and upon that the West Indies would base their largest desire for reciprocity. But there is another very large trade, which is becoming every year larger, and that is the fruit trade. There is the production of coffee, and of tropical fruits, but, confining myself to the fruit trade, what is the position in which we would be placed? It is that if we are to meet the two great wants and so get preference from the West Indies, it has to be with reference to their sugar and their fruits. Canada will be a very large consumer of tropical fruits, leaving out for the time being fruits of the temperate zone. The only way we can give a preference to the West India Islands in the matter of fruits is to have a general tariff against fruits with a lighter tariff on fruits coming from the West Indies, or with free fruit which is still better, from the West Indies. The United States itself is in part a tropical country, and it produces fruits in competition with the fruits of the West India Islands. To that ex-

tent we have put it out of our power, if we pass the agreement with the United States, to proffer on the matter of tropical fruits to the West Indies what would be their second greatest incentive to form a preferential arrangement with the Dominion of Canada. In those two respects you will find that the accomplishment of the proposed arrangement with the United States will be a bar, I think almost if not entirely insuperable, to our preference arrangements in the future with the West India Islands. I think it is a pity that an occasional market, with all its contingencies and uncertainties, should thus cut across the prospect of having a useful and a most profitable preferential arrangement between two parts of the empire in connection with our fellow colonists in the West India Islands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have brought this little digest, imperfect and not as comprehensive as I would like to have made it, to the attention of the House and of the country, I hope to a certain extent, for this reason, that it so often happens that the best knowledge we have is hidden away in the reports of commissions and of blue-books, and we do not get it, even when a commission is allowed to go on to the very end of its existence, and when its work is taken up as alone was contemplated when the commission began. But like ashes in the mouth is a commission, however able, whose findings, after it has done its work and done it well, are simply pigeon-holed and musted over by the passage of years, and result in nothing. It is the temptation of a government to allow that to be done, it is the glory of any government that will carry out to the end its commissions, properly conceived, and ably worked out, to the time the results are placed in their hands to take charge of and carry into effect. It was with that view that I ventured to trespass thus long in putting these facts upon 'Hansard,' and in bringing them to the ears of so many as have done me the honour of listening to me, and to add to that a plea, not only for consideration of businessmen, and boards of trade, and thinking men all through the country; and added to that, a plea for action on the part of the government itself, in order to bring advantage out of what I consider a most favourable position, and an opportunity which occurs only once in a long while. I want also to say that these blue-books are very good if they are read. Whilst I am on my feet I wish to make a suggestion to the government with reference to all these Dominion numbers. We have a secretariat, they are doing very good work, they will do better work in the future. Every once in a while they embody the result of their work in a blue-book, and I think the least the government can do, and they ought not to hesitate a moment, is not so much to reprint those, because that is not necessary, but to make an arrangement with the Secretary of State for the Colonies by which these numbers, when issued, shall also be issued to the Dominion in quantities sufficient at least for supplying the members of the two Houses, the boards of trade, and other public associations of that kind. I daresay the Colonial Office would do it without charge, but the charge is a mere bagatelle, and to prevent the duplication in printing, an arrangement ought to be made by which these when they come out—and some of them are treasure houses of information, they are filled as it were with the spirit of all the colonies and not simply devoted to the affairs of one; and so they give to the minds of those who read them, and furnish the understanding of those who are privileged to read them, with a fresh and current idea not only of what we are doing in the Dominion of Canada, but what other dominions outside of us are doing. There is a spirit in these Dominion numbers, and a retrospect of the affairs in brief of the great family to which we belong, which are very interesting. I cannot urge too strongly upon the government, if they have not done it already, the advisability of securing a reasonable number of the output of every number one of the Dominion Numbers which are now being published by the Colonial Departement under the new plan which has been arranged.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It is only with two or three sentences of my hon. friend's remarks near the close that I am unable to agree with him. I think he attaches undue importance to the effect of our reciprocity agreement with the United States upon our relations with the West Indies. I think it will be found on careful examination that, with the exception of a very small percentage of our trade, our business with the West Indies is not touched by the arrangement with the United States. The item fruit is of some importance, but I think hardly of as much as my hon. friend supposes. We have today the principal West India fruits, oranges, lemons, limes, shaddocks on our free list; and while the possibility of placing these on the dutiable list in the way of a discriminative tariff was discussed in the report, and suggested as a possibility, I do not think the West Indies themselves will attach great importance to it. The island of Jamaica was the only one who would attach great importance to that. I regret to say, however, that nothing we could do with relation to fruit or anything else is likely to win the approval of Jamaica to the project. My hon. friend is aware, from the general tenor of the report, that the feeling of Jamaica—where the commissioners were received with every possible courtesy and consideration—the feeling of the busi-

ness community was not well-disposed towards a reciprocal arrangement with Canada. Since the publication of this report the Governor of Jamaica has published a statement in which he has taken very decided ground against entering into any arrangement with Canada. So with respect to the principal island concerned in the fruit trade, I do not think there has been any change of opinion upon the part of Jamaica.

Passing from that, I have listened with great interest and pleasure to my hon. friend's remarks. He has given us a substantially accurate review of the history of the question of better trade relations with the West Indies from the year 1900 when he himself visited the islands, down to a very recent date. Several years before 1900, and a year or two before I entered office here, I had the pleasure of making a trip to these islands, and I heard then of the efforts my hon. friend had made a year or two before in order to interest the people in the subject. I realized then, as he realizes now, the many difficulties in the way. He is correct in stating that in later years conditions seem to have become more favourable. The island of Barbados passed a Bill for the purpose of granting preferential terms to Canada. In that Bill it was proposed to admit certain products of Canada into Barbados on preferential terms, but the list of those products was one that had never been agreed to by Canada. At all events, it was a list adopted by the government of Barbados at that time, and on further consideration, although it was a comprehensive list, we did not think it covered all that was desirable. Then they required that, as a condition of our receiving the measure of preference indicated by the Bill, we should give them not only the present liberal concession in the matter of sugar, but we should give them a further preference. It seemed that while they manifested by that Bill a very friendly disposition towards us, while they put their project into a precise form, it was quite impossible for us to do anything with it on the lines laid down, nor would it have been possible, even if the lines were satisfactory, to have made an arrangement with one colony only. In consequence of that the suggestion was made, in communication with the Imperial government, that the whole matter might become a subject of inquiry with a view of ascertaining whether a number of the West India Islands would unite for the purpose of making a friendly arrangement with Canada. The British government, readily acquiescing in that suggestion, appointed the commission to which my hon. friend has referred, headed by Lord Balfour of Burleigh as chairman, and the other members being Sir John Dickson-Poynder, now Lord Islington, Governor of New Zealand, Sir Daniel Morris, a gentleman well acquainted with the West Indies, the Minister of Customs and myself. I must not take to myself any large share of credit for what is in that report, because I was not able to give as much attention to the work of the commission as were some of my colleagues. I attended the meetings held in Canada and the final meeting in England; but I had not the pleasure of visiting the islands, which was the most interesting part of the inquiry. The outcome is the report which my hon. friend has been kind enough to speak of as a very full and able one.

Now, I come to speak of what is to be done in consequence of that report. My hon. friend has stated that all the islands, except Jamaica, have passed resolutions in favour of preferential trade with Canada. That may be correct, but I do not think it is correct as applied to events subsequent to the making of this report. The report was issued in the early autumn and was distributed to the various West India parliaments. We were asked by the Imperial government whether we were willing to have a conference with any of the colonies, to which we replied that if several of the colonies would indicate their willingness to approach the question by a conference, we would be quite ready to take it up, and, subject only to the demands of our parliamentary session, we would be very happy to arrange to meet our friends of the West Indies at such time and place as might be found most convenient to them. I think I am correct in stating that the only one of the West India colonies which has officially expressed a willingness to take up the negotiation is British Guiana. That does not mean that the other colonies have refused. It may be that on a matter of such importance they desire an opportunity for fuller investigation. At all events, I can assure my hon. friend that we appreciate the importance of the subject as fully as he does, and that whenever an opportunity occurs of holding a conference, as foreshadowed in the report of the commission, it will be both our pleasure and our duty to meet our friends from the West Indies to see if a satisfactory agreement can be reached. I agree entirely with him as to the importance of the matter, and that we should avail ourselves of that opportunity if it occurs; but he will see that when the various colonies have been invited to express their willingness to meet Canada in a conference, and when up to the present only one of them has so expressed itself, the moment has hardly arrived at which we can proceed. But whenever several of the larger colonies indicate their desire—because it would not be convenient to deal with a group of the smaller ones—to dis-

cuss the subject, we shall feel it our duty to meet them.

Mr. FOSTER. British Guiana is very important.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree with my hon. friend. British Guiana, with Trinidad and Barbados would represent a very powerful organization, and I am not without hope that that may come about at no distant date. I may say that in all our negotiations with the representatives of the West Indies, we have found that the great question was the sugar question. Other questions, relating to coffee, spices, fruits and so on, have their value, but the sugar interest is the one of greatest value to the West Indies, and it represents such a large percentage of our imports from the West Indies, that so long as we are able to give a substantial preference on sugar, we have a very strong lever to negotiate with.

I wish to say a word or two on the steamship question. We desire to have an improved steamship service. My hon. friend has indicated some of the objections taken to the old service, in some cases that it was slow, in other cases that the passenger accommodation was not as good as it should be, in other cases that there was a lack of punctuality, regularity, and so on. We all appreciated that, and desired to have a better service. While we were considering the matter along these lines, a very interesting incident occurred which gave us a new subject for thought. There is an existing service from Halifax and St. John to Demerara, touching at a number of the islands. This service is aided by the Dominion government and by the Imperial government, each government paying one-half. We were desirous that that service should be enlarged and improved, and while we were considering the matter along these lines we discovered that the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, of Great Britain, which had a contract for carrying the mails from Great Britain direct to the West Indies, had become dissatisfied with its arrangement with the Imperial government, and had given notice to terminate the contract. That led us to enter into communication with the British government on the subject. The British Post Office Department were deeply interested in that contract, and when they found that they were likely to lose the direct service from Great Britain to the principal West India Islands, they turned to us and said: You are trying to make arrangements for an improved service from Canada to the West Indies; if you make your service better and faster, we will help you, and we will send our mails to the West Indies by way of Canada. So we had the inducement of the co-operation of the Imperial government, and we felt that, in addition to what was already granted by the Imperial government, the British Post Office Department would throw into the scale the sum contributed to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company for carrying the mails, and we could possibly establish a direct service to the West Indies, which, in conjunction with the fairly fast service which we have across the Atlantic, would give us a satisfactory service to the West Indies, and give the British government a fairly satisfactory mail service. The report of the commission refers to that in a general way; but apart from that, the Canadian ministers spent some time in negotiating with the British post office authorities with the view of bringing about that desirable scheme; and when I left England last autumn we had an understanding with the British government that they would have a fast service betwen Great Britain, Canada and the West Indies established on the lines suggested.

That was the situation when I left England in the autumn and for some little time afterwards. Quite an agitation, however, arose in the West Indies against breaking away from the old direct service, and the impression prevailed there that we had something to do with the termination of that contract. What occurred actually was this. The company gave notice that it could not longer engage in the service, from Great Britain to the West Indies, and the British post office people suggested that we should work together and establish a service which would be imperial But the moment it became known that there was a probability of the contract service between Great Britain and the West Indies ceasing, there was a strong agitation in these islands to do something to prevent the change, and in some instances the West India colonies agreed to contribute to the British government a sum which would help to re-establish the direct service. Consequently when we were hoping for the co-operation of the British government to help us, we discovered that, in consequence of this agitation in the West Indies and their contributions, the British government decided to make a new contract with the Royal Mail Packet Company, and we were left to make our own arrangements as before. We received notification from the British government explaining the circumstances and their inability to go on with the scheme according to the understanding we had in England. The explanation they gave was that owing to the strong objections made in the West India Islands to the termination of the contract, and to the willingness of these islands to contribute to a direct service, they found themselves unable to carry out the arrangement they had contemplated making with us. Then they reminded us that as Great Britain

had no direct interest in the Canadian service, we need not expect any contribution from the imperial government towards it.

As to what effect that may have on our policy regarding the West Indian service, I am not prepared to say. I regret that the Imperial government have taken the step they did, but under the circumstances we can not blame them for having done so. We are still anxious to have a better service than we now have with the West India Islands; but in view of the change of attitude on the part of the British government, we have to consider whether we can appropriate an additional sum to secure that service, and also to ascertain whether the West India colonies themselves will be willing to contribute something to attain that object. I quite agree as to the desirability of an improvement, and trust that in some way or other we shall be able to have a more efficient service and that, although we shall not be able to have as fast a line as we contemplated, had we secured the assistance of the British government, we still may have a better service in every point of view than the existing one. I agree with my hon. friend in what he has said regarding the advisability of our having improved steam communication, and it will be the duty of this government to take the matter up and do what we can in that respect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long does the present contract last?

Mr. FIELDING. It had expired and was carried over a year pending the report of the commission. We suggested carrying it over another year, but the British government are not willing. I do not know that we have had the last word, but that is the position of the matter at present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We are all very much indebted to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) for having brought this matter to the attention of the House. I should regret very much if the steamship service between Canada and the West Indies were not improved in the early future. It is very desirable that we should keep in the closest touch with these islands and use every endeavour to increase our trade with them. If there be any country in the world with which we might, to the advantage of both parties, enter into a commercial arrangement, it seems to me that that country is the West India Islands. We produce exactly what the British West India Islands must purchase, and these islands produce the things which we cannot grow in this country and must import.

I had hoped, from my brief acquaintance with the matters dealt with by this commission, that there would have been a more favourable outcome than seems to be anticipated by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. And I desire to express the hope now that although that favourable outcome may not be realizable apparently in the early future, it still may be brought about. There is hardly a province in Canada which does not produce many of the articles required by the British West Indies. In Nova Scotia we have the fish, in other provinces the breadstuffs and in others manufactures of many kinds, so that every province of Canada is interested in closer commercial relations between this country and the British West Indies. Whatever policy the government may put forward for the encouragement of those closer commercial relations, provided it be a reasonable and sane policy, I certainly will be prepared to support.

Railways and canals—chargeable to capital—canals, Quebec—new tug, $6,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. These tugs are for the handling of our dredging fleet. We want to put a larger tug on this canal and to transfer to the Chambly canal one of the smaller ones that we have.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the department do this work of dredging, concreting, &c., on the canals by contract, or in what way?

Mr. GRAHAM. Large works, such as those we were talking about last night, are done by contract after tenders publicly called for. But small works of dredging we do ourselves.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is the tug purchased?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is purchased by tender.

Mr. FOSTER. How are tenders advertised for?

Mr. GRAHAM. The establishments that can turn out a vessel of this kind are limited in number. We ask the various builders to send in tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to plead with the minister (Mr. Graham) not to fall too far from grace. Starting out a year or two ago, he promised, with reference to the Intercolonial, that there would be no political favouritism in the distribution of his advertising. A very worthy citizen of this Dominion occupies some months of his time in the summer down near a station on the Intercolonial, and as he is averse to buying Grit newspapers, he never can tell when a train is coming or going, for the time table is not advertised in his own party newspaper. It is a special grievance to him which he has not heretofore voiced, but which, some of these days, he may voice. The practice followed seems to be against the principle that the minister started out with and in which I applauded him. There is no reason why, in regard to the country's railway, a newspaper which stands for the Liberal-Conservative party

in so important a place as St. John, N.B., should not have the time table; no reason why the minister should compel us to pay two cents extra to get the news and have it go into such detestable quarters.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know about the time table, but I know that a great deal of special advertising of excursions, &c., is put in some Conservative papers.

Mr. DANIEL. It may appear in the Halifax 'Herald', but not in the St. John 'Standard'—even advertisements of excursions which are supposed to reach the community at large. I brought the matter up two or three years ago, and the minister stated there was every reason why this advertising should be general, and he would see that it was done.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no definite information as to the particular paper to which my hon. friend refers, but I know that I have seen the advertisement in some of the other papers.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the same policy prevail in the advertising of the Intercolonial in Ontario?

Mr. GRAHAM. In Ontario—I suppose I should not say 'I regret'—the board saw fit to discontinue a large amount of advertising in the smaller papers. If I remember correctly, we now advertise only in the 'Globe,' the 'Star,' and the 'World' in Toronto, and in no papers outside that city. We have an office in Toronto.

Mr. BLAIN. And the 'Mail and Empire'—how will it be able to reach the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure about that.

Mr. DANIEL. What horse-power is this tug to be?

Mr. GRAHAM. About 100 horse-power.

Soulanges—mooring posts, $3,400.

Mr. GRAHAM. About thirty of these posts are to be placed. The work will be done by our own staff, and the amount of this vote is expected to cover the cost.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Where are the posts made?

Mr. GRAHAM. We buy them under contract after public competition.

Soulanges—new machinery, $1,150.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to buy an electrically-driven force pump, and engine and boiler, &c., for a new gate-lifter.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you buy directly from the makers?

Mr. GRAHAM. Where possible. This question has arisen lately in that connection. The makers of much of the material we want have their sales agents, and often they will not give prices, but refer us to their agents. Of course, that is perfectly legitimate. If a man has charge of a territory, he has a right to sell the goods that are sold in that territory.

Mr. FOSTER. That often occurs in certain classes of articles. But a department like that of Railways and Canals must buy a great deal of what may be called standard articles. For the purchase of that kind of standard articles which are always needed, the government should have an arrangement with the makers that would leave the government perfectly free with reference to what you might call occasional articles.

Mr. GRAHAM. We invariably communicate with the manufacturers themselves and with the various sales agents. In several instances the sales agents gave us a lower price than the manufacturers, explaining that they divided their commission with us. In some cases the manufacturers and sales agents quarrelled because the agent really gave a lower price than the manufacturers quoted to us.

Protection works, upper entrance, $100,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This work will take about two years to complete. Since the opening of the Soulanges canal the marine men have complained of the difficulty of making the entrance to the upper gates on account of the storms that often prevail on the lake. They discussed with us methods of obviating that difficulty. One was to remove the locks further down from the entrance to the canal. The other was to extend out the pier on the south side. I suppose we will extend it out 1,200 feet. After discussing it with the department the Marine Association have agreed to this proposition as laid down here as the better way to obviate the difficulty. If that does not serve a short breakwater will be run north and south a little further west which will overcome any little difficulty. It will cost about $205,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the traffic through the Soulanges canal increasing as compared with some previous years?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has increased. Last year the tonnage passing through the canal was 1,727,564 tons.

Stopping leaks and trimming slopes, $150,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Soulanges canal is constructed through very treacherous soil. Leaks have been constantly feared and on the outside of the banks the signs have been very plain that the water has been trickling through. The department undertook to build a sloped wall made of concrete at an angle of 45 degrees. We are

first protecting the points that appear most dangerous. The vessel owners tell me that with these banks they feel safe in making better speed through the canal but the main object is to prevent the breaking away of the bank. An examination of the outside of the bank shows that where we have done this work the small leaks are stopped.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that have to be done the whole length of the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are parts that do not appear to be dangerous and for the present we are doing only the parts on the south bank where it seems risky to leave it undone. It costs about $31 per lineal foot. The concrete is about 3 feet deep at the bottom and 2 at the top. It extends, of course, to the depth of the water in the canal, about 14 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. It is difficult to tell just what this work is costing. Is it done by day's work or contract? If this is built all of concrete it will cost more than if a good deal of stone were mixed with the concrete.

Mr. GRAHAM. This costs approximately $8 per cubic yard.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it done by contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is done by contract let to the lowest tenderer. There was only one tenderer, I believe, for this work.

Mr. SPROULE. In the specifications does it stipulate what and how much stone shall be used and the strength of the cement?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, we have a regular standard specification governing all that kind of work. We have spent on the work about $85,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The contractor gets a very good price for it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The minister had better advertise again for tenders if he is paying $8 per square yard, because any person who is acquainted with concrete work knows that a great deal of it is broken stone. There is very little cement in it. The mould is filled up, a foot or two at a time, with broken stone and the cement is mixed and poured on top of the stone. We have a lot of that down with our concrete dams at Gananoque, and I know that it does not cost any such money as that.

Mr. GRAHAM. This requires a special plant for depositing the concrete under water. The contractors informed me that they needed a special plant costing about $40,000 to handle this work which would not be required to handle it above water.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). There is no difficulty in doing the work under water. They simply use a coffer dam and fill it in from the top. There is no machinery needed at all. We are doing this work under water all the time at Gananoque.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, it took months of experimenting before they could get the special machinery to enable them to do this work under water. We find that the proper way to get these things done is to advertise for tenders, and get the best offer. Then, getting the best offer, we let the contract.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). We simply make a water-tight box, sink it and fill it.

Mr. BLAIN. What firm has this contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. Messers. Haney, Quinlan and Robertson.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How many tenders were received?

Mr. GRAHAM. Two.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You said one a moment ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. Two were received originally, but a change had to be made in the specification, and only one was finally received.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It looks like a job.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no job about it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It certainly is a job if you are paying $31 per lineal foot.

Mr. GRAHAM. We asked for tenders on a specification which was not quite clear. We revised the specification and received but one tender, Messrs. Morseen & Co. refusing to tender under the new specification. Therefore, the tender of Messrs. Haney, Quinlan and Robertson was accepted.

Mr. BLAIN. How did you advertise?

Mr. GRAHAM. In the public press.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In how many papers?

Mr. GRAHAM. About 15.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It looks something like the dredging contracts when a fellow was bought off who had a share in the lucky company.

Mr. GRAHAM. There was nothing of that kind in this.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It looks like it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are these advertisements published only in the local Liberal newspapers? Can you tell me the names of the newspapers in which you advertised?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I could not tell that, but we advertised in Montreal, Toronto, and Ottawa, the centres where large contractors are.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the minister if there has been any change in the policy with regard to advertising of tenders. I hesitate to bring it up year after year, but I notice my hon. friend is changing his policy with regard to a few things.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at all.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose my hon. friend thinks he and his department are getting better. May I ask what is the policy of my hon. friend with regard to advertising works of this kind in the public newspapers. Does my hon. friend allow advertisements of this kind to go into newspapers other than those which are supporting the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would rather be anything else than hypocritical. We have party government in the Dominion, and if my hon. friend were in my place he would put the advertisements, everything being equal, in his own friend's newspapers.

Mr. BLAIN. How does my hon. friend know that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I judge that from his usual conduct. It has been the custom of all governments in Canada, and will continue to be. Everything being equal, we have a slight cant towards Biddy.

Mr. REID (Grenville). For how long a period were these advertisements inserted in the papers?

Mr. GRAHAM. About four weeks.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says that, everything being equal, he selects his own party organs. In many cases there is a great inequality. A newspaper may have a circulation of 500, while another newspaper published in the same town may have a circulation of 1,500; my hon. friend selects the paper with a circulation of 500 because it happens to be a supporter of the government and overlooks the paper having a circulation of 1,500. All things are not equal there and it is because they are not equal that we offer this criticism. I compliment my hon. friend on one thing; he is very frank, and being so frank, I suppose we need not press it further. His frankness will indicate to the members of the committee that he is putting all these advertisements in papers supporting his own government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). May I ask if this advertisement is inserted in the Canada 'Gazette' as well?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I do not think we ever do that. It is a matter of record if you want to conceal an advertisement put it in the Canada 'Gazette.'

Mr. REID (Grenville). I take issue with the hon. gentleman in that regard, I advocated in this House a few years ago that all advertisements should be inserted in the Canada 'Gazette.' Then all contractors throughout the Dominion could subscribe to the Canada 'Gazette' and they would know everything that was being offered for competition, because they would see it in this official organ. There is the contract at Soulanges that the minister speaks of; there might be men in St. Catharines who might not be taking the Toronto 'Globe' and the result would be that they would never know anything about this until the contract had been let. It would be in the interest of the public if it were generally known that all advertisements would be inserted in the official government organ, and then publish them in the newspapers as well. I cannot see why that should be objected to and why the several departments have refused to insert these advertisements in that publication. It looks to me that by inserting these advertisements only in government newspapers they desire to give a preference to those who are supporting the government, and who get these contracts for the reason that others who are not supporting the government may not be taking these government newspapers. What objection would there be to inserting all the advertisements in the Canada 'Gazette' issued by this government, and in the other papers as well?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not see any objection to it whatever, it is well worth considering. We would have to take some other means of notifying the public, because people do not usually see the 'Canada Gazette.' But if it were known that these advertisements were to be published in the 'Canada Gazette' it might make a difference.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I mean in addition to the newspapers.

Mr. GRAHAM. If it were known that advertisements of this kind were put in the 'Canada Gazette,' contractors might look into it.

Mr. HUGHES. Can the minister recall an instance in history where an advertisement in a newspaper in connection with these contracts ever brought a tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. My experience is that the contractors are on hand all the time, and they know almost before you know yourself where work is going to be done. They are on the go all the time.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). There were not many of them on the go for this work.

Mr. GRAHAM. There were not many equipped for this work.

Mr. FOSTER. May be the minister would think it important enough to inquire into that. He would be perhaps surprised and humiliated if it turned out some of these days that a plan had been arranged on him.

Mr. GRAHAM. I discussed the matter with several people including contractors, and I was informed that practically those were the only people that had a plant for it, and that is the reason we did not get more bids for this work. In reply to my hon. friend just now—there is an increase in 1908 of 154,765 tons.

St. Ours' lock—electrical equipment, $2,500; movable dam, $13,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to provide for operating the gates. We have made an arrangement with the Sorel Electric Light Power Company for lighting the canal and operating the gates. We pay $50 per horse-power.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is altogether too much. The minister knows that in any part of Canada you can get horse-power for from $15 to $25. In the city of Kingston to-day they are offering it at $25, brought all the way from Trenton. In Montreal it is being offered for $15 and so on. In the city of Sorel they are selling horse-power at $15 to $20. $50 per horse-power at this time in the history of Canada is an outrage. This electric power comes from Shawenegan, only a few miles away, which also furnishes electric power to the city of Montreal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am surprised at my hon. friend's statement. If my hon. friend will look through Ontario, he will find that some of the users of small amounts of horse-power have to pay $50. As a matter of fact, this horse-power, all told, is only 12, and they build a transmission line ten miles and bring it to us. There are four gates, with a three horse-power motor in each gate. I doubt if the hon. gentleman can find a single instance in Ontario or in Canada where so small an amount of power is furnished under similar conditions for less than $50. My hon. friend talks about Montreal, but he knows that Montreal takes a vast amount. He knows that in every town which wants to get the cheapest power, the price is based on the guaranteed number of horse-power the municipality will take, and if they do not take a certain amount they do not get the low price. In comparison even with what has been offered to Brockville by the Hydro-Electric, considering the quantity, this is dirt cheap.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds).

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister any data as to prices paid for electrical power under similar conditions in other towns in the same locality?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot answer that question directly. We are dealing with the Sorel Electric Light Company. In making an arrangement with them our engineers in charge assured me that it is a fair price, in consideration of all the charges that were being made in that vicinity.

Mr. HUGHES. It is $17 in the town of Lindsay, a larger town than Sorel.

Mr. GRAHAM. But remember that this is ten miles away, and they build us the line, and only supply us with twelve horse-power.

Mr. SPROULE. How long do you agree to take this horse-power?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the contract is for five years.

Mr. SPROULE. Having regard to the fact that this is a small quantity, of course that would increase the price.

Mr. GRAHAM. Above the St. Ours dam the channel is very narrow and shallow, and we wanted to put a movable dam on top of the present dam, to conserve the water so that we can take it off when we need it.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the traffic through St. Ours?

Mr. GRAHAM. In 1909 we had 494 vessels passing up, and 497 passing down. In 1910 the number had decreased to 418 and 368.

Mr. FOSTER. What river is it on?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is in the Richelieu river and is only about one-eighth of a mile long.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the fall there?

Mr. GRAHAM. Six or eight feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was it not possible to have a little power of your own which would open and shut the locks and furnish light, without going to the expense of bringing the transmission line there?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would hardly pay us to go to the expense of developing the power there for that purpose.

Mr. BRODER. What is being done about the electric power on the Williamsburg canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. That matter has been discussed with Mr. Beach, who was anxious to erect a transmission line, and who proposed to make some contracts in which

the lighting of the canals would be included. I said that I was ready to discuss the question if he could make contracts say with Brockville and Prescott as well.

Sault Ste. Marie canal—extending north mooring pier at upper entrance, $32,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to enable at least two more vessels to be tied up at the western entrance.

Mr. BOYCE. How far are you going to extend it?

Mr. GRAHAM. 300 or 400 feet of new pier.

Mr. BOYCE. I have written to the minister several times about a man named Ericson who was injured there, and who is now helpless and unable to work. It is a case of great urgency and misfortune, and I would ask the minister to give it the consideration it deserves, and as quickly as possible.

Mr. GRAHAM. The department has been considering that case and has decided to do something, but I cannot give the particulars at present.

Mr. BOYCE. Will this work of extending the piers be commenced at once?

Mr. GRAHAM. As soon as navigation opens.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Welland canal—Port Colborne Improvements, $189,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Have you any intention of going on with the improvement of the Welland this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. The question of the Welland canal as well as the Georgian Bay canal is occupying the attention of the government very seriously. I have no item in any of these votes for the enlargement or construction of the new Welland canal. The situation is this. The engineering staff has been at work some time looking over the different routes and possibilities. There were two routes investigated, each of which would use a portion of the present Welland canal. Then there is a third route which would tap Lake Erie from three or four miles west of Port Colborne, and come out on Lake Ontario at what is called Jordan harbour. This would be altogether a new canal. It would look at first blush and it may turn out to be the case that it would possibly be better to utilize a portion of the present canal. The engineers found along this route a quantity of quicksand which has almost frightened them from it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is that the Jordan route?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, the Jordan route is a new one. Whether the quicksand is an insurmountable difficulty, I would not like to say at present. The engineers have made a thorough survey and borings on what I have described as the Jordan route. It is possible to construct on this route, but it will include something that may startle the ordinary individual. The idea in the minds of the engineering staff at present would be, if that route were adopted, to do away with all but two lifts. This would mean a lift at each place of over 150 feet. Mr. Weller and the chief engineers say that is practicable. At first thought, as a layman, I hesitated to believe it was, but I am assured that from an engineering standpoint it is. However, before it is adopted we will make a closer investigation, and get the best advice possible.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the height of the lift lock at Peterborough?

Mr. GRAHAM. Sixty-five feet. There would be a great saving in time in getting through the Welland canal if we had just two lifts instead of 26 or 27 locks.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How would the cost compare?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be a trifle less than using the flight of locks. The suggestion first was to use six or seven ordinary locks, but it was just as practicable to use the two and make two enormous lifts and complete the entire lift with these two locks.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the engineers completed their survey?

Mr. GRAHAM. They have and this is their judgment; but I would not like to say positively that a decision has been arrived at until I would call in one of the best men I could get on the continent to consult with my chief engineer, and my chief engineer would want that done.

Mr. SEALEY. Has the department any report on the Selkirk route where there is supposed to be no quicksand to overcome?

Mr. GRAHAM. The information we have is that, owing to the height of land, it is an impracticable route.

Mr. SEALEY. Was that arrived at by survey or casual observation?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not by actual survey, but by observation of the country. The difficulties are so great that there was no need to make a survey. The new canal by the Jordan route, if carried out, would be built with a view to deepening to thirty feet. The locks would be made of that depth and the canal of 25 feet, so that, if

we needed the additional five feet, there would only be the expense of dredging out the canal. The details in connection with this matter are under consideration of the government, and it may be possible, before the House rises, that we shall have something else to present, but I am not asking for anything now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the minister intend to get this expert advice?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not important enough?

Mr. GRAHAM. One difficulty is that I have not enough money.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Finance Minister will furnish the money.

Mr. GRAHAM. He can't do it without a vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. We can vote it, then.

Mr. GRAHAM. My idea is, before we proceed, to thoroughly investigate the other two routes also, for any person can see the advantage of using part of the old canal, if practical. A new route would be decided upon only if the other were found impracticable.

Mr. LENNOX. But the old canal will be used for some purposes, even if the new route were selected, would it not?

Mr. GRAHAM. We would have to keep the old canal open as far as Welland. There are many industries on that canal that will have to be served by it. Then, as to Port Colborne harbour, we would have to proceed with the work for which I am asking money now to make that harbour a little better. We built an elevator at Port Colborne, and last year that elevator paid running expenses and $2,000 besides. The cost of handling the grain, I think, was nine-sixteenths cents per bushel, and we handled something over 3,000,000 bushels. Of that quantity, 1,700,000 was distributed from that elevator by train, a good deal of it going to points in Ontario. So, for the convenience of western Ontario millers and their trade, that elevator would have to be continued, and we would have to maintain the harbour there. It would be an advantage also to the local traffic and the local industries. I was surprised at the elevator coming out a little ahead. It is the first year it has done so.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the minister allowing anything for the cost of the elevator?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, merely operating expenses. We try to keep the rate low.

Mr. LENNOX. That is rather valuable information as bearing on the western elevators—it shows that we could operate these probably without great loss.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Do you charge the same rate as other elevators?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure what the others charge; we charge three-fourths of a cent.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think they charge one-half cent in and one-half cent out.

Mr. SPROULE. Three million bushels was a very small quantity for such an elevator to handle, was it not?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, we could handle much more.

Mr. STAPLES. What did the elevator cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. It cost $1,100,000, I think.

Mr. STAPLES. What is its capacity?

Mr. GRAHAM. Eight hundred thousand bushels, with the foundations in for enlargement to two millions. The vote we have now under consideration is really for the completion of the work we have been doing there. We wish to extend the dock at the elevator, and place electric light and power works along the western pier. We will have the work done by contract. The expenditure on improvements at Port Colborne altogether have been $1,118,806, not including the elevator.

Mr. SPROULE. Considering the size of vessels on the lakes, does the minister think it necessary to give the canal a depth of more than 25 feet?

Mr. GRAHAM. The harbours at Duluth, Fort William and Port Arthur are made to accommodate vessels of 25 feet draught, and the main channel is being made 25 feet. The difference in cost between deepening the canal from 22 feet to 25 feet will be comparatively light.

Mr. SPROULE. But I understood the minister to speak of a depth of 30 feet. What I asked was, as there are very few vessels on the upper lakes drawing more than 25 feet, and very few harbours into which vessels can go that draw more than that depth, it would seem unnecessary to make the canal more than 25 feet deep.

Mr. GRAHAM. A very material part of the expense in enlarging the canal is in making the locks. While we are at the work it probably would be cheaper to provide locks of a depth of 30 feet, even though the canal is only 25 feet. Then, when the time comes to deepen the canal to 30 feet, all that will be necessary is to dredge the canal to the depth. One of the great items of expense in deepening the

Erie canal, for instance, is in putting in new locks, all along the route.

Mr. DANIEL. How wide will the new canal be?

Mr. GRAHAM. Two hundred feet.

Mr. McCALL (Norfolk). I regret that I did not hear the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) on this general question. What I have to say is not in way of criticism, but rather to give—I would hardly say information, but the result of my own observation in regard to the Welland canal. I worked on the canal in the former enlargement. It occurs to me that this country ought to be in a position to declare a definite policy on the question of its canal transportation, that we ought not to have a Welland canal enlargement simply, without an enlargement of all the other canals leading to tide water. An enlargement of the Welland canal would divert business to Oswego, to the enlarged Erie canal of 2.000 tons capacity. An enlarged system the whole way to tide water would certainly hold our through traffic and we ought to gain by it.

I heard the minister's remarks in regard to a possible 25 foot draft. I am bound to say that 25 feet is an impossibility in practice; it is not an absolute impossibility, but it will involve an expenditure beyond our resources. I think that 20 feet is now the maximum depth of all the water courses from the head of the lakes to the foot of Lake Erie. A 20 foot draught passes a 10,000 ton vessel. The obstacles are the St. Mary's river, the St. Clair Flats, the outlet of the Detroit river and every harbour upon the lake would have to be enlarged to meet the maximum draught of all these points. I think I am safe in saying that 18 feet is nearer the greatest draught of any vessel now plying upon the lakes. The ocean vessel of large capacity is an impossibility on the lakes by reason of her construction. Any one who is familiar with naval architecture is aware that the ocean vessel is moulded sharp and deep to hold her course in the sea against an adverse wind that would tend to blow her out of her course. The lake vessel is flat bottomed, with a full bow and stern. She holds her way in the water by her displacement. Therefore, I think I am safe in saying that we will not see the ocean vessel on our lakes, nor will we see the lake vessel making the trip across the ocean. In my earlier business days I remember one little Swedish brig, such a brig as I presume Columbus navigated the ocean in. She came to Milwaukee once a year with a cargo of gin, 600 tons. It was a great wonder to the shipping people in those days. At one time the experiment was made of sending lake craft across the ocean. About the time of the first enlargement of the Welland canal two vessels drawing 14 feet went to the old country, one with a cargo of lumber and one with a cargo of staves. These vessels were found wholly unfit for the ocean voyage for the reason I gave that they were flat-bottomed with centre boards and could not hold up against the winds.

It would seem the part of wisdom before we engaged in any large expenditure to get the opinion of a naval constructor to see if it is possible that a steamship of 5,000 tons capacity can be built sufficiently strong to stand the ocean voyage and with a draught that will enable her to navigate the lakes and the various harbours on the lakes. Twenty feet is possible. We will find 20 feet depth hard to maintain in all the channels I have named, that is the St. Mary's river, the St. Clair Flats, the lower Detroit river and the harbours through which our traffic must come. I assure the minister he will find the task of securing 20 feet depth outside of Port Colborne harbour over a sufficient area to allow a vessel to come in with safety very costly. In fact 20 feet is not sufficient, because the action of the waves would cause a falling and rising of the vessel which would require 24 feet depth of water. There is an immense area of rock outside of Port Colborne harbour that would have to be dredged over a wide space. If we could settle down to 20 feet depth in the Welland and the Lower St. Lawrence canals, so as to have a continuous passage of 20 feet we would have accomplished a great work. I will make a guess, which the minister may take for what it is worth, that every foot depth which would add to our present 14 feet on our canal system will cost pretty nearly $10,000,000. If you increase the depth from 14 feet to 20 feet, that is 6 feet, it will take $60,000,000. So when you talk of 22 or 25 feet I think you are talking of a physical impossibility. There is the question which came up this afternoon of leaks on these embankments, the enormous amount of water that must be held in retaining walls that may develop faults. I would be glad to hear if the minister had thought out a scheme that would cover our whole canal system. I am speaking of the canals connecting the lakes with a view to maintaining our through trade on the assumption that there will be some interprovincial trade in this country in the years to come. We will try to save enough to keep the canals going at least part of the season.

I think our great object in dealing with our watercourses is to prevent the diversion of our trade at certain points. There is a diversion at Buffalo which is hard to account for. It is difficult to see why we

should send wheat through the Erie canal system when we claim to have the cheapest route, but it must be remembered that occasionally a steamship must have outward freight, and will take it at the bare cost of handling or a fraction over. Formerly they would take it for ballast, but in these later days they use water for ballast and the necessity for carrying cargo as ballast is not so great. Agents of these steamship lines could cable to shippers all along the lakes and have a cargo ready which they could carry at rates which none of our vessels could compete with. We must face that condition. Not only have we to face the Erie canal system, but the six or seven lines of double or four track railways from the foot of Lake Erie across to New York harbour carrying 2,500 and 3,000 tons of freight in one train. Those trains are dispatched every 15 minutes, and a train of that kind will be transported from Buffalo to New York harbour, while the canal boat would be getting to Rochester and making the first lockage, and while our vessel navigating our own canal would be still hanging around at the foot of the Welland canal. We have to face that and it requires bigger schemes than we have heard announced in this country; if we are to save our freight for our own vessels, we should do still more. I venture to say that the records of the traffic of the Welland canal will show that in the earliest days of the canals a considerable quantity of American produce, chiefly corn from Chicago and Duluth, passed through that canal. I do not believe the traffic of the Welland canal has increased in the 20 odd years since the enlargement in the same proportion as on any other trade route we have. At the same time we have the property, it is a part of our system of transportation. We have taken a great deal of pride in that system. The history of the Welland canal shows as many other things we have undertaken in this country show, an heroic effort on the part of a few people with small means to build a highway and make it in some sense national. We have gone on in that way. We control the natural outlet to this enormous chain of lakes draining the traffic of ten or eleven of the largest states of the Union and also draining the traffic of our own northwest. The outlet to the ocean follows a natural route without lines of resistance. We simply require to construct a canal so that traffic in sufficient volume may profitably be engaged in. I offer these suggestions and I trust that I have contributed a little to the discussion of the subject. If at any time I can do so I will be only too glad to do my part in furthering this great project. I repeat what I said earlier that this government should have an altogether comprehensive scheme. There is no immediate hurry, the canal is not getting away from us and the traffic is not getting away from us, so that we need not be in too great haste. Let us get all the information, let us get all the figures, and then submit a plan to the House for its consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am very glad, and I am sure the committee will be, that we have had the opportunity of listening to the practical remarks of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. McCall). Those are the kind of remarks that help to the practical solution of these difficulties. I do not agree with him as to losing our traffic at Oswego. I have paid some attention to that question recently and I convinced myself that that danger does not exist practically. As far as I can ascertain the very greatest depth that is practicable from the expense standpoint for a canal leading from Oswego will be 14 feet. The number of days time to get to New York and back is much in excess of the number that it would take to get a cargo to Montreal and so, I think, the Canadian route cannot help but take the traffic. This, to my mind, is important, and I think it accounts in a way for Buffalo getting a large portion of our traffic although we have the better facilities at the present time in so far as the canals are concerned. Up to recent years the St. Lawrence route has, rightly or wrongly, not been considered as safe as it possibly might be and insurance rates have been high. That has been one difficulty. A vast amount of money has been expended upon it, and more will be expended to get a proper and safe depth to Montreal as well as to light the channel thoroughly. In discussing this matter with men who have a more intimate knowledge with it than I have, they have said that insurance rates will be further greatly reduced. In fact at the present time the only great difference is early and late in the season. Then, up to recently, we have not had the facilities at Montreal to handle the traffic that should be poured in there and as a result Buffalo, having the greater advantage, and New York being ready for quick shipment, the Canadian route was at a disadvantage. Under conditions that ought to exist in the future, with enlarged accommodation at ocean ports, and I speak of Montreal as an ocean port, the very enormous expenditure that will be entailed in providing these facilities at New York will tend, I believe, to the advantage of the Montreal route where the facilities can be improved at much less cost.

The other question arises of which my hon. friend speaks, and I desire to place before the committee a view that has been placed before me by men engaged in ship-

ping. They tell me that for practical purposes grain can be carried as cheaply and transhipped at the foot of Lake Ontario as if a larger vessel occupied its time going through the canal system to Montreal and return; in other words, that if the Welland canal were deepened to accommodate the largest and deepest draught vessels the cargo could be taken to Prescott or Kingston at the foot of the Lake, transhipped, into barges taken down through our present canals and the rate would not be any higher, and possibly not as high as if we enlarged these canals and occupied larger and more expensive vessels for a greater length of time going at a slow rate, to say nothing of the dangers that attend large vessels being canaled for long distances. We had this year a rate of 3½ cents, but that was owing to return cargoes which actually were taken at a very small rate.

Mr. SPROULE. That was from Fort William to Montreal?

Mr. GRAHAM. From Fort William to Montreal. But with the Welland canal enlarged, as it has been represented to be by Mr. Richardson of Kingston and several other members of the Marine Association, they believe that a rate could be maintained from Fort William, Port Arthur, or Duluth, to Montreal at a profit to the vessel owners of 3½ cents per bushel. If that would work out it strikes me that the American route could not hope to compete with that rate. If I remember rightly the rate via rail from Buffalo to New York is from 4½ to 6 cents per bushel. The Erie canal, when reconstructed, will only be I think, from 12 to 14 feet. Twelve feet was the first draught mentioned, but I think 14 feet has been discussed since. That canal alone is to cost New York state over $100,000,000.

Mr. SPROULE. They are estimating $101,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes something over $100,000,000. That canal, when completed, at the very greatest depth mentioned, will only be the same as our present canals forming part of the St. Lawrence route, and the number of days occupied in going to New York will, I think, render it altogether impossible for that route to compete with the port of Montreal and the St. Lawrence route. No doubt it will have the tendency to compel the railways to carry traffic from Buffalo at a cheaper rate than they have been carrying it. My hon. friend has been giving us some very practical information, and he, being a practical man, I am very glad to have it indeed.

Now, a word as to the depth of the canal. The American government are making any harbours they are deepening 25 feet. They are making the Sault canal 25 feet in depth, and they are enlarging the channel at the entrance to the Detroit river. One of their engineers, in discussing this matter with me not long since, assured me that they proposed to provide all along for 25-foot navigation. That being so, I had it in my mind that if we were going to enlarge the Welland canal we ought to enlarge it to accommodate vessels of 25 feet draught, because, if we enlarged it to 20 feet and in three or four years we were up against the proposition again, that vessels drawing 25 feet of water could not go beyond Port Colborne, and we could not accommodate them, we would be just where we were before. The Welland canal was originally started with 9 foot draught, then it was enlarged to 12 and then finally to 14 feet. In discussing the draught of the canals, I may say in reference to the Georgian bay that Sir Wm. Van Horne at one time expressed the opinion that if it was part of his transportation scheme he would make it 14 feet draught and use barges all the way from the head of Georgian bay to Montreal. I will not discuss that, but I have been assured by more that one shipper that they think very much cheaper transportation could be secured if we deepened the Welland canal to let large lake vessels come down to the foot of Lake Ontario as far as Prescott or Kingston, and use barges from there down. The problem would be solved for many years. I am not adopting that theory, I am simply giving it as I heard it.

Mr. McCALL. The minister has no doubt considered the question of return freight in the shape of coal if the St. Lawrence canal were enlarged. I would like to know how far he has considered this question, and if we cannot have Nova Scotia coal carried as a return cargo from Montreal upwards. In an enlarged canal we could use larger vessels both ways. The time will come when we will have to face the lumber trade on the Pacific ocean. The minister might do well to consider the whole scheme of a continued water-way from the lakes to the ocean, so that a vessel which goes down loaded with grain may come back loaded with Nova Scotia coal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have discussed the coal problem with Nova Scotia people. Conditions might be changed so that larger vessels could come to Montreal. But so far as the Nova Scotia mines are concerned, they have not been able to place their coal in Ontario at a profit.

Mr. McCALL. It would be desirable if they could.

Mr. GRAHAM. No doubt. They made the experiment, I think trying it as far as Brockville and Belleville. The Grand Trunk railway uses it at some of those points, but I am informed it was not a paying proposition to go any further west than Mon-

treal. Conditions might change if we had, as my hon. friend suggests, larger vessels coming down. At the present time I. presume a return cargo of coal to the west would be carried by a vessel going to Kingston and back from Oswego. A vessel might run from Oswego with coal, and come back with grain to Kingston.

Mr. LENNOX. Can you handle grain in the same vessel as you handle coal?

Mr. GRAHAM. They do it. It is a big problem, and I do not feel like launching out on any project until we have the best information available as to cost.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). I would like to call attention to the fact that American coal is carried down these present canals and competes in Montreal now with Nova Scotia coal. Now how could you pretend to bring coal up the canal past Montreal and compete against American coal in Ontario? For instance, coal in Montreal is probably worth about a dollar a ton higher than it is in Lake Ontario ports. Nova Scotia coal certainly would never pass Montreal where the market is a dollar higher, and come up and compete in Ontario where coal is a dollar lower.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). What kind of coal is brought through these canals, is it not anthracite?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). The only coal in which there would be traffic to any extent would be soft coal going down to Montreal. No anthracite could come up from Montreal. Soft coal goes to Montreal now, and competes with Nova Scotia coal.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister reached any conclusion as to when that Welland canal is likely to be commenced?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not say anything except that the government has the matter under serious consideration. The fact that I have no item in here for a complete survey, and the securing of all data, would indicate that possibly before the session is over we might have an item for something of that kind.

Mr. SPROULE. When you decide to have an election you will make up your mind?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend need not be afraid of that just now. These are big problems, and you cannot arrive at a decision in a short time concerning them. But the government is considering both this project and the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. LENNOX. Does this item comprise all the improvements contemplated at Port Colborne for the present?

Mr GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I suppose the minister is not going into a large work like that without having well considered the cost of the scheme. We do not want another Quebec bridge disaster. I suppose the minister will not go into this undertaking without fully considering the difference between building a new canal and enlarging the old one.

Mr. GRAHAM. If it were practicable to make the old canal of the dimensions I have indicated in the suggested new canal, and the engineers do not at the moment say that it is, it would cost fully as much, possibly a little more, than to construct a new one.

To widen canal near Welland, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a very narrow point where several accidents have occurred. This is cleaning up the contract. It will be 125 feet wide.

Williamsburg canal—residence for lockmaster at Morrisburg, $3,200.

Mr. GRAHAM. Before the canal was enlarged we had a very disreputable little house which had not been occupied for years. The lockmaster lives at a distance from the lock, and it is considered that in the interest of navigation we should have a residence near it. This covers the whole expense.

Chambly canal—macadamizing road, $16,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the minister going in for good roads?

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, this is a work we have been doing. Up to 1910 we spent $23,000 on it. When the canal was constructed, the road was placed in a new position, and we had to construct practically a new road. It was estimated that it would cost $39,000. We have spent $23,000, and this vote is to complete the work. The road is a highway.

Mr. LENNOX. How much does it cost per mile on the average?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think between $3,000 and $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This commits you to a perpetual maintenance of this road, which is really a provincial highway and ought to be constructed from other sources.

Mr. GRAHAM. Wherever a canal interferes with a highway, the government has to place the highway in as good a condition as we found it. It does not follow that we have to maintain it for all time to come. It becomes a provincial or municipal highway.

Mr. LENNOX. This is really an altogether different class of highway from the one the government displaced, I assume.

There would be no highway in that locality which would cost anything like $4,000 a mile.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the government ought to make a good highway even if there was not a good one there before.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). How long is it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think about 4 miles to complete. There were 6 or 7 miles before.

Cornwall canal—enlarging canal office, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is necessary from the fact that we are concentrating our office-work for the Williamsburg canal and the whole system at Cornwall.

Mr. LENNOX. How much have you spent on this before?

Mr. GRAHAM. The office has been there a good many years. The present building cost about $6,000. We are practically doubling the size of it. This will include everything.

Cornwall canal—improving upper entrance, lock 17, $24,400.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is already under contract. The amount of the original estimate was $55,000. Up to September 30, 1910, we spent $27,680.54. The work, figured at the contractor's prices, will cost between $55,000 and $60,000. The contract is let after public tender.

Cornwall canal—improving upper entrance, lock 19, $16,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year we took a vote of $5,000. The work was to be done by the canal staff. We spent $4,826. The balance of the work is so large, that we ought to advertise for tenders for it.

Reinforcing bank at Robertson's culvert, Cornwall, $3,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is one of the cases where there has been a leakage in the canal bank, and it is absolutely necessary to stop it as soon as possible.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Is this being done by contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; we can do that better with our staff, perhaps engaging a few extra men.

Removing high spots from prism of canal, Cornwall, $3,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This will complete the work which was under contract.

Farran's Point—improving lower entrance, $65,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is one of the most difficult locks to enter from the east owing to the very strong eddy there. The eddies along the shore are one of the most difficult things vessel men have to contend with. After a good deal of consultation with the vessel men, our staff think they can undertake the work at a cost of about $65,000, and thus save the shipping men from much difficulty in coming from the east. The work proposed is to run a crib pier down the north side and surmount that with a concrete wall. That will enable vessels to make the entrance from the east without the difficulty they now experience from the eddy. The work will cost $65,000 when completed. Tenders will be advertised for.

Improving upper entrance lock 28, Galops canal, $52,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to dredge off the slope of the south canal bank and replace it by cribwork and concrete the approach wall. The vessel men complain of difficulty with the southwest wind at that entrance, and this work will obviate that trouble. Total expenditure about $65,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Why not undertake the whole thing this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are asking for all we can possibly expend.

Rebuilding dock at Cardinal, $2,100.

Mr. GRAHAM. This was a river dock at the head of Cardinal. This dock was of use to vessels coming east. Vessels going west go through the canal. It is on the bank of the old canal.

Concrete walls, &c., Lachine, $42,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to complete the work between lock 2 and St. Gabriel basin. The sheds have been remodelled the last two years except a portion of shed No. 2, St. Gabriel. This amount of $42,000 is expected to finish the work. The work will be advertised and let by tender.

Dredging Murray canal, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This will be done under contract. A deputation waited on me to-day from Belleville urging the deepening of the Murray canal to 14 feet. This vote is not for that purpose, but to take out the sand and material which has really drifted in. The present depth is only 11 feet. We shall have to consider the advisability of making it 14 feet. Belleville is becoming important as a manufacturing centre, it has large cement works, and there is a good deal of traffic going through the Murray canal. At present vessels drawing 14 feet of water through the St. Lawrence canals cannot get through the Murray, and the question is whether we ought not to consider deepening the Murray to 14 feet.

Mr. LENNOX. Will this be let by tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

To build scow, Murray canal, $1,800.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for our repair work in the canal.

Canals—Quebec—dredging, $22,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for Soulanges, St. Ours, Ste. Anne, Carillon, Grenville and Chambly. It is to keep the channel clean.

Mr. LENNOX. It is perpetual then?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, we have to have a vote every year. Of this, $12,000 is to be spent on the Lachine canal, $4,500 on Chambly, and $6,000 among the others.

Canals—Quebec—macadamizing two miles of public road, Hungry bay dike, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an expensive affair. This Hungry bay dyke was built in 1856 to protect the lands against high water owing to dams at the head of the Beauharnois canal. The road has become impassable, and two years ago the work was begun of rebuilding it. The expenditure up to September last was $11,000.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the total length of the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are remodelling about eight miles of it. The total estimated cost is $40,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Was there not any way to get around, instead of spending this enormous sum of money on this road? And are we to understand that this is a road substituted for some other road taken by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is under arrangements made years ago. We had to build a dyke and maintain it for the protection of the farms, and by agreement we have to maintain a road in good condition upon it. It has been patched and patched, and we have been trying to make a job of it.

Mr. LENNOX. It seems to be a job.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are going to make a good job of it.

Mr. LENNOX. But it has been a bad job hitherto.

Mr. GRAHAM. Anyhow we want to make a complete job this time. My deputy who is a pretty good judge of roads, says this is the best way to do it—to make a good road while we are about it.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it done by contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. The materials are delivered under contract, and we do the spreading and rolling ourselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. (Leeds). In the summer time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then, you cannot use your canal men to do the work; you are simply jobbing it out?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, we have had a repair staff on this work for a year or two.

Mr. LENNOX. How do you finish it? Is it paved?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is just a well-rolled, crushed-stone road. Perhaps I am wrong, but I have the idea that where a government does a piece of work of this kind, it ought to be a little bit of an object lesson to those who may contemplate building a road.

Mr. LENNOX. They would never build it like that.

Mr. EDWARDS. It would bankrupt them if they did.

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not know the effect of a good example in road-building or in anything else. If the people see a really good thing, they will imitate it sooner or later. This work bears about the same relation to a poor road as a granolithic pavement does to a plank sidewalk—it costs more at first, but it is economy in the end

Mr. SPROULE. Is not this in contradiction of the statement the minister made some time ago that the government was not responsible for the maintenance of the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a special agreement. When we raised the water, the government of that day had to enter into an agreement to maintain this road on the dyke.

Canals—Quebec—protection walls north and south side of Lake St. Francis, $8,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a vote that has to be taken year after year, as the action of the waters makes repairs necessary.

Mr. LENNOX. Are we to understand that the minister waits until damage is done before taking action? Or is the minister carrying on a certain work to protect the banks?

Mr. GRAHAM. Along the lake shore, it is a little difficult to say just where the work is necessary until damage from the action of the water is threatened. It is difficult to make an estimate. This is to protect the lake shore.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Why do you protect the lake shore?

Mr. GRAHAM. This government, for purposes of navigation, has raised the water on the lands at different points, and that is why we undertook in a measure to protect the shores at points where the waters are likely to injure the farm owners.

Mr. LENNOX. How much has been expended?

Mr. GRAHAM. $4,500 last year, $8,000 this year. This vote started some 25 years ago, and there is a small amount every year.

Mr. LENNOX. Would it not be cheaper to pay the farmers for land damages once for all?

Mr. GRAHAM. Along the St. Lawrence route it costs a lot of money to pay damages.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has the department been called upon to pay damages for land anywhere along the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not of recent years.

Mr. EDWARDS. The minister knows why I am inquiring.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will have it looked up.

Mr. EDWARDS. The minister might take into consideration again the position in the neighbourhood of Wolfe lake, township of Bedford. Damage is caused to a road there every year from a dam built by the government. I do not think the dam was ever any use, and if some one were to blow it out I doubt if any one would want to have it replaced.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some one would want the contract. I have a note of my hon. friend's request somewhere.

Rapide Plat, dredging, $7,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to clean up this canal which is opposite Morrisburg. There is some cleaning to be done all the way down the canal.

Mr. BRODER. Is any work being done at the upper or western entrance to the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. The next vote, 'Improving lower entrance, lock 24, $45,000,' is to improve the lower entrance, lock 24. This work at the lower entrance will cost in the vicinity of $100,000. The work at the lower entrance is being done at the request of the steamship men.

Rideau canal, rebuilding bridges at Old Slys and Oliver's Ferry, $3,500.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will that complete the rebuilding?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is supposed it will.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has the minister received requests from the lockmen along the Rideau canal for an increase of pay? How does their pay compare with that of men on other canals? I believe that their hours are 24 per day, that they must be ready at any time to give their services to that work. Some of these men have written me to bring this matter to the attention of the minister. Consideration should be given to the length of time they are on duty.

Mr. GRAHAM. One question I can answer quite readily. Every body on the Rideau canal has asked for an increase of pay. It is true they have to be ready any time to pass a boat through, but navigation on the Rideau canal at night is not extensive, and the men are not prevented by their work on the canal from engaging in other vocations. Some of them have small farms. I am just pointing that out to you that when we say a 24-hour service it may be that they are not overworked with the night traffic on the Rideau canal. When we get to the votes for the staff, I am asking for an additional amount and the department is taking into consideration the lockmen on the canals.

Mr. BRODER. It seems to me that it would be wise to give these men more permanency. Lock labourers should be given wages throughout the year, and have permanent work. It is not easy for these men to get other employment. The general impression seems to be that they are already well paid and, therefore, it is difficult for them to get other work.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am glad to hear the minister say that the matter of increased pay to the staff is under advisement. The statement of my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) is one that should receive serious consideration. It is true that the traffic on the Rideau canal is not as great as it is on the other canals, it is true that the actual labour of locking through boats is not very great, but the fact remains that these men are required to be on duty for the whole 24 hours. They must be ready whenever they are called upon no matter what the time may be. It may be true that there are not many vessels going through at night, but the fact that they are always liable to be called should be taken into consideration, and the fact that for a part of the year they are out of employment should also be remembered in considering the wages that these men should receive. There are not very many of them on the Rideau canal. I am not speaking from personal acquaintance with very many of them, but what I have stated has been represented to me by the men at Kingston Mills.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct too.

Mr. EDWARDS. I really think that their claim is a just one and should be given consideration. The men ought to get more pay.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will consider them all. I am asking for an increased vote for the labourers on the canal.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I want to draw the minister's attention to the fact that within the last three or four years, since gasolene has become a motive power, the lockages have more than trebled on the Rideau canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine there is something in that.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The lockmasters and lock labourers are on duty almost night and day. This is especially true at Newboro and Jones' Falls. Now that the Department of Marine is lighting the Rideau canal the night traffic is nearly as great as that during the day. The minister says that many of these men have little farms. That is not the case. I have several locks of the Rideau canal in my county and these lock labourers start work in the spring, are discharged in the fall and have practically nothing to do in the winter. They ought to be employed permanently. There is lots of work to do on the canal during winter, repairing, mason work and work calling for labourers.

Mr. HARTY. Quarrying.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Quarrying. These men should be put upon a permanent basis. A few years ago nearly all the lock labourers were discharged, and new men put in their places because the men who had been employed there were not of the same political faith as the minister. Although they had been employed for a great many years, they were told that their engagement was only for the season, and they could put new men on in the spring. They are practically working 24 hours now, and they have to live in their clothes all the time ready to jump. If a gasolene launch whistles they have to come down and let her through. Their work has increased and the minister should take these things into account and give them largely increased pay and employment all the year round.

Mr. GRAHAM. In figuring out the pay we have a record of the lockages, and we will take that into consideration. With regard to what my hon. friends say as to yearly employment, I am afraid that if we were to do that, and these men were standing round doing nothing and drawing their pay people would think, even more than they do now, that the government was too generous.

Mr. BRODER. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that the Sheet Steel Company of Morrisburg have men employed during the winter to look after the ice?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not part of our contract to do that work. They would have to do that anyway.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. BRODER. You rent the water and do not give it to them.

Mr. GRAHAM. In repairing our canals early in the spring, we give the men of the regular staff the first chance to work, and a good many of them are employed on repair work for quite a while before navigation opens.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is another matter which I would like to mention. I have been told that the minister is quite an enthusiastic yachtsman. At all events he will know that I am correct in stating that probably there is no more picturesque waterway in Canada than the Rideau canal and its connections. I have heard American tourists say that from Kingston to Ottawa there is the most picturesque stretch of water that they have ever seen in their lives. The beauty of that waterway, however, is marred by unsightly stumps all along the line. I do not know whether it is feasible, but it seems to me that after navigation closes in the fall, a sufficient amount of water might be let off so that men could go in and remove these stumps entirely. You would then have between Kingston and Ottawa the most attractive waterway probably to be found in all North America. I cannot undertake to say whether it is feasible or not, but it seems possible that something along that line should be done.

Mr. GRAHAM. It could be done, but it would be pretty expensive. It is worthy of thinking about. The stumps do detract from the beauty of the route.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not think it would be expensive at all. It would not cost any more than letting the water off. I believe you could get any amount of people who would be glad to go in there, cut the wood out and take it away.

Mr. GRAHAM. If it were only the canal it might be feasible, but if these stumps are in the lakes it would be very difficult to let sufficient water off.

Sault Ste. Marie—rebuilding north entrance pier, upper entrance, $28,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I explained this work this afternoon while the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) was in. We are building a portion of this pier, about 300 feet out of capital. This is a portion of the same pier that has been in a dilapidated condition. We are building this portion out of the amount.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this the total amount required?

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimated cost is about $68,000, with the original appropriation.

Tug, $9,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a steel patrol boat to be used for the purpose of preventing more boats from entering than can be accommodated at the piers. A year or two ago we had an accident there owing to carelessness. Boats will crowd in, particularly at the Soo, where there has been a congestion, merely in order to get the lock. We propose to have a tug that will patrol to the west as a police boat, and see that no greater number of vessels go into the entrance to the lock than can be accommodated safely.

Improvements, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for new lock gates, derricks, scow and repairs to dam. We have expended $163,000, and require this year to expend about $15,000.

Mr. LENNOX. How do your lock gates at St. Mary's and our system generally compare with those on the American side? Could the minister tell what tonnage has been locked through that canal last year, and to what extent the traffic is increasing?

Mr. GRAHAM. The size of the lock on the Canadian side is 860 x 60. Our draught is now 20 feet. The traffic through the Soo canal has increased enormously during the last ten years, something like 600 per cent. The American side has now two canals and is building a third. Our canal at the present time has a little deeper draught than their deepest. Their new canal is providing for a draught of 25 feet. After their canal is constructed they will have better accommodation for deep draught vessels than we have. Our immense traffic going through the last few years is due to the fact that a little heavier vessel can go through the Canadian lock than can go through the American lock.

Mr. LENNOX. Does our government contemplate any change in the channel?

Mr. GRAHAM. It all depends on the results of the new lock on the American side when it is built. It may be that will accommodate traffic to such an extent that we will not be compelled for the present at least to build an additional canal. The suggestion has been made that we should build another canal besides the one we have, with a 25 foot draught. My own view is that we should not do this until we see what the result will be in the new 25 foot draught canal on the American side. We have been carrying their traffic for several years, a great portion of it.

Mr. LENNOX. What has been done in the last few years in the way of dockage accommodation in the neighbourhood of the canal, at the lower entrance? And what about the channel? I understand the channel was not very satisfactory down below the gates. Three or four years ago when I was there it was pointed out to me that there was very poor dockage accommodation, and that the channel was not in good shape.

Mr. GRAHAM. Practically all our traffic is handled at the platform at the lock. We have a pier at the lower entrance, though not an extravagant one, that will have to be repaired or rebuilt. It is not a dock of large dimensions. But outside of that the Railways and Canals Department has no docks.

Mr. LENNOX. I thought it was about as dilapidated and unsightly a place as I had ever seen. What docks there were seemed to be in very poor state of construction, everything seemed to be in confusion, and compared badly with the appearance of things on the other side. Where we come into direct competition with our American neighbours in the striking way we do at the Soo, it is worth something that Canada should present an appearance as good as is presented on the other side. To my mind, three or four years ago, the contrast was very painful indeed. I think the government could and should do something in the way of improving conditions round about the Sault canal, particularly below the gate.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I have explained, the only property we own is a small wharf at the lower side, which ought to be reconstructed. The United States government are practically making a small park in connection with their canal grounds. I have an idea that the Canadian government ought to do something of that kind where they have ground, so that it will look respectable at least. I am instructing the staff at the Sault to spend a reasonable amount of money this year in beautifying the ground.

Mr. LENNOX. At least 75 per cent of the people who see one shore will see the other, and they are very apt to draw contrasts between the two, and I think Canada is big enough and important enough to be able to make the conditions about the Sault canal more attractive than they are.

Mr. GRAHAM. In the year 1908 there passed through the Sault canal 12,759,216 tons, and in 1909, 27,861,245 tons.

St. Peter's canal—improvements, $150,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This canal is 2,400 feet long and it connects St. Peter's bay with the Bras d'Or lakes. My late deputy, Mr. Butler, had an examination made of this canal, and we took a vote of $25,000 with which it was thought at first we could make some repairs. After he had an engineer look over it thoroughly, he came

to the conclusion that there was no use attempting to repair it, that we would have to make new lock gates and make a complete job of the whole thing.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total expenditure on this up to date?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was started away before confederation. I am told that about $800,000 has been expended on it altogether. The walls and locks are practically worn out, and we have to rebuild it.

Mr. LENNOX. Are you changing the depth?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is no provision for that. The locks will probably accommodate a little larger boats, but the canal has a depth of 18 feet now. It is estimated that one scheme will cost $260,000 and another $300,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Has not the minister adopted one scheme, or is it possible to begin the work first?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the scheme will be the $300,000 scheme. My own opinion is that the most permanent way of doing the work is the cheapest in the end.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the difference between the two schemes?

Mr. GRAHAM. The $260,000 scheme would involve the repairing of the present canal and stopping navigation while doing it. The $300,000 scheme would mean making a new entrance and building another canal beside the present one. The old canal could be used while the new one was being constructed. One canal will be as good as the other when completed.

Mr. BLAIN. How did the old canal get into such a bad state of repair—through anybody's neglect?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is an old-timer, and timber was used in its construction.

Mr. LENNOX. What are you going to build the new one of?

Mr. GRAHAM. Concrete.

Trent canal—improvements, $74,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for the usual improvements which we make year by year with our own staff. Last year we spent to the 30th of September, $35,000.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What are the repairs this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are as follows:

Dredging—	
Between Kirkfield lift lock and Lake Simcoe	$ 5,000
Lake Simcoe at Gamebridge, entrance to canal	2,500
Otonabee river, between Peterborough and Rice lake	5,000
Sturgeon lake, Lindsay river	$ 4,000
Between Lakefield and Peterborough, including Little lake	2,000
Rip-rapping Balsam lake, Lake Simcoe division	4,000
Duplicate lock gates	5,000
Reservoir waters, Jumbo lake, township of Glemorgan	9,000
Reservoir waters, Sheldon lake, township of Lutterworth	4,000
Reservoir waters, Percy lake, Paint lake and Bedstone lake dams	4,000
Reservoir waters, Long lake, township of Burleigh (two dams)	4,000
Entrance piers at Buckhorn locks, two piers above and one below	4,000
Lockmaster's houses, Peterborough lift lock	4,000
Moving bridge at Fenelon Falls	2,000
Purchase of land, &c., filling flume and repairs to lock, Bobcaygeon	15,000
	$74,500

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to bring to the minister's attention work that requires to be done at Bradford. The people there do not approve of that piece of work towards Newmarket, not because it is leading to a rival town, but because they think it an unjustifiable expenditure. If, however, there was anything that would mitigate the offence, it would be to show some little justice to the town of Bradford. The minister promised to investigate and find out what it would cost to run a channel up from the Devil's Elbow to the neighbourhood of the railway station, but so far has done nothing. The navigation of Lake Simcoe is very considerable, and the navigation of the Holland river from Lake Simcoe down through the Trent valley system would be good right up to the town of Bradford if the minister would construct that half mile of channel. That would not cost a great deal, and would cost a good deal less if the work were carried on at the same time as the other stretch from the river down to Newmarket. The minister has put it off from time to time, and I think he ought to deal with that matter now. In South Simcoe we have not asked for any public expenditure and do not propose to ask for any unless it be an expenditure absolutely justifiable in every respect. I cannot understand how any argument could be urged against this small expenditure in the interests of the people of Bradford, and I trust the hon. gentleman will see that some provision be made during this session for the carrying on of this work.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not forgotten the matter to which my hon. friend refers, but have it in my mind. We have not come to the item for No. 1 section of the Holland river yet, but I believe we can do that work ourselves better than by letting it out on contract. We are now figuring out a scheme which will enable us to have

a plant to do that work on the Holland river and then utilize it for the Bradford work.

Mr. HUGHES. Do the Bradford work first.

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe we could take a plant of our own for channels of that kind without a very large expenditure. I believe we could use our own dredge to do just this kind of work, and Bradford is one of the places I had in mind when trying to work out that scheme.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the Newmarket channel not being done by contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are two sections, Nos. 1 and 2. No. 1 is the section I have been discussing, from the lake up to Holland Landing. The same dredge which would do that work could be utilized to make a channel up to Bradford.

Mr. HUGHES. You could take a dredge and dredge the channel to Bradford in two months.

Mr. LENNOX. In my opinion there is no possibility of the government proceeding to build the Newmarket canal until after another election, for this reason. If that canal were completed, its unwisdom would be self-evident, but at present we can only assume that it will be useless. I do not think, therefore, that the government will place us in a position of being able to show absolutely that it is of no use—at least not until after the next election. Am I to understand that the minister now says definitely that he is determined to cut that little channel from the point I have mentioned up to Bradford? And if so, about what time may we expect the work to be commenced?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I have made all the statements I can reasonably be asked to make, and that my hon. friend ought to be —I will not say, thankful—greatly encouraged, because, though I am sure he thought I had forgotten it I have kept it in mind. If he is patient, he will find that the work into Bradford will be done, not by contract, but by ourselves.

Mr. LENNOX. Nothing in the estimates this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Some time ago I drew attention to the fact that in the early years the waters of Hollow lake flowed down Gull river and into the Trent waters and so onwards. But, years ago, the lumberers changed the flow of many of the waters in that locality. The first change was to divert them down the Black river. Later on, about 1850, when lumbering became brisk about Bracebridge, the waters were blockaded into both the Gull river systems and the Black river system, down Muskoka. For years, in periods of high water, there were two outlets from Hollow lake, one through Muskoka, and one down the overflow into Gull lake and the Trent waters, flowing, often, even where they had dammed up the Gull waters. There are indications there yet of where they have to dam these waters. I drew the attention of the Ontario government also to this matter, and I was sent a very nice map with data by the engineers, showing that in 1860, the outlet had been found as it is now. Of course, I am prepared to go into the matter at any time, and also to go over the ground with the engineers, and have levels taken and demonstrate that every statement I have made is borne out by the facts. I got it from men who, in the early days travelled in canoes down the river at a time when the Gull river waters were the only outlet of Hollow lake—except that in high waters there was some flow into Muskoka. The entrance into the Muskoka was lowered by a number of feet so that the main flow went by the Muskoka way. What has the minister (Mr. Graham) to say about it?

Mr. GRAHAM. At the request of the hon. member (Mr. Hughes), I had some correspondence with, and communicated with the Ontario government, and I think the reply they sent me was a copy of the letter written by my hon. friend.

Mr. HUGHES. No, I sent it.

Mr. GRAHAM. In any case, we sent an engineer on the ground, and I expect his report in a short time. When I get it, I will confer with my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes).

Mr. HUGHES. If the engineer has not gone, I would like to have half an hour's conversation with him before he goes.

Mr. GRAHAM. He has gone.

Mr. HUGHES. I asked the minister to let me know first. I could have given the engineer some pointers, knowing the country as I do.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not so far but that, if he has made a mistake, we can send him back. When I get his report, I will have him confer with my hon. friend.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister is putting in reservoir dams for the Trent navigation and for manufacturing purposes. I would like to point out that the system could probably be improved without injuring the scenic beauty of the region. One instance is the very excellent dam being constructed at Redstone lake. That lake, like others, has two outlets, one by Redstone river into Grass lake, and the other into Eagle lake. This dam is being constructed on the Eagle

lake side, and there is another dam at the Redstone river end. Now, Redstone lake is certainly one of the most beautiful lakes in the world. Any one who has seen the Swiss lakes and the lakes of the Highlands of Scotland will admit that Redstone lake is unsurpassed for beauty. But many of the most beautiful beaches of that lake will be under water for a number of weeks in the early summer, and also the foliage will be destroyed, if the water is kept at a high level. I do not think it necessary to raise the water so high; means could be devised for storing the water in other ways without spoiling the beauty of the place, or injuring property that will be of value in the future. I could give the engineers my ideas on the subject, and they could do no harm, for I know the country very well. I have talked with the officials of the government on this subject, who are doing their best, looking after everything in as proper a spirit as could be expected. I think these things could be done in a proper way.

Mr. GRAHAM. I agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. HUGHES. I noticed an item in the estimates for cleaning up the Lindsay river. It is the Scugog river—but that is a detail. Is this work to be done above or below Lindsay?

Mr. GRAHAM. For taking out the deadheads below Lindsay.

Mr. HUGHES. What policy has the minister in that regard? I have pointed out not only to the present minister, but to several of his predecessors, both Conservative and Liberal, that a system could be devised to rid these waters of deadheads, these sunken logs which rise when the water is disturbed by the wheel of a passing steamer, and the even more dangerous ones with one end at the bottom and the other floating. When a man owns a yacht costing him from $600 to $2,000, it is not pleasant to have a hole stove in her by an old log. The lumbermen object to having these logs confiscated. But they are very dangerous to navigation. Many boats and canoes are upset and yachts are damaged—I have had my own boat smashed two or three times. But if a system were adopted under which any person could take one of these logs to the mill owner and give him the opportunity to pay 50 cents and take the log or leave it to the ownership of the man who found it, these waters would soon be cleared of these logs. Of course, if this sum were paid for a floating log, men might be tempted to take them out of the booms, but that could be easily provided for. At present, ten cents is allowed for one of these logs, but at that rate it does not pay. But with gasolene launches multiplying every year, with hundreds of them plying those waters, scores of which are damaged every summer by these logs, something should be done to rid the waters of these dangerous obstructions.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are considering a regulation for the Trent canal, by which we will take these logs out and charge the owners 50 cents each. If the owner does not want to pay, he does not get the logs.

Mr. HUGHES. At Ancona, where the Canadian Pacific railway touches Sturgeon lake, the minister's officers are planning to build a little wharf. I presume that is included in this or some other vote?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Public Works Department make the grant, but they allow us to spend the money for them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister knows there has been complaint about the keeping of the bridge at Cardinal?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend spoke to me, and instructions were given to put snow on the bridge. I suppose it has been done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Can the minister say it has been done?

Mr. GRAHAM. Instructions were given to do so. If they have not been carried out I would like to have my attention drawn to it.

Mr. HUGHES. There is an item for the repair of Fenelon Falls bridge. What is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is proposed to move the present wooden bridge a sufficient distance away from the lock to prevent the operating of the lock interfering with traffic on the bridge.

Mr. HUGHES. That will not meet the difficulty. The bridge now is opposite the main street running north and south and unless you had a high protection wall there would be danger of accidents. It would be better to leave the present bridge where it is and construct another higher up; then traffic could use either bridge and there would never be a blockade.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is worth looking into, and we will look into it.

Mr. HUGHES. The Scugog river above Lindsay is badly in need of dredging. That district is largely used as a summer resort by Toronto people, and there are many pleasure yachts on the river. There has not been much heavy traffic there, and there are a lot of weeds in the channel and some logs. I understand that the minister's officers have a plan for cleaning out the logs and the weeds below Lindsay, and I would like to have them at the same time look into the conditions above Lindsay.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no difficulty in what my hon. friend proposes. For years there has been a discussion between the people of Port Perry and some others as to the depth of water in Scugog lake. The Port Perry people think we are draining the water off that lake.

Mr. HUGHES. You have been. That is why I proposed to have a double lock at Lindsay to prevent waste. The Port Perry people have been complaining that the water at Lindsay has been allowed to get down three feet below the dam.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they have that provided for now.

Mr. FOWKE. I think it is generally understood that since the construction of the new lock the water will be raised all the way to Port Perry. I understand there is some conflict as to jurisdiction as to which department will do the work on Scugog river. The Minister of Marine has kindly said he will send up his engineers to investigate with a view to dredging, and also putting up lights along the way.

Mr. HUGHES. Scugog lake and river have always been under the Railways and Canals Department.

Mr. FOWKE. We have reasonably good assurance that something will be done at the opening of spring.

Highway bridge at Jane street, Welland, $2,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a small steel bridge which we will buy and have put up by our own staff.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the bridge for?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is over the raceway in connection with the canal.

Mr. BLAIN. For vehicles?

Mr. GRAHAM. The bridge will be for vehicles and foot passenger traffic.

Welland canal—stone protection to banks, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for stone protection to banks. The high waters of Lake Erie injure the protection and we have to keep repairing it from time to time.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there much of this to be done?

Mr. GRAHAM. We spent up to March 31, 1909, $446, and up to March 31, 1910, $9,000. We have spent up to September 30, 1910, $298. This is nearly all a revote.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not said to be a revote at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is nearly all a revote. We did not get sufficiently low water this year to enable us to spend more than $298 out of last year's vote.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not specified to be a revote; does that occasion any complication or difficulty?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; it is just lapsed.

Mr. LENNOX. No danger of the money going wrong?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Auditor General would not allow us to take a farthing of it even if we wanted to.

Williamsburg canal—building entrance pier, old lock 23, $1,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for repairing the entrance pier to the old lock at Morrisburg.

Mr. LENNOX. This seems to be much cheaper than work of this kind generally.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an old lock that we have to keep in repair. It is really beyond repair and 'replacing' perhaps would be the proper word to use.

Iron mooring posts, $2,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. These are iron mooring posts along the Williamsburg canal.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What did they use before?

Mr. GRAHAM. In my time we had the old wooden snubbing posts that we used to sit on as boys.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is a pity you are not sitting on one now.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a better post now.

New machinery, $1,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to buy a new suction, centrifugal pump with engine.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where will this be purchased?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will ask for offers from the various pump men, and then we will have to leave it to our mechanical department to say which is the best one.

Mr. SPROULE. You will not purchase it from Merwin?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know the man.

Mr. BLAIN. Will you invite public competition?

Mr. GRAHAM. One thousand dollars is not a very large amount to spend much on advertising. We will write to several dealers and get their best figures.

Mr. BLAIN. Who are on the list to supply these?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no list for these.

Mr. BLAIN. How does my hon. friend in his department know where to send?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have directories and that kind of thing. The political persuasion

of the men with whom we deal does not make any difference when we are buying goods for the public. We have a purchasing agent who attends to that fairly well.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister does not seem to have learned anything from his associates. He does not understand things as they do.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I am slow in some things.

Railways and Canals—miscellaneous—arbitration and awards, $4,000.

Mr. LENNOX. You have a vote every year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. We have just spent a few hundred dollars this year.

Mr. LENNOX. This is not said to be a revote?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; it is a vote that we take every year.

Mr. LENNOX. If you take a vote of, say, $4,000, and only spend $500 I would suppose there will be a revote of $3,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This estimate is made up in September, and we cannot tell how much will be expended before the end of the year. Perhaps the whole $4,000 may be expended before March 31, and we would be misleading the committee if we called it a revote, because we might expend it or a great deal of it.

Mr. LENNOX. How much was spent last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Less than $500.

Mr. LENNOX. How much the year before?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is in the annual report.

Mr. LENNOX. What are these arbitrations generally about?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will try to get the details of one case and show my hon. friend what they are.

Mr. LENNOX. I was only wanting to see the class of things that you refer to arbitration.

Mr. GRAHAM. We might have a dispute as to a water-power on a canal, or flooded land, or an old claim in connection with some canal. These things are constantly arising.

Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada—maintenance and operation of the, $138,000.

Mr. LENNOX. I see that $121,400 was voted last year. Was that all spent?

Mr. GRAHAM. Every cent of it was expended.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. LENNOX. How was it expended?

Mr. GRAHAM (reading):

Staff and secretary's office	$ 3,650
Assistant secretary to the staff	4,700
Chief engineer with four assistants	15,950
Traffic officer and staff	15,100
Operating officer and staff	18,400

Our operating officer, Mr. Nixon, is a new appointment; he was appointed last year.

We divided the traffic department from the operating department, and put a man at the head of that staff. His duty is to decide questions where there is a dispute as to what the railways ought to do in matters of operating. For instance, at a level crossing of two railways the commission decides the kind of connection or crossing; there we must have a man acquainted with railway operations who could tell the railways what it was possible to do. Mr. Nixon is an operating man who has come up from all the lower grades. He was a superintendent on the Grand Trunk.

Mr. LENNOX. When they want to make connection between two lines would he have anything to do with that?

Mr. GRAHAM. He would be the man to decide disputes as to the practicability of the junction. I will read to the committee a list of the various officials employed on the board, with their salaries:

Staff in secretary's office	$ 3,650
Assistant secretary and staff	4,700
Chief engineer, 4 assistants and staff	15,950
Traffic officer and staff	15,100
Operating officer and staff	18,400
Law clerk	2,600
Record officer and staff	8,850
Private secretary to Chief Commissioner	2,000
Stenographers (12)	8,150
Messengers (4)	2,650
Official reporting	12,550
Official car	3,000
Printing	2,000
Stationery	5,000
Board and staff's travelling expenses	12,000
Telephone and telegraph	1,500
Outside service, persons not appointed by order in council	2,000
Contingencies	10,000
Increase in salary expenditure	8,000
Total	$138,100

Expended at September 30, $61,296.36.

That is the estimate for this year, and we have some increases. The operating staff is enlarged this year. The commissioners' salaries authorized by statute are $55,000, in addition to the $138,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the total cost of the Railway Board last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. $162,000; that includes everything.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you the staff complete now?

Mr. GRAHAM. The staff is complete at the present time. But the chairman of the board is recommending the appointment of three men who will act as inspectors of rolling stock. There have been a good many complaints, and the question was raised in the House in reference to locomotives, and the head of the operating department thinks we ought to have three practical men in different parts of the country who would be competent, one of them at least, to jump on a locomotive and see if it was what it ought to be before it left the shop. That is for the protection of the lives of the travelling public as well as of railway employees. To-morrow morning we have an appointment with representatives of the employees of railways in Canada, and I imagine it is something along the lines I have been indicating. The chairman of the board is appointing three such men to make the rolling stock more secure than it is at present.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you going to take those men out of the present staff?

Mr. GRAHAM. The staff is kept as busy as any staff you can find in the city of Ottawa. I have not interfered with the appointments by the board. I seldom know who their appointee is until they recommend him to me, and I take it to Council. The Governor in Council appoints on the recommendation of the board.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the board doing in regard to railway crossings? How many railway crossings have been separated during the last year, and what money has been expended? Also, what is the board doing to ascertain which crossings should be taken up and dealt with first? We have discussed the question as to the advisability of getting some general information in regard to crossings which have to be dealt with by the board. Is it just by haphazard that certain parties come before the board and represent that a certain crossing should be attended to, while other men less alert do not make any representation? If so, it will happen that a great many crossings that require immediate attention will be neglected, and others that are not so necessary will be carried through. I think if the government is going to get the best results they should ascertain and classify those crossings, so that some would be regarded as immediate, some as important, and others that do not require to be dealt with at present. I do not urge the expenditure of money uselessly, but I believe it will not be found satisfactory, and there will not be an efficient service, until some person is charged with the duty of ascertaining by inspection those crossings which require attention sooner than others. What money has been expended and how many crossings have been improved?

Mr. GRAHAM. I laid that report on the table some time ago. The commission at the outset, asked the railways to give a statement showing every crossing. Then the commission had their inspectors examine a large number of these. We had passed an Act declaring that where an accident had occurred at any crossing, that crossing would be regarded as dangerous, and the commission requested the railway companies to provide protection for these or show cause why they should not. A good deal of that work has been done.

Mr. LENNOX. Did the commission ask the railway companies to give their views?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they did. The commission sent their own men to look at these crossings and dealt with the great majority of those which the Act declared dangerous. The railway companies objected at first but have now agreed to provide a remedy as prescribed by the commission.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the fund set aside by parliament been exhausted?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it has been more than sufficient up to the present, but we shall have to renew or extend it when the period runs out.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister inform us what has been done towards determining what kind of cattle guards should be used? Some years ago there was a good deal of agitation about this. I understand that the commission was to take that question up.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have discussed that on several occasions with the chairman of the commission and representative farmers. In the west the railways have in some cases cattle guards more or less effective. They take them up in the winter, because they say they interfere with the snowploughs and they also take up the planking at the crossings. I am considering an amendment to the Railway Act, but do not know whether it will meet the case altogether or not. There does not seem to be a cattle guard yet invented that will give protection to the railway or the stock that go on it. It has been claimed that if we made the railways responsible for the killing of stock in any event, we might perhaps then get a good cattle guard. I am not sure whether that would open the way for good lawsuits or not.

Mr. LENNOX. They would settle when they knew they would be liable.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have had consultations with the chairman of the commission and farmers of the west to see if we could provide a clause not too severe on the railways and would still afford sufficient protection for the public. I hope to be able to introduce that measure and have it discussed, and shall then be better able to judge its efficacy.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister any idea of the salaries to be paid those three new men?

Mr. GRAHAM. I asked the chairman of the commission if that was going to add anything to his estimates, because if so I would have to add an item, to the supplementaries. But I have not yet got any reply.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope the minister will introduce the legislation he speaks of pretty soon so that we may have an opportunity of dealing with it properly and not have it rushed through at the end of the session with other legislation. Will legislation with regard to interswitching, to meet that passed by the Ontario legislature, be included in this Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. ROCHE. I have not been a close reader of the report of the railway commission which is annually laid on the table, and therefore, I would ask the hon. minister to inform me, if in that report there is any comparison of rates charged, for instance, in the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan and those charged south of the international boundary. Such a statement would be of much advantage and dispel a great deal of the misconception at present existing, according to the statement made by the hon. minister a week or two ago. If it be not in the report, I think it would be a good idea to have the commission include such a comparative statement in their future reports, just as we have information in connection with the reciprocity question—a comparison of the prices in the American and Canadian markets—submitted for the consideration of this House. A week or so ago the minister stated that notwithstanding the good work performed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railway freight rates charged in the Canadian northwest were lower than those charged on the American side. The reason I bring this to the attention of the minister is that the chief Liberal newspaper in Winnipeg has denied the accuracy of that statement, and even correspondents of the paper have alleged that he is misinformed in making it. A leading article in the 'Free Press' of the 27th of March gives concrete instances of freight rates on the Great Northern in North Dakota and Minnesota which are considerably lower than the rates on the same articles on the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. If the statement of the minister can be borne out, and an authentic report to that effect were issued by a responsible body like the Board of Railway Commissioners, it would do much towards dispelling misconception among the farmers of western Canada, and would avert a great deal of adverse criticism of the minister and his department as well as of the railway commission. A comparison of the rates on both sides of the line might be given in their annual report.

Mr. GRAHAM. The report would not be big enough for that. It would have to give the rates from every place to every other place, or some person would accuse the commission of being misinformed or of giving wrong information. What I was discussing, and I have no reason to change my statement, was the rate paid on the wheat haul from points in western Canada to Port Arthur compared with the rate from similar points in the States to Duluth. What the Winnipeg 'Free Press' discusses are the rates on other kinds of goods going in, such as brick, cement, tile, and that kind of thing. I was confining myself to the transfer of the wheat crop, and I took different points in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and I was assured that one of the reasons for the lower rates was the Act passed by the present legislature of Manitoba. Then I was asked about coal, and I stated that the rate from Port Arthur to Winnipeg was $2.50, and from Duluth to Winnipeg, $3. I did not go into a discussion of the other items dealt with by the 'Free Press,' with regard to which it may be correct—I do not know.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister's statement apply to other grain as well as wheat?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it was grain in general, I think.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a very important statement for the people of Canada, because we have had a good deal of complaint of freight rates both in the east and the west. Is the Board of Railway Commissioners in any way under the control of the Railway Department or under the direction of the minister, or are they free to do and go as and where they wish?

Mr. GRAHAM. Their duties are outlined by statute, and while they are a branch of the department and report through the head of the department, he does not control their movements in any way. They make their own appointments and go and come as they see fit in the interests of their work. If any complaints were made as to their work, I suppose the

head of the department would have to take the responsibility, but I do not attempt to control their actions or their work.

Mr. LENNOX. What arrangement is made, if any, by the government in the way of prosecuting cases before the board? It was suggested at one time that the Solicitor General could render some valuable legal assistance in the way of bringing forward cases on behalf of persons who did not want to go to the expense of employing a solicitor. Is any provision made for employing anybody to protect the public interest in cases heard by the board where the railway companies are represented by counsel?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not see any necessity of having a public prosecutor in these cases. The beauty of this Board of Railway Commissioners is that the poorest man in Canada can go before it and tell his own story and get justice as quickly as he would if he had the best lawyer in the country. The board is very careful about that. If a farmer goes there about a crossing, he can have the matter settled in five minutes without a solicitor, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it is settled without any cost to him. I have discussed the question with the chairman, and he is of opinion that it is not necessary to have a public prosecutor, and I think rather prides himself on the fact that the public gets justice and is thoroughly protected without a solicitor.

Mr. LENNOX. I am prepared to believe that in many cases it is much as the minister says. But I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that in all cases, even with the greatest activity on the part of the board in the interest of the person who brings the case, the case can be presented as well as by counsel. There is a certain amount of preparation required for a case that can only be made by a person who is skilled in that kind of thing. There must be a good many cases in which, however desirous the chairman may be that justice shall be meted out to all parties, yet, with, an astute counsel on behalf of the railway company and on the other side a man who is not experienced in the collection of evidence, or the marshalling of facts, and coming before the commission unprepared, unintentionally, of course, justice is not meted out. I think it would be advisable for the minister to consider further whether he ought not to appoint some one to represent the public. I can imagine that there are many cases, also, in which there is an individual having certain interests on one side, and the railway company having certain interests on the other side, with the general public between, and having interests also. In such a case it would clearly be necessary to have some one representing the public interest. The minister will see that I am anxious that the Solicitor General should have something to do. And I think it would be worth while to consider whether something could not be found for the Solicitor General to do in connection with this Railway Board, or in connection with the enforcement of some of the penal statutes of which we have passed so many within the last few years. Of course, I think the chairman of the board is doing what he can to make certain that on all occasions the man who has not much experience shall be protected against the railway interests. Of course, I must remind the minister of what he seemed to forget—that the railway companies appear by counsel.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not true that where there is a dispute, the board sends its own inspector to learn the facts?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. They may in many cases send a man to inspect, but that is a different proposition from bringing evidence in support of the case; and his action cannot dispense with the necessity of collecting evidence.

Mr. SPROULE. The greatest weakness in this matter is that the railway company always has an expert at hand well skilled in the arguments to be used against individuals. The board are doing good work and making praiseworthy efforts to do what is right. But in some cases this constant presence of the company's counsel seems to be the weakness. They got more familiar with railway companies, than with the people, and sometimes, when the railway companies got through practically dictating what should be done and why, that pretty much settled the case in many instances. The inspector goes to the place and looks over the ground, but it all turns out about as the railway wants it. I saw some cases argued out like that, not before this board, but before the old Railway Board. There is a good deal of merit in so arranging it that any one can present his case, but it does not follow that because they do so that either the individual or the municipality gets full justice.

Mr. ROCHE. I did not know, when I drew the attention of the minister to this article in the Manitoba 'Free Press' that it had been up on a previous occasion, called attention to I think, by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes). I understand that the minister promised that he would give reasons for the discrepancy between the rates charged on the American and on the Canadian side.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, but we were discussing the Intercolonial, and I was asked by

the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton to compare international rates with these.

Mr. ROCHE. When the minister brings the information, will he be in a position to give the rates charged on these articles mentioned in the 'Free Press' on each side of the boundary line?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not an expert in railway rates.

Mr. ROCHE. But the minister has his experts.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Board of Railway Commissioners fix the rates on this side, and the Interstate Commerce Commission on the other side.

Mr. ROCHE. Then, the minister does not attempt to dispute the statement?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was pleased to hear the minister hand out a bouquet to the Manitoba government on the ground that the rates in that province are low, owing to the action of the Conservative government there.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said that was claimed by their friends.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I accept that as a bouquet, and I think it was intended as such. In any case, the facts bear it out. I listened attentively to the minister, and wondered whether he was telling us what was right or not. I have shipped both ways, and my impression is that a freight rate of 10 cents per hundred would cover a distance of 50 miles less on the other side of the line than on this side. I think the minister had better revise what he said.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member (Mr. Campbell) seems to steal the bouquet from his friends.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would not wish to do that and could not. For, if it had not been for my friends the farmers of Manitoba would have been paying two cents per hundred more from Winnipeg than at present.

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave the statement showing the rates from point to point on the different roads, and I have no reason to revise it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did the minister quote the rate from Winnipeg to Port Arthur and to Duluth from Minneapolis?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think I included Winnipeg. I was discussing the rates from the three provinces and took various central points and compared them with practically the same mileage on the south side of the line, and the charge for carrying our grain on the Canadian side to Port Arthur and Fort William, for the same distance, was cheaper on the Canadian side than on the American in nearly every case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. From Saskatchewan and Alberta as well as from Manitoba?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I spoke in the House last year in respect of complaints among farmers in western Ontario, as to insufficient accommodation at small railway stations where they are shipping cream and milk to Toronto and other cities. In some of these stations there is no accommodation for farmers when they drive in, and they are compelled to wait until the train comes to put their cream on board. Application has been made to the railway companies to provide for the farmers, and in almost every case they are told that provision of that kind must be made by the farmers themselves. The railway companies are receiving daily patronage from the farmers, and they should provide suitable accommodation for the protection of the farmers and their horses. The minister should take some note of this and see that the railway companies are compelled to provide some accommodation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not at all object to bringing it to the attention of the Railway Commission, but it would be easy for my hon. friend to drop a line to the Secretary of the Commission.

Mr. BLAIN. It will have more influence coming from the minister. This is a matter that should not be left on the shoulders of any member.

Mr. NESBITT. Do not the farmers ship their milk and cream by express?

Mr. BLAIN. I think so.

Mr. NESBITT. I ship cream constantly, and there is no occasion for my men to wait, they leave the cream on the platform and it is loaded.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not know what is going on in Oxford nor do I know that it makes any difference whether the shipment is by express or freight, but I know that the farmer is compelled to remain at the station and load his cream. There are as many as 150 cans of milk and cream at some stations, and one man could not load them in the time that the trains would stop at the station. The railway companies refuse to allow their trains to stop long enough for that.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will make that suggestion to the Railway Commission.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume the Railway Commission have control of the management of railway stations. I know of cases

where there is a kind of shelter but no fire, and passengers coming in the early morning may have to wait in the shelter for a long time. I am thinking of one at Brentwood, on the Grand Trunk. I suppose if complaint were made to the Commissioners, they have jurisdiction over matters of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. I recognize that where there is an individual case it is a matter for some one to make a complaint, but where it is a matter of policy it is for the minister to express his opinion as to what he desires shall be done and the commissioners will then naturally carry it out. Here is a matter that should receive some attention from the minister. Sectionmen on the railway go out in the morning, have to attend to a certain division of track and do not return to their homes until the evening. They have to contend with all kinds of weather. The railway companies have not provided any shelter for these men. The section extends for a few miles and there is a certain portion of the road at which the men are liable to be about mid-day. I think that, having regard to our climate and the conditions that these men have to contend with, the time has arrived when it ought to be the policy of the government to see that some shelter is provided. I notice that in some places the men themselves have built little huts where they go to take their mid-day meal. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), says that there is some provision in his part of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Well I think the minister should see to it that that would be regarded as something that the government thinks ought to be done, and an expression of opinion in that direction ought to be given by the minister so that all over the country some general system will be adopted and the companies will be compelled to put up some reasonably comfortable shelter at a proper point in each section where the men can take shelter during a storm, and have an opportunity of enjoying a little degree of comfort while they are having their mid-day meal. There might be a stove, a small supply of wood with which they could light a fire and have their meals in some kind of comfort. They should also have a place where they could take shelter from a sudden blizzard or storm. If the minister would announce it as being something that meets with his approval and would intimate to the commissioners that he thought it would be a proper thing to do and to enforce, the public would be apprised of it and the necessary action would be taken in case railway companies do not of their own motion make a movement for carrying out the idea of the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that in most cases it is the custom to have small section houses at different points along the line.

Mr. LENNOX. There is nothing of the kind in any part of the county of Simcoe.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will make a note of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I just want to say a word in support of what has been said by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) in regard to compelling railway companies to construct shelters for the men who are keeping the roads in order. If it is necessary anywhere in Canada it is necessary in the Northwest. There we have 30 to 40 degrees below zero, and almost all of the men have districts ranging from 10 to 15 miles in extent to keep in order. As my hon. friend said they leave home in the morning, they go out and they are subjected to whatever weather there happens to be, no matter how cold, the luncheon they may have taken with them is frozen hard and they are placed under the greatest possible conditions of discomfort. It is time that the government insisted upon the railway companies providing shelters for these men. They need not be very costly; a few dollars will erect a little shanty with a small stove in order to make the lives of these men a little more comfortable. If men are working under comfortable conditions their work is very much better done, and the minister should give careful consideration to what has been suggested by my hon. friend.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 11.48 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 31, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. GERVAIS moved that the first report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Debates of the House, be concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest that my hon. friend let that remain until Monday, and in the meantime be printed in the records.

Mr. GERVAIS. The object of the report is very simple; it is merely to provide for a re-arrangement of the staff, and a re-

definition of the duties of the chief reporter; it is to make him chief editor, and to appoint a sub-editor. But there is no question of the expenditure of money.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman's motion, but I think the report ought to be printed in the records so that we may see what it is.

Motion stands.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 152) respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—Mr. Fowke.

Bill (No. 159) to change the name of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

REVILLON FRERES TRADING COMPANY, LIMITED.

Mr. DEVLIN moved the first reading of Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the Revillon Frères Trading Company, Ltd.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like to know if there has been a petition presented asking for leave to introduce this Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the Bill is referred to the Committee on Standing Orders, which will inquire into it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE BUDGET.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to inquire of the Minister of Finance if he has any intimation to give to us as to the date on which he will deliver the Budget.

Mr. FIELDING. Unless something unexpected occurs, I expect on Tuesday next to deliver the Budget.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolutions reported and agreed to.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FIELDING To further facilitate the passage of the desired Supply Bill, it is necessary that the House consider some matters in Committee of Supply. I therefore beg to move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. This is the last day of the fiscal year. To-morrow a new year begins. As respects a portion of the estimates, the committee has dealt with them, and concurrence has been taken in due course. But there is a large portion of the estimates with which the Committee of Supply has not dealt. It is desirable, therefore, that we should obtain what is commonly called a vote on account. I, therefore, beg to move that, as respects those items of the estimates with which the Committee of Supply has not dealt, we appropriate one-sixth of the amount of each item. I shall not ask that the House be detained by the reading of all the items in detail. I think we may rely on it that the officers of the House have correctly made the calculations.

Resolution reported accordingly and concurred in.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1911, the sum of $2,460,549.81 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

He said: This is the sum we have voted in the supplementary estimates for the current year. The items have been collected by the officers of the House, and I have no doubt are correct.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. I now desire to move a similar resolution covering the appropriations for the new year:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1912, the sum of $45,115,912.81 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the Finance Minister what does one-sixth of the items that have not yet passed amount to?

Mr. FIELDING. The one-sixth amounts to $13,113,283.56.

Mr. HENDERSON. I just thought that, as we passed an item of $13,000,000 in about one minute, we should not hear anything more about blocking Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. I will testify at any time that there has been no blocking of Supply to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON. Nor any other day.

Mr. FIELDING. Sufficient unto the day is the good thereof.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions from Committee of Ways and Means reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 160) for granting to His

Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending respectively the 31st March, 1911, and the 31st March, 1912.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and the second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

Mr. FOSTER. As I do not like to rob the hon. Finance Minister of any of the honours that legitimately belong to him, I might point out that this is probably the first time in the records of Canada when its Finance Minister allowed some 15 months to elapse without making his yearly financial statement.

Mr. FIELDING. We have to suit ourselves to circumstances. New occasions teach new duties.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose if it is possible to go 15 months longer without making that statement, that will be just another of the steps which hon. gentlemen opposite are taking to govern us outside of constitutional practice.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend is unnecessarily disturbed, as both the constitution and the country are safe in our hands.

SUPPLY—BANK ACT.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the question of the Bank Act. Some months ago the hon. minister assured the House that this Bill would be proceeded with this session, and I suppose we may, therefore, take it for granted that it will. But having regard to its importance and the necessity for a very careful investigation of all its provisions, it is to be regretted that the government is so dilatory in proceeding with this legislation. The Bill was introduced on the 15th of December last, and received its first reading. We have now been in session about four months and a half, and it is not too much to say that notwithstanding the agitation in the country over the question of reciprocity, a great deal of concern is felt regarding this Bank Act. After a lapse of 10 years in the history of a country developing so rapidly as this, it would be only natural that our people take a good deal of interest in a measure of this kind especially in view of the many disasters in banking which have occurred in that period, and there is a very strong feeling of disappointment over this unprecedented delay. I presume that this measure will be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee. Before that committee a great many people will want to be heard, and a great deal of time must be taken before that committee gets through with the Bill. It would not be surprising if it required almost as thorough an investigation as the Insurance Bill, and why the government have not seen fit to put it through its second reading and refer it to the committee it is hard to understand. It is absolutely necessary that it should be dealt with this session, and if it is to receive at all the consideration to which it is entitled, it is necessary that the government should not lose any more time in pressing it forward.

To hon. members of the House a great many different questions will present themselves in connection with this Bill. One that occurs to me is that, having regard to the disastrous insufficiency of our legislation up to this day, we must take greater precautions to have a closer inquiry into the issuing of certificates. It might have appeared until recently that the statute was practically sufficient on that point, but we have the most unfortunate proof that it is not sufficient. It will involve considerable discussion and the taking of evidence from various interests to enable us to determine just what precautions should be taken, and what inquiry made in reference to the issuing of these certificates. Another matter is that there seems to be no provision in the Banking Act for suspending or cancelling a certificate. That may have been one of the reasons—it does not appear to be, however—that the Farmers' Bank certificate was not recalled. One experience shows that there should be power somewhere to recall a certificate, or suspend it under circumstances similar to those in connection with the Farmers' Bank. Then, there is a practical question which will probably need a great deal of investigation and will range people on opposite sides, the question of external audit and inspection. I am aware that there are great differences of opinion in reference to that matter, and we will have to investigate it thoroughly. But this and other questions will not be satisfactorily dealt with if this matter is left until about the time when the House is closing and this Bill must be rushed through in the dying hours of the session. Then, I notice that the minister has provided in the new Bill for some protection to the subscribers for stock in the way of giving them notice of the double liability.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to understand whether the House gives general consent to the discussion in this way of a Bill which is on the Order Paper.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) does not enter into the question largely, I have no objection. But the discussion is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is contrary to the rule to anticipate an order that is on the

Paper. Of course, it can be done by consent.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to press a matter which is not fairly before the House. I was calling the attention of the minister (Mr. Fielding) to the fact as an illustration, that this Bill would involve very considerable time, both in the taking of evidence, and in the discussion, as a reason for urging upon him that, if he is going to send the Banking Bill to the Committee on Banking and Commerce—as I assume to be his intention—he should press the Bill to its second reading, so that it may be sent to the committee at an early day.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member (Mr. Lennox) will observe that the Banking Bill is one of a number of government measures on the Order Paper which we have not been able to advance. He will acquit the House I am sure, of being idle, for it has been steadily occupied with matters which, in the judgment of hon. members, must have been important, otherwise time would not have been taken up in discussing them. But we have not been able to advance the Banking Act as I expected to do. I intended, and I still intend, that the Bill shall go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce for the reason that there should be opportunity for the fullest inquiry. When the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) last mentioned the matter, I answered positively that we intended to proceed with the Banking Act this session. I still expect to proceed with it, though I must speak with more reserve, as the matter must depend on the progress made with the business of the House. But, if circumstances make it necessary to bring in a temporary Bill carrying the banks over for another year, I think no harm would be done. A little further time will not be to the disadvantage of any interest concerned. We brought in the Bill with the intention of proceeding with it this session, and may yet be able to do so; but, if business should so shape that some government measures cannot be proceeded with, I do not think that any great public interest will suffer if this measure has to stand for another year.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to ask the minister a question. I have no criticisms to make of the minister's reply more than is suggested by asking whether it would not be possible to have this Bill referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee which could then go on with it without interfering with the business of the House, or the general business of which the government has charge? It seems to me that that could be done.

Mr. FIELDING. If it were a matter of less importance, I would readily concur in that view. But the hon. gentleman has said, quite truly, that this is a very important measure. If it were sent to the committee, it would occupy the attention not only of the committee but of some of the ministers. We will keep the matter in mind with the desire still to expedite the enactment of the measure. But, as I have said, if it is to be deferred for another session, no substantial injury will follow. It is a matter we have to take into consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot appreciate the argument of the Minister of Finance in his reply to the plea that this Bill should now be under way in the Banking and Commerce Committee. For the last three weeks, certainly, we have not been doing a very great deal of business in the House, and what business we have been doing has not, apparently, called for the presence of more than one or two ministers at any sitting, and for a small proportion of the members of the House. So, three weeks have past which might have been utilized for the discussion of this Bill in the Banking and Commerce Committee. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), has had none of his own estimates before the Committee of Supply, and therefore he has been free of attendance so far as the estimates are concerned. Matters that have been discussed, in all but one instance, did not seem to require the attention of the Finance Minister, nor of any of the other ministers except the one who was under review. So, in this respect, three weeks of very valuable time, a splendid opportunity, it seems to me, to have taken up the Banking Act before the Committee on Banking and Commerce and of hearing representations of business and other interests, has been entirely lost. The minister now states that he cannot give a pledge that the Act will be taken up and put through this session. It would certainly seem that it is beyond the category of the doubtful in the mind of the minister that the Bill will not be taken up. The action of the last three weeks seems to make it pretty certain that it cannot be taken up and that it is not the intention to take it up? That is a disadvantage. We have heretofore kept steadily to the custom and tradition of what, I think, is fairly proper unless there be some strong countervailing reason, that the Banking Act should be revised before the expiry of the time. If there ever was a time when the people of Canada felt a lively interest in the provisions of the Banking Act, it is now—because of circumstances which it is unnecessary for me to recall. At such a time, when the minds of people are aroused, is the time when we are sure to get the best representation of various opinions. I do not mean it would be proper to pass a measure under a period of abnormal excitement, but there is nothing

like that apparent in the country. What is apparent in the country is that there is need of a revision of the Bank Act, not such a formal revision as we have had the last two or three times, but some revision which should go to the root of what are acknowledged to be great weaknesses in the Act. At such a time when the public mind is alive to the question would seem to be the most opportune period for taking up the matter and having these different phases thoroughly examined. I regret on the whole that the Finance Minister has practically intimated to the House and to the country that this measure will not be taken up for examination, and is not likely to be passed at the present session.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before you leave the Chair I want to bring to the notice of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver)—who happens not to be present at the moment—an order of the House which was granted the other day with regard to what is called the Aylwin Irrigation grant. I am anxious to have the papers laid on the table as early as possible. I know it will take no time, the file is on the table of the official in charge of that particular department, and for reasons of my own I am anxious to have it here.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the hon. gentleman's inquiry.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Railways and canals—contribution of the government railways to the faculty of McGill university towards the foundation of a school of railway engineering and transportation in general, in connection with the faculty of applied science, $2,500.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to ask the minister with reference to this and the next item, whether this grant is to apply to any other colleges. I should think, for instance, that the University of Toronto and other educational bodies throughout Canada would be anxious to avail themselves of this grant, and I presume the minister would be willing to make a similar grant to the other institutions.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are two institutions that have branches of railway engineering, and particularly they give lectures on transportation, rates, tariffs and that kind of thing. If any of the other universities were doing the same thing, I would be glad to consider their application.

Governor General's cars—attendance, repairs and alterations to, $2,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an annual vote. Up to September 30, we had expended only $659 of last year's vote.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Is this car kept continuously for the Governor General's use?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are two cars kept for the use of the Governor General, and for no other purpose.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Do we understand that a certain amount of money is used every year to keep up these two cars? I should think that he could not occupy more than one very well. I recollect there has been a good deal of talk about these private cars, and others for members of the government. I think the minister had better explain this item more fully.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I have said, last year there were only expended out of this vote $659. But there may be some repairs required for which we would need $2,500 a year on the two cars, but it is not likely we will spend half of it. Repairs are constantly being made on the cars. You may start out on a trip and break down. For instance, there have been repairs to the electric light on the cars, belts break, and sometimes they break twice in a month. We have an electrician who looks after them. This item includes attending to the electrical apparatus, the storage battery, sundries, smithwork, repairs, fuel, &c., on the 'Cornwall' and on the 'York.' As long as you keep a car you have to keep it in repair.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How many private cars are there for the use of members of the government, and what do they cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have four cars. The car 'Ottawa' is used nearly altogether by Mr. Schreiber in connection with his inspection work on the Grand Trunk Pacific. The items are found on page W—47. The car 'Ottawa' is used for other purposes when it is desired. Car '139' is the car that the Prime Minister generally uses, and it can be used for other purposes. It cost last year $1,741. Car '109' is the car the Minister of Railways and Canals uses. That cost $1,266.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Does that mean for repairs?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it means for running the car the entire year. The Minister of Railways does not have to pay anything to any railway for drawing his car. It is his right to have it drawn for nothing.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How about other members of the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know about the others.

Mr. CROSBY. Do you have to pay when you cross the line?

Mr. GRAHAM. The car of the Minister of Railways is taken on any system in America. As a matter of fact, I have the same right as the president of a railway company by virtue of being head of the Railway Department.

Mr. FOSTER. The country pays for it, because you have to provide the same courtesy to magnates who come from the other side.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it is an exchange of courtesy between all the railways. Car 'No. 128,' $534.29. These are the amounts paid for the upkeep of official cars during the past year.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Does the minister pretend to say that he does not know whether the ministers have to pay for hauling their private cars over the different railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. I never asked them that question, and I do not know. When they take the car from the Railway Department they have to make all their own arrangements and provide for the food supply, transportation and everything else.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). We should have some more ministers here, so that we could get an answer to these questions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many private cars are there on the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not call them private cars; we call them official. The cars which I have been talking of, belong to the Department of Railways and Canals, and not to the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). You have extra ones for the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. The officials of the Intercolonial railway have their own the same as the officials of any other road.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many official and private cars have the government altogether?

Mr. GRAHAM. Four.

Mr. LENNOX. How many on the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. Three.

Mr. LENNOX. How many have the Railway Commissioners here?

Mr. GRAHAM. One. They asked for another last year, but they did not get it. The Transcontinental Railway Commission I think has one, and the chief engineer of the Transcontinental railway has one.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I should think that the government would be very much crowded if they have only four cars and two of these are required to take care of the Governor General.

Mr. CROSBY.

Mr. GRAHAM. He carries a suite wherever he goes.

Mr. FOSTER. They must bunk together?

Mr. CROSBY. I understand that there are only four cars owned by the government and under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, that does not include the three on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. CROSBY. We want to know how many cars there are, including those for the use of the members of the government and also those used by officials of the government in order that we may make a comparison between the number of cars owned by the present government and the number that we had in 1896 when this government came into power. We used to hear a great deal about this private car business when we only had one car for the Governor General and all combined. I know that some of the officials of the Intercolonial railway have cars of their own with which they travel from one end of the road to the other.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have repeated it, but I will repeat it again, for fear that my hon. friend did not hear at this distance——

Mr. CROSBY. I heard it very well, but I want to get the facts.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have told the committee that there are four cars owned by the Department of Railways and Canals, and three owned by the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. CROSBY. That is seven?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would appear to be —yes.

Mr. CROSBY. I understood the minister to say that it would appear to be? Does he not know that it is seven?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are some self-evident facts.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister says that we have four here and three on the Intercolonial railway, which appear to be seven. He does not really know exactly what he has. I understand that we have seven cars.

Mr. LENNOX. I think we have twelve—two used by the Governor General, four for the government, three for the Intercolonial railway, one for the Railway Commissioners, one for the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, and one for the engineer.

Mr. CROSBY. What appearance has that now?

Mr. LENNOX. Another may appear at any time.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—remuneration to government director of, $2,000.

Mr. LENNOX. What is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the remuneration of the representative of the government under the statute on the Grand Trunk Pacific Board.

Mr. LENNOX. How much has that cost up to date?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be $12,000 in six years.

Mr. LENNOX. Are there any perquisites or anything that would go to increase this amount?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not included in any return we have got with reference to the expense of building the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; it does not come out of the Transcontinental railway vote.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not classified in any return we have got as being one of the expenses in connection with this road?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not.

Mr. LENNOX. But it is solely for the purpose of this road?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; not for the Transcontinental railway, but for the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. LENNOX. I know it is for the Grand Trunk Pacific, but I do not think there is any distinction to be drawn between the two things.

Mr. GRAHAM. Excepting that we are building one of them.

Mr. LENNOX. We are building one, and we are having this director who is costing $2,000 a year, and when we come to make up the total cost of the line from ocean to ocean, it will include this item?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it would include that item.

Mr. LENNOX. This is only a little item, but there might be a lot of the same kind. For instance, I asked a question yesterday about the supervision of the Quebec bridge. I asked:

What are the names of the engineers and other persons acting for and on behalf of the government, in what capacity did these persons respectively act, when and for how long, and what were the sums paid each of them for these services? Are these sums exclusive of the sum of about $7,000,000 said to have been paid out on taking over the Quebec bridge undertaking?

I am told that there were various officers employed, and that no charge has been made in connection with the building of the Quebec bridge in reference to any of them. For instance, it is said that Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, was one of them.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was chief engineer of the department.

Mr. LENNOX. He was chief engineer of the department, and although a large portion of his time is taken up in looking after the Quebec bridge, no part of his salary is apportioned to this expense.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think there was very much of his time taken up.

Mr. LENNOX. It comes down to one thing or the other; either some of them had assigned to their charge the supervision of the Quebec bridge or else the Quebec bridge had no supervision at all. I do not know which horn of the dilemma it ultimately rests upon. Then it says that Collingwood Schreiber, chief engineer of the department, was succeeded by M. J. Butler on July 29, 1905, as chief engineer; Robert C. Douglas, bridge engineer, inspector of substructure; E. B. Johnston, engineer, Department of Railways and Canals, checking up monthly progress estimates on superstructure; G. A. Bell, as auditor of the Department of Railways and Canals; and it says that the above officers were paid out of civil government under their regular yearly salaries and received no further remuneration. Would the minister explain how much of the time of any one of these officers was devoted to the supervision of the Quebec bridge. I understand from the evidence that one official went down to the Phoenix shops to supervise the work while it was being turned out. How many men representing the government were actually engaged their whole time, or most of their time, in connection with the Quebec bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact Mr. Schreiber, or his successor, Mr. Butler, were not supervising the superstructure of the Quebec bridge at all. The Quebec bridge was being built by a company. The bonds were guaranteed by the Dominion, and Mr. Bell audited these accounts, as he does the other accounts of the department.

Mr. LENNOX. Something like the Auditor General?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, he is supposed to do that work in his official capacity. Mr. Johnston checked over the progress estimates for the purpose of showing that the government was all right in releasing its guarantee. Mr. Tolmie was sent down to the Phoenix shops, and his salary was about $70 a month.

Mr. LENNOX. He is not mentioned in this answer at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will have that inquired into.

Mr. LENNOX. I am endeavouring to find out how many men had some charge over this old Quebec bridge on behalf of the government to see that it was properly constructed and how much the services of these men cost.

Mr. GRAHAM. Those officers mentioned are all servants of the department, and not a cent of their remuneration was charged to the Quebec bridge. I cannot make that any clearer.

Mr. LENNOX. I am satisfied with that. I understand these men had not supervision of the bridge in any shape or form. But what we have a right to know is what men, if any, looked after the construction of this bridge to see, in the interests of the country, that a safe and proper structure was being erected?

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, Mr. Cooper, of New York, was accepted by all parties as the inspecting engineer, and he is the only man who had oversight. The government did not have an inspector. It is in the evidence that Mr. Cooper said he would resign if any man was appointed in that capacity. Mr. Cooper was accepted by all parties as the best authority on the subject that could be found at that time. The government was not supervising the bridge and had no person there for that purpose.

Mr. LENNOX. When we made the guarantee it was arranged that the government should exercise supervision and would have a competent man in charge.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Cooper was agreed to for that purpose.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Cooper was an engineer, residing in New York, and a man in feeble health.

Mr. GRAHAM. Only since that time.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know whether Mr. Cooper ever came to visit the bridge at all, but at all events he was not exercising any degree of actual inspection on the work. As I understand it, there was no one representing the government inspecting the work, but I did see in the evidence that one man went down to the manufacturing concern to inspect some work there. I want to get his name and what it cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. LENNOX. Who is the director?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Brunet.

Mr. LENNOX. Where does he reside?

Mr. GRAHAM. Montreal.

Mr. LENNOX. What is his occupation?

Mr. GRAHAM. He was a commissioner of the Transcontinental railway, and resigned that position, and was appointed to this.

Mr. LENNOX. Has he any other occupation that takes up his time or attention?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not, I think he is a man of considerable wealth.

Mr. LENNOX. Is he the first appointee or has it been in the hands of others.

Mr. GRAHAM. He is the only appointee, I think.

Surveys and inspection—canals, $25,000.

Mr. LENNOX. What is this item for, it is increased?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am frequently asked to make surveys of canals, and this vote is for that purpose. For instance, I have been requested to look over the Rideau canal, as boat-owners complain that it is not in proper shape at the present time. Incidentally it might develop some water-power, but that would only be incidental to the survey. At present I have some figures as to that, but they are not satisfactory.

Surveys and inspection of railways including inspection Grand Trunk Pacific, $50,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have to inspect every railway that is subsidized before the subsidy is paid, and this vote provides for that. The inspection of the branch lines was taken out of this vote, and the inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific is also provided for here.

Mr. LENNOX. Of that $22,000 expended last year did you expend anything in reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. GRAHAM. $12,225.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that included in the sum of $94,000,000 which the minister stated as having been expended on the Transcontinental?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, that is not included in the Transcontinental. That would be west of Winnipeg, where we have to inspect the line for guarantee purposes.

Mr. LENNOX. When this scheme was launched, the whole scheme from ocean to ocean was spoken of as the Transcontinental railway, and the division from Winnipeg to Moncton I understand to be the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway. Now the portion west of Winnipeg is said to be the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Canals, collection of revenue, $1,250,720.

Mr. GRAHAM. This item is really the working expenses of all the canals. It is increased over last year by about $100,000, which is to be used in the adjustment of the wages of the men operating the canals. We have had requests from them all, and

the deputy and chief engineer will go into the whole question, with the view of making a general adjustment. Everything else is the same as last year. There are about 1,900 men employed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Are any of the men to be provided for employed on the Newmarket canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. They will be when it is completed.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the aggregate amount of the salaries of these employees at present?

Mr. GRAHAM. The aggregate of all the salaries last year was $1,106,460.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). What is the average salary you pay to the lock-keepers?

Mr. GRAHAM. Take the Sault canal: the lock-master gets $70 a month, motormen, linemen, lamp trimmers and night watchmen, $50; painters, $2.50 a day; carpenters, $2.50. On the Rideau canal, lock-keepers get $1.50, lock-masters $1.50, caretakers $36 a month.

Mr. RUSSELL. What percentage of increase will they get?

Mr. GRAHAM. It seems to be nearly 10 per cent, but it may not work out that way, because there may be some men in the upper grades who are getting enough. My idea is to give the increase mostly to the men who are getting the lower pay.

Mr. EDWARDS. Do I understand it to be the minister's intention to apply this increase to the lock-men on all the canals?

Mr. GRAHAM. We intend to adjust the salaries of all the employees. It will result in an increase to the men who are paid the lower salaries.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then I would be justified in telling the men at Kingston Mills, Brewer's Mills, and along the Rideau that there is a good prospect of their getting an increase?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so.

Mr. RUSSELL. How many months in the year are these men employed?

Mr. GRAHAM. The lock-masters have employment the year round, the lock-labourers during the season of navigation. Then we have repairs going on at both ends of the season, and the lock-labourers are given a preference over others on the repair staff.

To pay damages by flooding—Trent canal, $30,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have paid for land damages along the Trent canal since 1908, $131,345. Last year we paid $29,981 to October 31.

Mr. LENNOX. On the main item which is held over, I intend calling the attention of the minister to a case which was before the House last year. I forget the gentleman's name, but it was the case of a lawyer. I asked a question or two this year, and did not get a satisfactory answer.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was engaged by the Justice Department.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the Minister of Justice last year, and the Minister of Railways to make two promises, namely, that they would investigate and would probably, under certain circumstances, prosecute.

Mr. GRAHAM. I never made any such statement.

Mr. LENNOX. The statements are on record in 'Hansard.' I put a question this year, and was told that nothing had been done.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Minister of Justice answered the question, not I.

Mr. LENNOX. Both gentlemen spoke last year, and what they said is on record, and, according to my construction of what they said, they have not carried out either promise.

Mr. WALLACE. A return was asked for which has not been brought down.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall try and get it. There was a return brought down, but perhaps not this year.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think any was brought down last year.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I can find the return, I suppose that will answer the purpose.

Salaries and allowances to lighthouse keepers, $450,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This shows an increase of $50,000. The House is aware that for some time recommendations have been made by a large number of members for larger salaries to the light keepers. Some years ago we thought of classifying the light keepers according to the importance of their lights. This $50,000 increase will provide for an augmentation of salaries of from 15 per cent to 35 per cent.

Agencies, rents and contingencies—lighthouse and coast service, $60,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This shows an apparent increase of $10,000 but really there is none. We had in the different agencies some men paid out of this vote, and others out of maintenance and construction, and we thought that all the men employed permanently in some agencies should be paid entirely out of this vote. We take $10,000 to provide for the transfer.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, $650,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This shows an increase of $100,000. It is accounted for by the fact that certain steamers, which had formerly been paid out of this vote, will be paid next year out of the vote for Dominion steamers. In the latter there will be an increase which makes a decrease in this.

Mr. ARTHURS. In my riding certain repairs were made to the channel in Lake Nipissing under the direction of the Department of Public Works. The engineers of the department reported that certain changes in the lights were necessary on account of the change in the channel. The light is a lamp stuck on a pole, and is more likely to lead a vessel into trouble than out of it. Would that come under the minister's department?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is under our control if it is a question of light.

Mr. ARTHURS. I have a largely signed petition showing the facts.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals, and providing suitable boats for carrying on construction work; also for the improvement of the West Coast Trail, B.C., $1,000,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This sum is the same as last year. The work is divided into two parts, one which is administered by the chief engineer, and comprises the construction of the lighthouse. The other provides for the apparatus. On construction apparatus we propose to make the following expenditures:

British Columbia	$116,000
Ontario	165,000
Quebec	70,000
Montreal district	18,000
New Brunswick	30,000
Nova Scotia	125,000
Prince Edward Island	17,000
General	18,000
Total	$500,000

So far as construction is concerned, we estimate that the following will be required: British Columbia, $300,000; Ontario, $60,000; Quebec , $100,000; Montreal, $1,000; maritime provinces, $85,000; general account, $115,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is the distinction made between Quebec and Montreal?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are two agencies, the Montreal and the Quebec. The Quebec agency covers from Quebec city down to the sea, including the lights in the Strait of Belle Isle and on the coast of Newfoundland.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Dominion maintain lights on Newfoundland?

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, we could not expect Newfoundland to light the Strait of Belle Isle because they are not interested in the navigation of those waters, and the same in regard to the southern coast of Newfoundland. So, we obtained permission from the Newfoundland authorities to erect lights where the interests of navigation demanded.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these lights are to be established on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. BRODEUR. The principal works are. Flat Island, new lighthouse; Bagot Bluff, completon of station; Little Metis, new dwelling; Kamouraska, new dwelling; Natashkwan, light; Ferolles Point, new station; Carleton, rebuilding light; Father Point, repairs to dwelling; Cape Chatte, submarine bell station.

Mr. SPROULE. This is intended to cover repairs as well as the erection of new lighthouses?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, this is for construction; repairs come under the vote we have just passed.

Mr. SPROULE. We are told, year after year, that this channel between Montreal and Quebec is perfectly lighted, and much is said of the improvements in navigation and the consequent reductions in marine insurance rates effected by this government. This is what we have been told for the last three or four years, but every succeeding session money is asked for new lights. I am not complaining of the expenditure; if new lights are needed, it is the part of wisdom to provide them. But I do complain of the statement repeated year after year that this government has finished this work of lighting and otherwise improving this channel.

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount we ask this year is not very large, and if the hon. member will consider the figures I gave, he will find that there are only two new lighthouses, those at Flat Island and Natashkwan. This latter is not properly in the St. Lawrence channel, that is, the channel navigated by the large ships; it is on the north shore where the channel is used by vessels of two or three thousand tons plying between Blanc Sablon and Natashkwan and other north shore ports. Ferolles Point and Flat Island are to have new stations. These are on the Newfoundland coast of the Strait of Belle Isle. These have been asked for by the federation of shipping and the shipping interests generally. They have been reported on favourably by the lighthouse board and I think we should provide for their erection. These other expenditures are mainly for dwellings for stations already in existence. Little Metis, for instance—the expenditure

there is for a new dwelling, but the station has been in existence, perhaps, for fifty years. The same is true of Kamouraska. At Carleton the lighthouse is to be reconstructed in part. The expenditure at Father Point is for a dwelling, and at Cape Chatte is a submarine bell station. We are constantly in receipt of communications from different maritime bodies stating that the work we have been carrying on in the St. Lawrence has been fruitful of good results. However, we do not wish to prevent further improvements, and give careful attention to requests for improvements that come to us.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has given himself unnecessary trouble, giving one kind of answer at one time, and fifteen minutes later a different kind. I asked how much of this money was to be spent for new lighthouses on the St. Lawrence, and he told me it would all be spent in that way. Now he says it is for the erection of dwelling houses and for repairs. My object was to find out how much was to be spent for new stations and how much for improvements. In his latest explanation he says that there are only two new lighthouses contemplated.

Mr. BRODEUR. I misunderstood my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), I thought he was asking how much was to be spent on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. SPROULE. My aim was to ascertain whether the St. Lawrence was properly lighted, and if so, and if the work was completed, it seemed strange that we would have every year an item of about the same size for doing practically the same work. I am not at all objecting to lights and lighthouses where they are needed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before passing this item, I would like to ask the minister with reference to wireless telegraph stations. Last January a return was brought down in which I noticed that the minister had expended over $200,000, and the revenue from that expenditure only amounted to about $2,000. He states in this return that the bulk of these wireless telegraph stations are operated under contract by the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, as aids to navigation. Would the minister give us an idea of what that contract contains, and the amount of money that is likely to come back to the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. That does not come under this item. The wireless telegraph system has been transferred to the Naval Service. It comes under item 235, that may come up this evening.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister if he is meeting with any better success with regard to the gas and whistling buoys that are established, especially about the Bay of Fundy. I notice that a good many of them often go adrift. It would appear there must be some cause for their going adrift, either that they are not sufficiently anchored, or that the chain is too slight. There must be some method by which the government could maintain these buoys in place. When this matter was up before, the minister stated that there was so much trouble with these buoys that he was really considering whether it was worth while to place them there at all. This is a very important matter, and where navigators are in the habit of seeing a lighted buoy when they come along at night, they are much embarrassed when they fail to find one. I would like to know if the government has adopted any different policy, has found out any better means of keeping the buoys in place?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is true that there were in the Bay of Fundy some complaints with regard to these buoys going adrift. They are very heavy buoys. Unfortunately, we had only one ship which could attend to them, and in spite of all the efforts which were made in the way of anchors, we found that a certain number, especially in very heavy gales, went adrift. I gave instructions a little more than a year ago that another vessel should be sent to the Bay of Fundy to assist the 'Lansdowne' in looking after them. We sent the 'Stanley,' removing it from the Prince Edward Island route. When the 'Earl Grey' was put on that route we thought we could dispense with the services of the 'Stanley,' and we sent her to the Bay of Fundy. For more than a year now the 'Stanley' has been in the Bay of Fundy, and has been assisting the 'Lansdowne.' We have no complaints lately of the buoys going adrift, or if any did go adrift, it was immediately reported, and the agent at St. John sent a vessel up there to see that they were put right. My hon. friend knows that there is a very strong current in the Bay of Fundy, and that accounts probably for these buoys going adrift. But with the addition of another ship we find that the number of accidents has been materially reduced.

Mr. DANIEL. How often are these buoys regularly visited to see that the carbide is sufficient and the light is burning?

Mr. BRODEUR. The orders given to the agent are to see that all the buoys are visited. There is no set time fixed for visiting them, but he is instructed to see that they are always kept in order, these are the general instructions. Besides that, when other vessels, merchant vessels, pass that way, if they see that the light is not strong enough, they are asked to report to us, and a vessel is sent on immediately to make repairs.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the government not know how long the amount of carbide that is put into one of these buoys is supposed to last?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is supposed to last for some months. Sometimes it happens that the supply does not need to be renewed for three or four months. But the buoys are visited much oftener, in order to see that the light is well maintained, and to renew it with carbide if necessary.

Mr. DANIEL. I think in the case of the Old Proprietor buoy that went wrong, the evidence was that it had not been visited within a year.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was at a time when we had only one ship, the 'Lansdowne,' there, which is not a very fast ship, and according to the evidence, she tried several times to get near that buoy and replenish the light. But it was found impossible for some reason or other, and the buoy went wrong. I see by the reports which we have that since the 'Stanley' has been on the route there has been such an improvement that no complaints have reached the department.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to bring along with him a statement of the total amount received by the Marconi Company for the 18,000 messages that they forwarded, and if possible the profits that they made out of these stations? Would the minister also be good enough to give us the reason why the government should build these important stations and place them in the hands of the Wireless Telegraph Company?

Mr. BRODEUR. These stations were built as aids to navigation. Most of them are situated at places where no business was expected. It was found necessary in the interests of navigation that these wireless telegraph stations should be established along the St. Lawrence in order that if an accident occurred to a vessel plying on these waters she could put herself into communication with Montreal and Quebec and receive succour. I will be very glad to supply my hon. friend with the information if we have it in the department.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We gave them 18,000 messages, amounting to 265,000 words, showing that considerable business is being done, and while I appreciate the work that is being done I wonder why it is not under government control.

Mr. BRODEUR. These messages are government messages, and there is no money coming to the company out of them. This business is done on the Pacific coast, not by the Marconi Company, but by the government system of wireless which is established there.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox and Addington). How many lighthouses have we in Newfoundland, and what does it cost us to maintain them?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will supply the list in a moment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I take it for granted that these vessels that go around visiting the lights, &c., are all charged up to the vote for the construction of lighthouses?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not all the vessels.

Mr. REID (Grenville). A good many are used for that purpose?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And they are charged to this account?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I have made a change this year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see by the heading that they are charged to this account.

Mr. BRODEUR. For the hiring of vessels. We have not changed the vote because sometimes we may want vessels for the purpose of carrying out our work. But I have adopted a different system this year. I thought it would be more convenient for every member of this House if all the Dominion steamers were put under one vote. If my hon. friend will look at the vote for Dominion steamers he will find an increase which provides for an expenditure under that vote on vessels that formerly came under the item for the maintenance of vessels.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand there are some vessels used in connection with the construction of lights. This item is more than construction. In last year's Auditor General's Report we see the headings: 'Construction of Lights, Aids to Navigation', &c.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there were some last year, but I am changing the system. I thought that all these vessels should be put under the one vote of Dominion steamers. But we have left the vote as it was before because it may be necessary to hire boats to carry out our work. In British Columbia, which has a very extensive coast, we are carrying on some very large construction work. It may be necessary, in order to carry out this work expeditiously, to hire boats, and in order to do that we provide in this estimate for the hiring of boats.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The item in the estimates is:

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals, and providing suitable boats for car-

rying on construction work; also for the improvement of the West Coast trail, B.C.

Under that heading would come aids to navigation, and so on, and under that heading would be work done at Sorel, and charged to this account. There must be some work in connection with aids to navigation. Boats must be repaired.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, those boats belong to what is called the St. Lawrence channel and they do not come under this vote at all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know what procedure the minister follows now in so far as the building of these lighthouses and the fitting of them up is concerned. The minister knows that after he took charge of the department there were a great many of these lighthouses built under his instructions. We all agreed that many of these lighthouses were necessary, and there were many more required. I believe that this House will be unanimous in voting any money necessary for the improvement of navigation. I do not know whether the minister changed the method of erecting these lighthouses when he took charge of the department. The minister knows that the course was first to select the place, then to give the work out practically without tender, send men down to do it and buy the supplies that were necessary at exorbitant prices without tender. Take cement, as an instance; I remember that we had one instance of buying cement at very much more than any private individual would purchase it for. Then, there were other items charged up to these lighthouse buildings. There was $4,000 or $5,000 worth of files charged up to the building of a lighthouse, or something of that kind. I think that was done after the minister took charge.

Mr. BRODEUR. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; the files were before my time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We had the instances of Merwin being paid from 50 to 150 per cent more than any private individual could purchase goods for, and although we brought it to the minister's attention he still continues to do business with the same man for a year or two; at least, I noticed that he was doing business with this same firm and at the same prices. We objected very strongly, but the minister still does business at the same old stand, and at the same old prices, even after the disclosures of the Judge Cassels' investigation.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). They have Lymburner now.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes. Lymburner is a new man, and they are paying him 150 per cent more than anybody else could purchase the stuff for. There are instances in the Auditor General's Report which show that graft still continues. There are some items here that look rather fishy. Last session the minister wanted an ice-breaker and plans were made for a boat that would go through the St. Lawrence and Welland canals, and tenders were to be called for, but the size of the boat was enlarged so that she could not go through the canals, and hence our Canadian builders could not tender.

Mr. BRODEUR. Was that the 'Earl Grey?'

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know her name, but the plans were changed so as to make the boat one foot wider, and one foot longer than the canal, and it seems to me it does not make any difference whether an ice-breaker was a foot longer or a foot shorter. Then again when tenders were called for, the minister did not accept the lowest tender but paid $150,000 more.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister paid a very large sum in excess of the lowest tender. Now, the excuse the minister is going to give is that the boat he purchased can go 17 knots an hour, while the one originally provided for only could go 16½ knots, but I cannot see what difference the extra half knot per hour would make in an ice-breaker. The tenderers were all good responsible firms, and yet the minister did not accept the lowest. Then again the minister is going to tell us that some of the firms that tendered were not well known, but as I understand it the plans and specifications are all furnished by a marine architect, and they are followed exactly, and there is no reason why any reliable firm cannot do the work. Another reason the minister is going to give for having this boat built in England is that no firm in Canada is used to building ice-breakers. He told us he had to go to Russia himself to find out how an ice-breaker was built, and that there is only one firm in England competent to build an ice-breaker. But let me tell him that we have in Prescott a car ferry which is also used as an ice-breaker, and it will go through any amount of ice, and it was built by the Polson Iron Works at Toronto. Then, the Grand Trunk Company have a ferry running to Cobourg that will go through any quantity of ice, and she was not built in England. I would like to get some new reason from the minister as to why this boat was not built in Canada. A few years ago the Minister of Finance told us that if they could buy steamers cheaper in England they would buy them there. The Minister of Marine gave an

order for a small vessel that cost $15,000 less in England than he could buy it for in Canada, but if he added the duty on the iron and other materials, and the extra cost of labour in Canada, he would find that it would be cheaper to get it in Canada. I am satisfied that there is some thing that looks—if I may use the word—crooked in the way the whole deal is put through. If I or any other private individual wanted a steamer I would go myself or I would send my head man to negotiate with the builder, but the minister will have to admit that he does not negotiate with the builder or have his deputy minister or any of his high officials do it. The first thing he will do if he wants a vessel is to send down for Mr. Lewis of Lewis Brothers, hardware merchants, of Montreal. The minister knows that Mr. Lewis is the grit organizer and heeler of the province of Quebec, the man who handles the funds for the Liberal party, and he says to him: I want a vessel, and Mr. Lewis goes over to England, and does the whole business for the Minister of Marine.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). And gets a rake off.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know who gets it, but the rake-off must go to somebody. Mr. Lewis does not travel backward and forward to England for nothing.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would like to know where my hon. friend gets that information; his statements are most extraordinary.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the minister deny that he buys vessels through Mr. Lewis of Montreal?

Mr. BRODEUR. All the vessels we have bought of late years have been bought on public tender.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Take the 'Earl Grey' as a sample.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That boat was bought from Mr. Lewis.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Lewis bought that vessel, and the way the minister gets over it is that he puts him down as agent for Vickers Sons, & Maxim.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Lewis is the agent, or rather the middleman, to call him by his right name. Mr. Lewis makes the deal with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to buy this vessel. The minister calls for public tenders, and he gets six tenders. I think that of Vickers-Maxim is the highest. Then the minister refers the matter to his naval architect to find out which of the firms tendering is the best. The naval architect is Mr. Duguid, who was employed by Vickers-Maxim, and who was sent over here, where the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gives him a job, and, of course, he recommends this firm because they have had experience in building these ice-breakers, while the others have never had any experience; and so the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has to pay a very large amount above the amount of the lowest tender. The minister may as well own up and say that the difference between the lowest price and what he paid was a loss to this country, and that he was the means of losing that amount. That was the rake-off that went to somebody—to Mr. Lewis, and what he did with it the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should tell us; because a certain percentage of it went into the campaign fund. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries smiles. He is glad to see the country lose a large amount of money by that kind of management of his department. It is getting to be a serious thing, having the department carried on in that way. After the experience the minister had, not only from members of this House and from the Public Accounts Committee, but from Judge Cassels, we looked to him to give us a good deal better department than he has; but it seems to come out in the same old way—when you drop one middleman, another looms up. I have asked the minister to explain a few points, and I would like him to give me an answer.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will certainly give the hon. gentleman all the information he wants in regard to the 'Earl Grey' or any other business of the department, since I have been connected with it. The hon. gentleman has been labouring under a delusion in stating that I have made purchases of files from Merwin. These files were purchased before I was in the department. The same is true of Merwin's accounts. Some of them have been paid since I have been in the department, but for purchases made before I came there. I am surprised that my hon. friend did not know that. We have now in that department a purchasing agent who makes all the purchases. He is absolutely independent and free from any political influence, and everything is done above board. My hon. friend said that we were not willing to encourage Canadian ship-building. In that respect also he is mistaken. In all cases where the difference between the tender of a Canadian shipbuilder and the tender of a British shipbuilder is not more than 20 per cent, I recommend to my colleagues to give the contract to the Canadian shipbuilder, as it is in the interest of the country that we should develop the Canadian ship-building industry. There is no duty on ships coming from England, while our Canadian ship-

builders are obliged to pay a large amount of duty sometimes on the materials which go into the ships they build. Besides, the Canadian shipbuilder is obliged, under our law, to observe the fair wage clause, while the British builder is not. Under these circumstances, the policy of the department and of the government has been to give the Canadian shipbuilder some protection and consideration.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When did you commence?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some years ago. My hon. friend cannot mention one case in which a Canadian shipbuilder who has tendered at not more than 20 per cent above the British shipbuilder, has not got the contract.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have given the case of the 'Earl Grey.' You changed the plans, making the vessel one foot longer and one foot wider.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let us come to that case. My hon. friend has been trying to investigate it, and he knows it exactly; but he did not give all the particulars that might have been given to show how the construction of the 'Earl Grey' was carried out. The 'Earl Grey' was an ice-breaker required for the Northumberland Straits. For years we had complaints that the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland was not satisfactory. We were bound by the Act of Union to provide as good a steam service as possible. Some years ago the Canadian government purchased the 'Stanley' and later the 'Minto,' for that route. For many years these two vessels had been performing that service, but still it was not satisfactory, and the people of Prince Edward Island complained that we were not fulfilling the terms of union. What did we do? We took steps to ascertain whether it would not be possible to have an ice-breaker strong enough to pass through even 15 inches of ice.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Do you mean to say that could not be built in Toronto?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not say that it could not, but I am stating the facts as they are. The department got experts, and we studied the question for some years. My hon. friend states that the Naval Architect of the department was formerly employed by Vickers-Maxim. That is true, and my hon. friend will find by the records of the department that this man was selected under the following circumstances. We wanted as a naval architect a man of ability and experience, whose opinion could be relied on in all cases. My predecessor applied to Lord Strathcona, and Lord Strathcona recommended this man. My hon. friend finds fault with the government for having such a good man in our service. I think that on the contrary he should compliment us. In order to get a competent naval architect we went to England, which is the greatest ship-building country in the world. That is how Mr. Duguid came to be selected. Before we came to a decision about the 'Earl Grey,' I made a trip myself to Germany accompanied by the technical officers of my department, and we found that in England we could get better ice-breakers than anywhere else. We had to prepare plans and this naval architect prepared them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did he draw the plans himself?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. My hon. friend complains that the plans were changed and that the vessel could not get into the Great Lakes. I do not remember whether the plans prepared by Mr. Duguid prevented her from going through the canals or not, but my hon. friend knows that the plans were referred to the British Admiralty.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Supposing they had been, if the plans had been referred to the British Admiralty, why could not the contract have been given a Toronto firm?

Mr. BRODEUR. Let me make my statement and I will come to that. The plans were referred to the British Admiralty, as my hon. friend well knew, why did he not mention that in his remarks?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not know that. How should I know?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, my hon. friend knew.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What difference does that make? Suppose they had been referred——

Mr. BRODEUR. The plans were referred to the British Admiralty. After examining them the British Admiralty recommended certain changes in the dimensions and we followed the recommendations. Had I not done so, I would have been open to censure. I accepted the plans as amended by the British Admiralty, and these plans required a vessel which was not wider than could pass through the canals. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman brought up this question, because the facts show conclusively the department could not have done otherwise than it did. What happened since? We called for public tenders. We did not go and negotiate with Mr. Lewis, of Montreal, or anybody else, but we called for tenders and awarded the contract to a firm recommended as being best able to execute it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who recommended it?

Mr. BRODEUR. The technical officers of my department, Mr. Desbarats and Mr. Duguid. Mr. Desbarats is one of the best engineers in this country, and has had great experience in the construction of ships. I accepted the recommendation of these men, and the firm which was given the contract was not the one which had submitted the highest tender. There were other tenders very much higher, but the tender of this firm according to the laws, they had made the necessary deposit, and were the firm best able to do the work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know if the minister referred the first plans to the British Admiralty. There were two plans made, as the minister practically admits; and in the first the boat was one foot narrower and one foot shorter than the one actually built. Were those plans all submitted to the British Admiralty for its approval? Was it the admiralty who changed the plans? I never heard that it was, and that is a point which has not been clearly explained. I want the minister to say whether the first plans were submitted to the admiralty, and if these plans had been revised, or if the admiralty suggested that the boat was too narrow or too short, and if new plans were then made.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember all the circumstances. My hon. friend has followed the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, and is perhaps better informed in that respect than I. The plans accepted have been approved by the British Admiralty and we made great——

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, take the minister at his word. These plans were submitted to the British Admiralty. Was it necessary that these plans for an ice-breaker should be submitted to the admiralty and approved by them before the minister could give the contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will tell my hon. friend the reason. I thought that before spending $500,000 or $600,000 on a vessel it was well to take the precaution of finding out that she would meet the purpose we had in view. The British Admiralty has the best naval architects in the world—I think no one will deny that, and as they were good enough to go over our plans, I thought we should avail ourselves of their kindness and ask for their opinion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But, after the plans and specifications had been approved by the admiralty, they could have been handed over to the Toronto firm, and they would be capable of building that vessel, under the instructions of the minister's naval architect. But the minister is trying to make us believe that the fact of the plans being submitted to the British Admiralty made it necessary to have the vessel built in England. The hon. minister must assume the responsibility of that position. But, suppose he wanted another ice-breaker, a vessel that would go through the canals, and if he submitted the plans to the admiralty, and then asked for tenders, if the Toronto firm's tender were no more than 20 per cent higher, would he not give it to the Toronto firm?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, if plans could be devised that would meet the approval of the British Admiralty by which the vessel could have a width which would allow her to pass through the canals, I would be glad of it.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE. THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 148) respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Molloy.

Bill (No. 149) respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 139), for the relief of George Addison Brown.—Mr. Thornton.

Bill (No. 138) for the relief of Gertrude Maud Grant.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 140) for the relief of Mary Hamilton Johnson.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 141) for the relief of Dalton Mary Stapleton.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 142) for the relief of Lorne Forbes Robertson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 143) for the relief of Cecil Ernest Freeman.—Mr. Blain.

Bill (No. 144) for the relief of Ethel Mary Hornell.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 145) for the relief of Paulina Verena Meyer.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 137) for the relief of Maggie Florence Sadler—Mr. Reid (Grenville).

CANADIAN NORTHEN BRANCH LINES COMPANY.

Mr. CASH moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company, be concurred in.

Mr. GRAHAM. These are several amendments made by the Senate and concurred in by the Railway Committee of this House to whom they were referred. Section 8 in the original Bill is struck out. The old clause allowing them to deal in stock for all purposes has been struck out. In section 12 a clause allowing them to hold stock of other companies is struck out. In section 16 these words are struck out:

And thereafter the company may acquire and hold guaranteed bonds and securities of other companies.

In 18 and 19 a provision with reference to the authorization of stock has been replaced by the standard clause. In 21 these words are added:

Any transportation company authorized to carry on any business incidental to the work of the railway, and upon such terms as are specified.

Motion agreed to.

ALBERTA CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CASH moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 92) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company be concurred in.

Mr. GRAHAM. The chief amendment made to this Bill is to strike out the particular clause they had asked for as to the authorization of capital, and putting in the standard clause. These words are also added: 'Subject to the Navigable Waters Protection Act, chapter 115 of the Revised Statutes.'

Mr. SPROULE. It would appear from the amendment made in clause 21 that what we have frequently refused in other Bills has been granted in this. In clause 21 it says:

The company may, in addition to the powers hereinbefore contained, acquire, hold, guarantee, pledge and dispose of stocks, bonds and other securities of any railway company, or of any transportation, navigation, transfer, express, hotel or other company, authorized to carry on the business incidental to the work of the railway.

That was practically giving them a general power to amalgamate which we generally refuse to do. I see no reason why we should give that right to the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company and refuse it to every other company. We should make one rule which would apply to all and show no favouritism.

Mr. GRAHAM. That point was thrashed out at considerable length in the committee, and it would seem that this clause appears in practically the same language in the original Canadian Northern Act and also in the original Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Act. The Canadian Northern has a system of financing all peculiar to itself under which the parent company assists the other subsidiary companies and they being all the same people they all deal in the stock of the different companies. Both the Committee of the House and the Committee of the Senate concluded unanimously that we might disturb their system of financing if we change this, they having acted on these powers for years.

Mr. SPROULE. The Committee of the House was unanimous for clause (b) in the Bill, but this is an amendment made by the Senate.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Senate rather curtailed than enlarged the scope of the Bill. The original clause left the company to deal in the bonds of any company but the Senate restricted it to some company having a business incidental to the working of a railway.

Mr. SPROULE. That is exactly what they wanted. It is true the original clause was wider in some respects, but in this particular case the scope of it is wider than the House agreed to give them.

Motion agreed to.

The order for Private Bills having expired the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Construction of lighthouses, $100,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). At six o'clock I was replying to the statement of the minister that he now had a purchasing agent and that the department was free from political influence. But I would like to know how it is that practically all the supplies for his department continue to be purchased from Liberals. Is not the same patronage list hung up before this purchasing agent; has he not to go to the Liberals in different localities and buy from them? In Montreal are there not a selected few from whom he must purchase and who knowing that, all put on the same price. Will the minister explain how it is that if this purchasing agent wants anything in Montreal he has to go to Lymburner who charges 125 per cent more than the stuff is worth. What is the use of having a purchasing agent if it is only for the purpose of cloaking over the rascality that is going on in this department, by saying that there is now a man who is free from political influence and who can do as he likes. That is only a myth. The system is just exactly the same as before he was appointed. The minister complains that I was finding fault with the naval architect, but that is not so. I believe it was absolutely necessary that the minister should have a naval architect, and as I do not believe in employing a cheap man I believe he should have the very best man he could get. I never saw the naval architect to my knowledge, and I have nothing against him, but it did seem to me a little strange that when the minister required an ice-breaker he did not get it made in Canada especially in view of the fact that

the minister admitted to-day that so long as the plans were approved by the admiralty, any concern that had the necessary plant could build the steamer, and that a ship-building firm in Toronto could build it. The minister puts the whole blame on the naval architect, but if I were a minister I would assume the responsibility no matter what the consequences, and would not blame my officials. I never liked the idea of a minister blaming his officials and trying to shield himself. There is no doubt at all that in this case the naval architect made plans for a vessel that would go through the Welland canal, and if I remember aright tenders were advertised about the 18th of February to be received in Ottawa about the 10th of March, and they had to come all the way from England.

How could any Toronto or Collingwood firm tender on a vessel that they could not get through the canals because of that little change? Some one suggested to the naval architect that change in the plans—I am not suggesting that it was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because it may have been some one else—and the result was that tenders had to be asked in England. The minister cannot deny that there were several tenders lower by thousands of dollars than that of Vickers-Maxim. This certainly calls for an explanation. The minister was in England, and he could deal directly with these people. I want to tell him that I had it from a representative of one of the largest concerns in England that had sold vessels to the department in Ottawa, that it was absolutely necessary for them to have an agent in Canada, because they had to pay a commission in order to sell a vessel to this government. The minister knows that the agent in Canada of Vickers-Maxim is Lewis, of Lewis Brothers, Montreal, and he said before six o'clock, if I understood him correctly, that Lewis had not had anything whatever to do with this contract, and knew nothing about it. Is that right? If my memory serves me, Lewis telegraphed to the minister to hurry, and have the money sent on. Why was the minister dealing with Lewis if his firm represented Vickers-Maxim? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, after having been on the gridiron for two or three years, promised us solemnly that in future he would do right and be good. Now he comes with another deal, and it appears to me like this: I want a steamer; my naval architect makes out the plans of what will suit; I have to give out the contract; if I gave it to Polson's or some other Canadian shipbuilder, they would not give us a commission for political purposes; I will make the vessels a foot wider and a foot longer, and it will have to be built in the old country; now, whom can I get to handle this for me? Lewis of Montreal handles the goods for us for elections.

Mr. REID (Grenville).

Lewis is sent for; he goes to England; he handles this contract through Vickers-Maxim, the concern with which Mr. Deguid is connected; and the deal goes through. That is enough to convince me that the thing is not exactly right. I am afraid that if work of this kind continues, we shall have to get the minister up again and give him another lesson, so that he will again promise to be good. The minister says that this government has adopted a policy not to buy a vessel in England so long as they can purchase it in Canada for 20 per cent more than the English price. I can hardly believe that is correct in every department, because I was more than surprised the other day at reading in a newspaper that a vessel only 90 feet long had been bought in England for this government. I thought it was for the Department of Marine, and I was not surprised knowing what I did about the 'Earl Grey' scrape; but when I found that the Minister of Agriculture was the culprit, I concluded that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries must have been giving him some lessons. It does seem strange to me that we cannot give this work to our own Canadian ship-building firms. I have heard some of them say: Give us 20 per cent more than the English price of a vessel, and we will build it every time. But I want to tell the minister wherein he does not treat the Canadian shipbuilders fairly. He calls for tenders for a vessel, and these men come to Ottawa. Then he tells them they will have to have this thing and that thing, and these fittings to fit up the interior in elegant shape, and then they can figure. But he does not tell this to Vickers-Maxim; and when the vessel comes over, you can find in the Auditor General's Report that there is a great deal more added to the cost than there would be if a Canadian firm did the work. It is not necessary to say to the minister that if there is any middleman to carry the funds in Quebec when an election comes on, or if it is necessary to have a rake-off, we cannot trace it in England, it is absolutely safe. We cannot trace it in England, and are willing to hold up our hands in that respect. Therefore it looks to me that there is something else besides cheapness which induced buying in the old country. I do not take any stock in that old story about the willingness of the government to give 20 per cent in advance of what they can buy at in England. The next time the minister wants a steamer built in Canada, let him send the specifications and the lowest tender he gets in England to our ship-building firms in Canada. We have one in Toronto, one at Collingwood, one near Niagara Falls, and one about to start in Port Arthur in a very few weeks, and no doubt there are some in the east, and I would like him

to say to these: Here are the tenders I have got from England and I will give you 20 per cent more. If he would do this, he would soon get a contract in Canada. But let him not take the course he did in the case of the 'Earl Grey.' Let him not accept a tender which, if not the highest, was pretty near the top. The minister will not say that in that case he accepted the lowest tender. The one he accepted was thousands and thousands of dollars higher than several others.

Mr. BRODEUR. I entirely agree with my hon. friend that the government should if possible have the ships built here, and that is our policy. Not many months ago, we gave the construction of two ships to Canadian shipbuilders, although their tenders were not the lowest. One of these vessels is the 'Estavan' and the other the 'Bellechasse'. In both cases the lowest tenders were not taken, but as the Canadians were obliged to pay duty on certain goods to be used in the construction of these vessels, we thought it advisable to take that into consideration, and at the same time give our Canadian industries a certain percentage of protection. There is no protection now at all in the case of shipbuilding. Ships built on the other side come to this country free of duty, and the shipbuilders there are not obliged to submit to the fair wage clause which we force on our Canadian firms.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). You do not mean vessels coming from the United States?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; there is a duty on ships from the United States, and besides we have never had any tenders from any American shipbuilders. It is only fair that we should give a certain percentage of protection to our Canadian shipbuilders, and that is what we have been doing. Coming to the 'Earl Grey', my hon. friend claims that a change was made in the width of the vessel, and that this change prevented her from passing through the canal, and consequently prevented Canadian ship-builders on the Great Lakes from tendering. But it was after consulting with the people of Prince Edward Island that we determined on having a draught of 18 feet loaded and 15 feet and a few inches light. A vessel of that draught could not pass through our canals, because our canals can only accommodate 14 feet. We took all the necessary precautions to make sure that this ice-breaker would be a complete success. For a great many years, we had complaints that the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland by the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' was not at all satisfactory, and it became absolutely necessary that we should have a stronger ice-breaker. We had the plans submitted to experts. Captain Brown, whom we sent to England, has been in charge for many years of the 'Stanley' and is considered by the people of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia coast as one of the best sea-faring men in the country. He has been many years on the service between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, and is considered a very competent authority on the navigation between these two places. I thought it advisable to send Captain Brown to England to confer with the architects there. When he arrived he suggested a change in the first design made. He suggested that the space for the cargo and passengers should be changed, and that put the vessel a little higher. As he knew exactly the local conditions, his opinion was accepted, but that change could only be made on condition that the width of the vessel should be increased. Captain Brown acted purely and simply in the interests of the localities interested, and the width was changed on the advice of the British Admiralty. We must not forget that the vessel is a sea-going one engaged in very important work, and 18 feet was considered by every one as the proper fraught for the work she has to do. Therefore 14 feet would not have been suitable.

No naval architect would have recommended such a draught. It was a requirement due to the circumstances and to the service the vessel was required to render. So, the width and the draught accepted as being necessary by the British Admiralty were the two conditions which prevented the vessel from being built on the Great Lakes. To charge the department with preventing the shipbuilders on the Great Lakes from tendering for this ship seems to me a preposterous thing. Consider the results that have been attained. Last winter, it is true, was a mild winter. The vessel could go almost during the whole time from Charlottetown to Pictou and all the time from Georgetown to Pictou, and there was no interruption of the service for a single day. The present winter has been, in the opinion of men living in the locality, one of the worst and coldest ever known, and yet we find with the exception of two or three days, this vessel able to make the passage regularly, when the other vessel, the 'Minto,' which also is a powerful ice-breaker, was stuck in the ice. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) says that in the case of the 'Earl Grey,' we did not accept the lowest tender. There were lower tenders, but they did not comply with the conditions; there were lower tenders which were not even accompanied with a deposit. Would it have been sound administration on the part of the department to accept tenders sent in

in that form? No one will contend that. We accepted the lowest tender that complied with the conditions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the fact that the minister made his purchase through Mr. Lewis of Montreal? Why did he not make the purchase direct?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is quite incorrect. There was no purchase through Mr. Lewis. Tenders were called for the construction of the vessel, and Messrs. Vickers, Sons & Maxim were given the contract. My hon. friend says the correspondence shows that Mr. Lewis communicated concerning the money due to Messrs Vickers, Sons & Maxim. That may be true. It is quite the common thing for these firms to have agents in Canada, and Mr. Lewis may be acting for these people.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Taking the statement of the minister, it would appear that it was impossible for any firm in Canada to tender, and the vessel would have to be got from abroad.

Mr. BRODEUR. I say the vessel could not be built on the Great Lakes, for she had a draught of 18 feet, as against a depth of 14 feet in the canal and she was wider than the canal provided for. When tenders were called for it was open to the builders on the Great Lakes to tender, provided they could deliver the ship in Charlottetown. And we gave the builders in Canada a special advantage by providing that the vessel must be delivered in Canada.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister gives as one reason why this vessel could not be built on the Great Lakes the fact that her draught was 18 feet, which is four feet deeper than the canal.

Mr. SPROULE. Her light draught is 15 feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But there would be the same difficulty of passing her through the canal. Now, if one did not understand the conditions, he would have to admit that the minister was right and that the vessel could not be built on the Great Lakes. Let me tell the minister that there is a vessel running between Montreal and Quebec which has a greater draught than the depth of the canal, and yet she was built by the Polson works of Toronto. They first built the hull and took her down to Montreal without engines and boilers. Thus, her draught was only about 10 feet. Then the machinery was loaded on a vessel and went through also, and at Montreal they simply put the machinery into the hull. The machinists could work at Montreal as well as at Toronto when their work was inside the vessel. Whoever gave the minister information to try to let him out of the hole has merely put him in a worse position. For the vessel could have been built in Toronto and taken down in the way I have indicated, even if her draught had been 25 feet.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then, why did not they tender?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Because the minister changed the plans. The minister admits that he changed the plans. These people were ready to tender on the old plans, but when he changed the plans they could not tender, because they could not get her through the canals. The minister told us he had one of the best experts in the world to design this vessel. The minister told this naval architect what was required of this vessel—to carry freight and passengers, to break the ice and so on. On this basis the expert made up his plans. Yet he tells us here that he gives these plans to a gentleman named Captain Brown, the man who is running the steamer across from Prince Edward Island, and Captain Brown has full authority to change those plans and to do what he likes. After he has got his plans all ready, he hands them to the captain of a vessel who is not an architect, and tells him to go to England with them. When he gets to England, this captain decides that this vessel must be made just one foot wider and one foot longer. It seems suspicious that everything was placed in this man's hands. Does the minister say that if this vessel had been one foot narrower and one foot shorter she would not have been just as useful a vessel in plying between Prince Edward Island and the mainland? I would like to know if this vessel has been carrying a full cargo of freight and passengers all the time. As I have heard his officers state, the chief thing required in an ice-breaker is to run as fast as she can, a few miles an hour. Now, I do not think the people of Canada will believe that it is necessary to pay thousands of dollars in addition for a vessel to break ice, the speed of which is sixteen and a-half knots an hour, or seventeen knots. The thing seems absurd. I cannot understand why the minister did that thing. I think myself that the whole deal was arranged. Lewis, of Montreal, is agent for Vickers, Sons & Maxim, and the minister knows that it was not necessary for this firm to have an agent in Montreal in order to get this business from the government. The minister picks out one of the leading Liberals of the province of Quebec, a man who assists him with campaign funds, and the minister knows well enough that Vickers, Sons & Maxim had Mr. Lewis there for the purpose of a great big rake-off. The only excuse given is that the naval architect, a former employee of Vickers, Sons & Maxim, recognizes this firm and discards all the others. He discarded the firm that built

the two Empresses for the Canadian Pacific railway. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was afraid to give it to a firm that built the 'Empress of Britain,' and the 'Empress of Ireland,' and I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion it was not done for that purpose at all. Lewis, of Montreal, is the man who knows what it was done for, and if the minister does not know why it was done, it is about time he did.

Mr. WARBURTON. I happen to know something about this ship, which I do not think the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) does. He speaks about the Canadian Pacific railway building the empresses. That is true, but the empresses are an entirely different class of ship from the 'Earl Grey,' and a shipbuilding firm that would build an empress might not be able to build an ice-breaker like the 'Earl Grey.' If my memory serves me right, Vickers, Sons & Maxim were the people whom the Russian government employed to build their ice-breakers. The ice-breakers of the Russian government have very heavy work to do, and this firm was selected in preference to all other firms because of their capability for doing that kind of work. I do not think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have beeen justified in going up the Great Lakes and trying experiments there which might result to our disadvantage. He would not have been justified in giving the people there a contract to build a boat which is required for the most arduous work perhaps in the service. The 'Earl Grey' is no doubt a remarkably fine boat, and she has stood a very severe test this winter. This has been one of the most severe winters we have had for many years, and she has proved a great success. It is questionable whether she would have proved so great a success had she been built by men who did not understand that sort of work. A vessel engaged in that work has to be of great weight, she has to have good speed, to have plenty of beam in order to afford accommodation. True, she is not always loaded with passengers and freight, but at other times she is. But the point I wish to make is that the men who built this ship were not the men who build ocean greyhounds. They build men of war, and have built ice-breakers for the Baltic and for the northern seas. You will find in the reports that many of the English firms who are good shipbuilders would not undertake to build vessels of this class because it is out of their line, they have not the necessary experience and skill. I suppose there are no better shipbuilders in the world than Harland & Wolff, of Belfast, but I doubt if they would undertake to build a vessel of this kind, because it is out of their line. To build a vessel of this kind requires peculiar facilities and peculiar skill. If the minister sees his way shortly to build another vessel, I hope he will follow the course he has adopted with regard to the 'Earl Grey,' and not trust the building of the new vessel to inexperienced firms. It is too important a matter. If you make a mistake in the building of a vessel of that kind you cannot repair it. It will take a couple of years to get such a vessel built.

Now, I would like to say a word or two about Captain Brown, whose name has been mentioned. I know Captain Brown very well. He is an old, experienced mariner, and I am quite sure that he could have built a ship if he was put to it. I have no doubt that if you put him down in a shipyard, provided with plans, and with the necessary facilities, he could oversee the construction of a ship of this class. But a man like Captain Brown, a first-class seaman of great experience, a man who has had many years experience in ice navigation, would be just the man to consult with a naval expert, or naval architect, in regard to improvements in a vessel you were building for that sort of work.

Any intelligent sea captain—and Captain Brown is a particularly intelligent man—knowing ships as well as Captain Brown knows them, in the course of a very short experience, would be able to point out the important features in building of a vessel of that kind, and in view of the fact that Captain Brown has had an experience of these straits for the last twelve or fourteen years it is beyond question that he would probably know more than any other man, except his brother captain who is engaged in the same occupation, what sort of a vessel is best adapted for that route. Mr. Duguid went down there and crossed week after week in these vessels to see what kind of work they did and to see what improvements he could make upon the plans that had been adopted, and he was largely indebted to the captain of these vessels for the knowledge that he acquired.

There is a great difference in builders. The 'Stanley' was built by the late government about twenty years ago, and the 'Minto' some twelve or fourteen years ago. The 'Stanley' is generally believed to have been a better vessel than the 'Minto.' She was built by the Fairchilds, a firm of large experience in that style of building, and she was built to some extent under the direction of a well known old sea captain who at one time was a member of this House, and who was able to give information with reference to the ice conditions to be met with in the straits. They turned out a remarkably good vessel; she was not as strong as the later ones, but she was a good vessel and she was probably built by a better builder of that class of ships than the firm that the 'Minto' was built by.

The experience of those working the vessels enabled the architects to find out any defects that there were in the previous vessels, and those defects were to a large extent if not entirely removed in the new ship, the 'Earl Grey.' No man, I take it in his own private business, would have a ship of that kind, if he required one, built by men who were accustomed to build lake vessels or even ocean steamers. If he were a man of business at all he would put the building of a ship of that kind into the hands of people who understood that particular class of work. That is what was done in this case. Even although the department did not accept the lowest tender, even although any other tender complied with the conditions, they would have been very well justified in spending some thousands of pounds more to get the work done by a firm which they knew perfectly well was capable of doing it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not wish the hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton) to feel that I am at all reflecting upon Captain Brown. I do not know the gentleman, and never heard of him. But the minister stated that he had a naval architect who was an expert upon this class of vessel, that he had served with this firm in England, that he knew all about this kind of work and he was certainly supposed to have the experience and knowledge to enable him to design the class of vessel that is required more than the captain of a vessel running from one shore to the other. I am perfectly satisfied that Captain Brown is a good man, but it is not to be expected that he could have the same knowledge. Then, as the minister states, after the naval expert made these plans, in order to prove that they were correct and satisfactory, he sent them to Captain Brown to give him the benefit of his experience and knowledge after which they were changed. If, Captain Brown is a man of the qualifications and ability that the hon. member for Queens credits him with, the minister has not done justice to Captain Brown. He should be occupying the position of Mr. Duguid here in Ottawa. If he is so much superior to Mr. Duguid then he should be filling that position. What is going to be the result when we come to build the class of vessels that are required in Canada? Here you have a man who has not the qualifications to build that sort of vessel and who is inquiring from Captain Brown what he should do; in fact, it is the captain who comes and changes the whole plan. My opinion is that you should get Captain Brown here at once and turn over to him the architectural branch of the department for he apparently is the man who has the information. Let Mr. Duguid draw the plan and let Captain Brown tell him what is required. There is not the slightest dispute as to the 'Earl Grey' being a first-class vessel. Whether this or that firm got the contract you would not have anything else but a first-class vessel. Nobody is finding fault with that vessel, but what we are finding fault with is the price that was paid. The hon. member for Queens states that he would only give a contract like this to some firm that knows how to build these vessels. We are building vessels on the upper lakes as large as the vessels going from Montreal to the old country. We have built on the upper lakes numbers of vessels which have been taken down to Montreal and are now sailing on the ocean. They are, in fact, ocean vessels. I remember several. They could not take them through the canals completed because they were too long, being 300 or 400 feet in length, but they built them on the upper lakes, put them all together, ran them down to the canals, cut them in two, took the rivets out, put in false bulkheads, took them down in two parts and when they got them to Montreal or Quebec they put them together again and they are now running as sea-going vessels. There are shipbuilding concerns in Canada just as well qualified to build vessels as are Harland and Wolff or any other firms on the other side. The architect makes out the plans and specifications according to a certain mold or design, he specifies whether it shall be Lowmoor iron or steel and what kind of material shall go into the vessel, the thickness or size of the sheets, the kind and number of rivets, how they are to be placed, the number of frames; everything is put down there in detail. The builder is not the man who has to plan and figure out what is to be done. This is all done for him by the architect. The contract for a vessel is the same as the contract for a house. If you want to build a house you show the contractor the plan and specification he carries them out and you are supposed to have some one there to look after him. If you have one of these vessels built it is the naval architect who must make the plans and specifications, and it is the duty of the minister to require the naval architect to see that the plans and specifications are carried out. Why cannot we build these vessels just as well in Canada? We can build 'Empresses' at Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. Or at Collingwood.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, or at Collingwood. They are probably too large for the canal, but we are building vessels as large as the Empresses. There are vessels on the upper lakes 600 feet long and carrying 350,000 bushels of wheat, but you could not build them up there and compete with the English shipbuilder if you get the price

without graft in England, and you have to pay graft in Ontario. The member for Queens, P.E.I. knows as well as I do that there were seven or eight tenderers for the 'Earl Grey', and that Vickers, Sons & Maxim were amongst the highest, if not the highest, by a very large sum of money. Yet the member for Queens, P.E.I. is willing to see that amount of money squandered and go to some grafters simply because he was told by the Minister of Marine or somebody else that Vickers, Sons & Maxim built ice-breakers for the Russian government. Perhaps it was Lewis told him that. I have no hesitation in saying that the 'Earl Grey' would not be in it as an ice-breaker with the Grand Trunk steamer that runs from Cobourg to Rochester. Hon. members have now heard both sides of the argument, and I am willing to drop it here and let the committee decide whether the minister or I am right.

Mr. CROSBY. I know something about ships and shipbuilding, and I can say that the remarks made by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) about the construction of the 'Earl Grey' are highly applicable to the conditions. There are vessels carrying freight across the Atlantic that can carry three times the cargo of the 'Earl Grey' on 14 or 15 foot draught and I believe that a vessel doing the work of the 'Earl Grey is doing can be constructed to go anywhere on less than 14 foot draft. The marine architect draws the plans, makes the specification, and sets out exactly where every bolt and plate and piece of machinery is to be put, and any competent shipbuilder can and must follow the architect's plan, no matter whether the vessel is built on the Great Lakes, or on our Atlantic coast, or in England, or anywhere else. The minister told us that Captain Brown took these plans, which were carefully prepared by this special naval expert from the old country, and that he went to London and that somebody got hold of him there. I say that this country cannot give too good a service to Prince Edward Island, because the better the service for Prince Edward Island, the better for the island, and the better for all Canada. For my part I would be very glad to see the tunnel built if it is feasible, and I think some effort should be made in that direction. I am glad to know that the 'Earl Grey' has been more successful than any former steamer on that route, and that is very natural because year after year the science of naval architecture is improving, and we can get vessels to perform work now that was impossible 10 or 20 years ago. There is no reason in the world why the 'Earl Grey' should not have been built in Canada. If I am well informed that she cost somewhere close to $1,000,000 she could be built in Canada, and built at a very good profit.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is a little astray; she cost $500,000.

Mr. CROSBY. I was going to say that if she cost $900,000 she cost as much as one of the Empresses cost. There are lots of places in eastern Canada where that vessel could be built. She could have been built in Pictou; they built one large sailing ship there and she has been very successful. We have facilities in Halifax, and our friends there have been trying to get the government to give them a chance at shipbuilding.

Mr. BRODEUR. Why did they not tender?

Mr. CROSBY. Because the government made it impossible for them to tender, and I say right now that the government should have given some Canadian firm 10 per cent on the construction of that vessel in order to have her built in Canada. The minister shakes his head, but will he get up here and state that this government is opposed to giving assistance to the shipbuilding industry in this country. Delegation after delegation from eastern Canada has come to the government wanting $6 a ton, and not less than $5 a ton, and I myself heard the government offering $3 or $4 a ton to encourage shipbuilding. Why did not the government give the building of this ship to some firm in Canada to encourage the industry, and if they did the ship would be well built. We are doing in Halifax some of the best repair work that is done in America, and we get some of the shafting from Pictou.

I am satisfied that good work can be done in the lakes. There is nothing to prevent a vessel being built in Canada so far as draught is concerned. The people of this country made a name for themselves in the construction of wooden ships. We put the British sailing ship out of business, because it was a narrow, deep, long-keeled ship, which could not hold her own with the Canadian ships. We out-pointed the British shipbuilders in building wooden ships, and I believe we will in time outpoint them in building iron ships. But how are we going to get a start if the government does not give us a chance? I am ashamed to say that only a few days ago I saw that a little boat 80 feet long and 18 feet wide was built in Dartmouth, England, and brought to Canada for the quarantine service. The 'Earl Grey' is a good ship, and we are glad to have a ship able to give the accommodation she does, but she cost a lot of money. I know of ships a great deal larger and as well constructed that did not cost anything like as much money. We have two or three ships sailing out of Halifax, which were constructed for the carrying of passengers between Halifax, New York and Newfoundland, and so constructed as to be used in sealing in the

St. Lawrence in winter time. Though they are much larger than the 'Earl Grey,' they did not cost nearly so much money. I am not complaining of the cost of the 'Earl Grey,' but I am complaining, as every member of this House should complain, that some of our shipbuilders in the east have not been given an opportunity to construct these ships for the government. The minister says he is anxious to give us a chance. Well, the best way to show that anxiety is to give us one of these contracts. I do not care whether the ship is constructed at Halifax or Pictou or Yarmouth or anywhere else, I believe you would get a good job. If the government gave an order for one ship to be constructed on a 10 per cent profit, would they be hurt very much? I do not think they would. It would be an honest proposition, and I believe you would get a good job. When we want to purchase anything that we cannot manufacture in this country, then let us go to the mother country to get it; but, on the other hand, anything that we can produce or manufacture in this country we should get here; that is the principle I go upon. I am glad to hear that the 'Earl Grey' is a good boat and is giving good service. But the time has come when the ships required for this country should be built in this country as far as possible; and do not let us be too exacting in the specifications. Twenty years ago or even ten years ago we could not get as good a ship built in England as we can to-day. Let us give the people of our own country an opportunity to try what they can do; and if the first ship they build is not quite as good a ship as we would like to have, let us give them a second opportunity, and in the course of time we shall establish a shipbuilding industry that will be a credit to Canada. So far as Captain Brown is concerned, while he is a good man, and is well fitted for the position he occupies, we have in the province of Nova Scotia just as good men. You will find plenty of them in Pictou county, in Richmond county and in Cape Breton. In fact the province of Nova Scotia is full of good captains. Let us build the next ship we require in Canada, and not plead as an excuse for not doing so some quibbling about the contract or the deposit. Should the government not be able to get any concern in this country which would undertake the contract and make the deposit, let the government hand the work over to one of these concerns I have referred to, in Halifax, Pictou or Yarmouth, which are accustomed to build seagoing vessels. Though of course I am more interested in Halifax, I would not raise any objection if the contracts should go to Pictou or Yarmouth, but what I want is that the boat should be built in Canada.

Mr. CROSBY.

Mr. SPROULE. I would scarcely be doing justice to the section from which I come, were I not to say something with regard to the shipbuilding plant at Collingwood, which is turning out so many large vessels on the upper lakes to-day. I cannot see why the contract for the 'Earl Grey' should not have been given to the Collingwood Ship Building Company. The objection cannot be the length of the vessel, because that company has built many much longer, nor could it be owing to its depth, because it has built boats of two or three times that capacity. What length is this boat?

Mr. BRODEUR. 250 feet long.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the reason the contract was not given to a Canadian firm was because the vessel was too long to go through the canal. If my hon. friend from Grenville is correct the length was changed in order to provide just such a reason for not having the boat built at Collingwood. But the company there has built boats 400 and 500 feet long, and can build them even longer, because there is a dry dock at Collingwood which the government has subsidized for the building of such vessels. When, however, the government has any work to be done, it entirely overloks this Canadian firm and gives the contract to an English firm. I understood the hon. minister to say that he was desirous of favouring Canadian firms even though he might have to pay them 15 or 20 per cent more.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is my own personal view.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I cannot see why the hon. gentleman did not make some effort to have this boat built in Canada. As my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) has said, it could have been built just as well in Collingwood as in Halifax or in England. The objection that the draught was too great cannot hold because several boats have been built at Collingwood of heavier draught and taken right down the canal. By not putting the heavy machinery into it, until it gets through the canals, a vessel with an 18 foot draught would probably only draw 11 or 12 feet, and our canals can accommodate 14 feet. Nor could it be on account of the inability of Canadian firms to build a boat of this class that the contract was not given to any of them because men eminent in the shipbuilding line, with experience both in the old country and Canada, have told me that they can get just as good a boat at Collingwood as at the Clyde, or Glasgow, or in Ireland. When we pay out money to construct a dry dock for the purpose of building boats, I do not see why the Min-

ister did not make an effort to have this boat built at Collingwood, and we can hardly take him seriously when he says he is desirous of giving the work to Canadian firms.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I do not think that any one who has looked at this question with any degree of care could take much stock in the proposition that a boat of the type of the 'Earl Grey' could be constructed in the upper lakes and brought down to the Atlantic ocean. I am quite aware that at Collingwood there is a splendidly equipped shipbuilding plant which has turned out many vessels of most satisfactory type and that nothing can be said against the capability of that plant to build vessels. The construction of the 'Earl Grey,' however, was a peculiar proposition, in that it involved the carrying out of the terms of confederation in regard to the maintenance of continuous navigation between the mainland and the island of Prince Edward. To say, as the hon. member for Grenville says, that a vessel of the type of the 'Earl Grey,' as she is known to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) and the members for Prince Edward Island, could have been built, and then cut in two and then brought down the canals and then meet the ice conditions in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is to my mind, an absurdity. But that is not the main point. Every one agrees that, in the past, we have had to go to Great Britain to get our vessels built. But I think the time has come in Canada when we should not be obliged to go to England for our vessels; they can be constructed here in Canada. They can be constructed in Collingwood or in other plants on the upper lakes, and in Halifax and Pictou counties we have plants in which vessels have been constructed, and where, if the minister carries out the policy he has expressed a desire to carry out, we can construct all the vessels required for the fisheries protection and lighthouse services.

Mr. BRODEUR. And the naval service too.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I was just going to refer to that. The policy of the minister in that regard has been shown by the fact that in connection with the ships of the navy it is rendered absolutely essential that these should be constructed in Canada. Let me point out one difficulty that arises through the construction of vessels in England. Machinery of a patented kind is prescribed very often, and in vessels constructed in Great Britain conditions are sometimes established in regard to the draught of the boilers suitable peculiarly for the use of Welsh coal, the highest type of coal, and which, to a certain extent, interfere with the use of Canadian coal. There there are peculiarities in connection with the engine and all the motive parts of the steamer, which compel the government to send these vessels back to Great Britain to be repaired. There is no reason why vessels should be so made that they must go to Great Britain for repairs. They ought to be repaired here. And, in view of the development here of the iron and steel industry and attendant manufactures, I strongly join in supporting the proposition that, in all our services requiring vessels for any purpose whatever, we should give a preference to their construction in Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. On this question I have already expressed myself strongly in favour of the construction of ships in Canada. We have carried out that policy in all cases where conditions would permit. In every instance, where vessels are required public tenders have been called for, and one of the provisions of the contract is that the vessel should be delivered in Canada. Why make this condition? In order to give the Canadian builder an advantage over the British builder or any other. In that way, they were obliged to arrange for the delivery of the ship in Canada. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) stated a few minutes ago that in the case of the 'Earl Grey' that we should have given opportunity to the builders in the east to tender. As a matter of fact, they were given every opportunity possible. And we went further. In the case of the 'Earl Grey' it was provided that she was to be delivered either in Halifax or in Charlottetown. Therefore, the Halifax shipbuilder had an opportunity to tender at an advantage over all other builders. Now, as to building ships on the Great Lakes, let me give the committee facts which will show how anxious the department and the government are to do something for this important industry at Collingwood, Toronto and now at Kingston—because another industry is being established in Kingston. I believe there was an industry of this kind on Lake Erie, but I think it is not in operation now; at any rate, they have never tendered upon any ships for which we offered contracts.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). What is the name of the firm in Kingston?

Mr BRODEUR. The Kingston Shipbuilding Company.

Mr. SPROULE. They are only talking about organizing that, I think.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we have contracts with them. That is a fact of which my hon. friend probably is not aware. It

has not been brought before parliament, but I am glad my hon. friends have given me this opportunity to show what we have done. When I have given the facts, I think he will be satisfied that we are doing everything possible to aid the Kingston industry. We have asked for tenders for three ships lately. One of these, the 'Estevan,' was to be used on the Pacific coast. Another was the 'Bellechasse,' and another the 'Dollard.'

Mr. CROSBY. What size are these vessels?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Estevan' is 200 feet long, and the 'Bellechasse' 160 feet.

Mr. CROSBY. Where is the 'Bellechasse' for?

Mr. BRODEUR. For the ship channel of the St. Lawrence. As the 'Estevan' was to be used on the British Columbia coast, we provided that she should be delivered there. The Collingwood Shipbuilding Company tendered, undertaking to deliver the vessel on the Pacific coast and offered a better price than the other Canadian tenderer, the British Columbia Marine Railway Company of Victoria. The tender of this latter firm was $455,000, while the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company undertook to build the vessel and deliver her at Victoria for $260,000, or almost sixty per cent less.

The lowest British tender was that of Dobson & Company of Newcastle-on-Tyne, $201,000, delivered at Victoria. Well, it is not more expensive for a British firm to deliver at Victoria than on the Great Lakes, perhaps not as expensive. But this firm did not send a deposit cheque, and we could not accept it. The second tender was Bow McLachlan & Co., $219,000. Then Fleming & Ferguson, $236,000; Campbell & Laird, Birkenhead, $227,000; Swan & Hunter, $253,000; McMillan, $243,000; Vickers Sons & Maxim, $267,000; Fleming & Ferguson, $236,000 were much lower than the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company at $260,000. We gave the contract to the latter company, because we wished to encourage Canadian shipbuilding. The British firm have no duty to pay upon ships, whereas Canadian builders have to import a certain quantity of goods from the other side upon which they have to pay a duty of from twenty to thirty per cent. We thought under the circumstances we should encourage this Canadian shipbuilding company, and we gave the contract for $260,000 to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Collingwood Company were under the same agreement to deliver the vessel at Victoria you were giving the British firm a financial advantage.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. Dobson & Company tendered for $204,000. For delivery at Victoria there was added £3,000, that makes $219,000. We gave the contract to the Collingwood Company for $260,000. Now take Swan & Hunter, a very reputable firm, they tendered for $233,000, and they added $4,000 for delivery at Victoria, that would make $237,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister give us the difference between the price paid to the Maxim people and the lowest tender on the 'Earl Grey'?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not got the figures here. The 'Earl Grey' was built three years ago, and I did not expect this question would be brought up to-night. But here are the actual facts. Here are the contracts which have been made. Here is one made on the 24th of January, 1911.

Mr. CROSBY. Did you ask a Halifax firm to tender?

Mr. BRODEUR. I believe Mr. Brookfield is a very reputable firm, but he has never tendered. Now, take another ship for which an Order in Council was passed on the 25th of February 1911, the 'Bellechasse,' which is going to be engaged in the survey of the St. Lawrence. On this ship we had several tenders. We had Charline & Company, $97,000, but no deposit cheque. McLachlan & Co., Paisley, $128,285. In that case again it was provided that the ship should be delivered in Canada. It has always been the policy of the department to encourage the construction of ships in Canada, and we have done so in all cases where the tenders justified us. Then Thornycroft, a very good firm, tendered for $138,681. Fairfield tendered for $136,000. The Polson Iron Works tendered for $178,000, and we gave the contract to a Canadian firm, the Kingston Shipbuilding Company. There were some other British firms who tendered, and their tenders were higher than that of the Canadian firm. The Palmer Shipbuilding Company, The Ferguson Company and Vickers, Sons & Maxim tendered at a higher figure.

Mr. DANIEL. Was the vessel to be delivered in Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. All with the condition attached that the vessel was to be delivered in Canada. Vickers, Sons & Maxim's price was $154,000 delivered at Quebec.

Mr. JAMESON. Is there any duty chargeable on these ships?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are no duties. British ships coming into Canada to engage in the coasting trade are not dutiable, except under a provision that we adopted some years ago, that ships registered but not built in Great Britain are dutiable. We

found that some American firms, in order to evade payment of the duty, were going to have their ships registered in Great Britain or Newfoundland, and then were going to bring them into Canada to engage in the coasting trade. In order to prevent this the parliament of Canada, six or seven years ago, passed legislation by which these vessels, although ships of British register, would be dutiable. Ships built in Great Britain are not dutiable when they come to Canada.

Mr. JAMESON. Is not the duty on ships constructed in Great Britain, brought to Canada and registered as Canadian shipping, 25 per cent ordinarily and, under the British preference, 15 per cent?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; they are free.

Mr. JAMESON. When was that change made?

Mr. BRODEUR. In 1902 or 1904. My hon. friend will find it in the statutes of one of those years.

Mr. ARTHURS. Was the general average of the Canadian tenders above or below the general average of the British tenders?

Mr. BRODEUR. Above.

Mr. FRASER. Canada is the pioneer in ice-breaking ships. The first ship that was put on this route was the 'Northern Light,' built about 1873 or 1875, largely as an experiment in that line of navigation. Afterwards this question was taken up by the Russian government and further developed. Then we had the 'Stanley' built by the late government. It was considered an up-to-date ship at that time, and one of the best ships that had been built for the ice-breaking service. She was followed by the building by this government of the 'Minto' and again by the latest addition to the service, the 'Earl Grey.' The 'Earl Grey' is the most up-to-date ice-breaker, not only in Canada, but also in the world. I understand that this government sent men to Russia to study the construction of ice-breaking ships there before they gave the contract for this work. I do not know anything about the letting of the contract. I am not prepared to discuss that point, but, speaking from experience, because I crossed the Straits on the 18th of this month after one of the severest winters we have had on the Atlantic coast for years, I am prepared to give the full measure of credit to this government for having built one of the best ships for ice-breaking service in the world. The 'Earl Grey' is giving us the best service that has been given up to this stage, and if she did cost about $500,000 I think she is worth every cent of it. I am not prepared to say anything about how the contract was let, but I do say that that ship is worth all the money she cost. She is finished in the very best manner inside and out, and is one of the strongest and best ships that could be provided for that work. The 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' her predecessors in this service, had a horse-power of less than 4,000, while this ship has a horse-power of about 7,000, or almost twice as much. In building a ship for ice-fighting there are two things that are specially required—strength and power. She has the power. She has 3,000 or perhaps 3,500 horse-power more than the other boats, and her strength is also proportionately greater. I am willing to give credit to the government for doing anything of this kind, and I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he is soon to be translated to another sphere, will leave a monument to his good work in carrying out the terms of confederation. I only trust that he may remain with us a sufficient time to give us a sister ship to the 'Earl Grey.' It is the opinion of a great many people that if we had another ship we would have the best service we could get next to getting the tunnel, and I hope we will get that also in the course of time. This is a young country, and when the tunnel was first spoken of it was looked upon as a mighty project. I was reading in a newspaper to-night an account of the completion of a tunnel nine miles long in Switzerland at a cost of only $20,000,000. If we could demonstrate to the Minister of Public Works that we could get the tunnel built for $20,000,000 I do not think there is a member in this House who would oppose it. But, at the present time we are only asking that a survey be made to ascertain what the cost will be.

Mr. DANIEL. How long will the tunnel be?

Mr. FRASER. About nine miles, and, as I say, I was reading in the newspapers only to-night about a tunnel which they finished recently in Switzerland nine miles long at a cost of $20,000,000.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understood the statement of the hon. gentleman correctly, it was to the effect that the two special advantages of the 'Earl Grey' were her strength and power?

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any reason why a vessel could not be built just as strongly here as in England, or why you could not put as great horse-power in her here as in England? I think there is none.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). We are just coming to that.

Mr. SPROULE. The remark was made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that it was a palpable absurdity to think that you could do it, and before he sat down he was in favour of everything of

that kind being done here. His argument was a palpable inconsistency.

Mr. FRASER. As to building ships and building everything else in Canada that we can build, I do not think that there are any two opinions in this House. Both sides would be united with regard to building ships or anything else in Canada so long as we could do it, but I firmly believe that this ship that was built two or three years ago could not be duplicated in Canada. At least, I don't think she could, and I am only giving my own opinion on that matter for what it is worth. If the government should decide to build a new ship in Canada I would be only too glad of it, and on that point I do not think there is any difference of opinion. Perhaps the government will build a ship in Canada, and if she is finished on the basis of this 10 per cent, I think that perhaps there would be as much criticism of her as there was in this case. However, I can say that if the members of this committee had crossed in that boat on the 18th day of this month they would at once come to the conclusion that the 'Earl Grey' is to-day one of the finest ships for such a service on the North American continent, if not in the world. As to the capability and qualification of Captain Brown, there are no two questions; I have already spoken of his high qualities in this House, and I need say no more. He is a careful, efficient, and good commander, and no one can say a word against him. The people living in this inland country can hardly realize what winter navigation down there is, and what the responsibilities of the captains of these ships. Only a week ago the good ship 'Bruce,' plying between Nova Scotia, Cape Breton and Newfoundland, went on the rocks, and out of 150 passengers only two were lost, which was a tribute to the fitness of the officers of that vessel for their command. I think the department realizes, although a great many people who live in this part of Canada do not realize, the dangers and hardships of winter navigation in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. There are a number of ice-breakers on the River St. Lawrence engaged in breaking ice so as to hasten the opening of navigation, to let the mercantile people get their goods in and out at an earlier date than otherwise would be the case, and if I am not mistaken this vote is largely intended for that service.

Mr. BARNARD. What proportion of this vote does the minister purpose spending on the British Columbia west coast trail this year?

Mr. BRODEUR. The estimated amount is $30,000.

Mr. BARNARD. What distance of trail does the minister intend to build for that?

Mr. BRODEUR. The matter is under the consideration of the engineer.

Mr. BARNARD. When the engineer gives an estimate of $30,000, does he not know what he expects to do with the money?

Mr. BRODEUR. The assistant engineer has been investigating this question in the west and he has only just returned and has not made his report.

Mr. BARNARD. What length of trail has been built?

Mr. BRODEUR. Fifteen miles.

Mr. BARNARD. Is it a road or just a trail?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a pretty good road, wide enough for a horse and cart to travel.

Mr. BARNARD. What is the total cost to date?

Mr. BRODEUR. $150,000.

Mr. BARNARD. The object of the trail is for life-saving purposes along the coast?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. What is the full length of coast line that requires this trail and between what points will it be finally built?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman remembers the circumstances under which the west coast trail was undertaken. Some years ago a shipping fatality disaster occurred, and petitions were sent asking for the building of this trail so that succour might be sent to ships in distress. We thought at the time that this request represented the unanimous opinion of the people.

Mr. BARNARD. So it did.

Mr. BRODEUR. And that it is still unanimous?

Mr. BARNARD. I may say for the information of the minister, that the only reluctant party in the matter was the Dominion government, which asked the provincial government to do this work although it was none of their business.

Mr. BRODEUR. The question arose as to whether the provincial government should not do something, and so far the provincial government has not subscribed. This road is considered as an aid to navigation.

Mr. BARNARD. Then why should the provincial government be asked to assist?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because some day the road would doubtless be used for general traffic. The provincial government refused to assist, and we had to do it ourselves. I hope that some day the provincial government will at least give us the land on which the trail has been constructed.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like to have my question answered as to the full length of the road when completed, and for what length of coast the road is required?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is difficult to answer that definitely. The matter is engaging the attention of the engineers of the department as to whether it is absolutely necessary to push the work very much further. It is expected that a few miles more will cover sufficient of the coast line to meet the request made some years ago.

Mr. BARNARD. It is fair to assume that the government recognizes the necessity for that work or else they would not have undertaken it. I point out to the minister that he has constructed 16 miles of road in four years, and I am credibly informed that although it is intended for life-saving purposes there are grades on the road so steep that it is practically impossible to get a life-saving apparatus up or down them. I am further informed that the road in many cases is half a mile from the coast, and any one who knows the roughness of that country, its rocky character, and the density of the underbrush, will know how absolutely impossible it would be to get from the road to the sea. Under the conditions the minister might as well have built the road ten miles off as half a mile. To build an ordinary road over where a horse and cart might go is costing $10,000 a mile, pretty nearly as much as he could build a railway for. It is possible that there is an explanation of this in the fact that it was rumoured at the time of the last election that every man was required to sign a document before he was employed that he would vote for the government candidate. I am not saying that rumour was true, but I do say that it gained a good deal of credence in the locality. It does seem to me outrageous that $153,000 should have been spent on 15 miles of road. I do not complain of the work; it is an absolute necessity, so much so that it should have been finished long ago; and if the work had been done in an ordinary business-like way, it would have been completed long ago, instead of being half done, and would not have cost any more than it has cost.

Mr. CROTHERS. Before we grant this item, it would seem expedient that we should have some detailed explanation of it. It is about four hours since it was called, and in that time we have had no information concerning it. It is only one item of a million dollars, which is a mere bagatelle to the Minister of Marine, too trifling to warrant any explanation whatever. It seems to me that these items should be put into some sort of intelligent shape. The minister does not condescend to tell us how many lighthouses he proposes to build, where they are to be erected and the estimated cost of each. If the members of this House are expected to scrutinize or criticise this item surely we should have something more from the minister than the mere statement that he wants a million dollars for the construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation. It seems to me that the minister can tell us where these lighthouses are to be built, the number of them, and the necessity for their construction—something to enable us to exercise our judgment upon it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose my hon. friend was not here this afternoon when I gave the details.

Mr. CROTHERS. I was here, but I did not hear anything about the points I have suggested.

Mr. BRODEUR. However, I will repeat the statement. The vote is divided into two parts. The part relating to lighting apparatus covers the following requirements:

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Prince Rupert, buoy depot machinery	$10,000	
Holland Rock, apparatus and lantern	2,000	
Brown passage, apparatus and lantern	20,000	
Rose Spit, gas beacon	2,000	
Langara island, apparatus and lantern	20,000	
Point No Point, apparatus and lantern	20,000	
Improvement of 3 stations at $1,000	3,000	
Five gas beacons at $2,000	10,000	
Four gas buoys at $4,000	16,000	
Gas buoy lanterns	6,000	
Unlighted buoys	2,000	
Freight, erection, &c	5,000	
		$116,000

ONTARIO.

Improvement of 18 stations at at $1,000	18,000	
Four gas buoys at $2,500	10,000	
Gas buoy lantern	6,000	
Unlighted buoys	1,000	
Lighthouse depot, Prescott, improvements	5,000	
Testing and experimenting at Prescott	5,000	
Freight, erection, &c	4,000	
		49,000

QUEBEC.

Bagot bluff, apparatus and lantern	$ 7,000	
Ferroll point, apparatus and lantern	20,000	
Cape Chatte, submarine signal apparatus	15,000	
Improvement of 11 stations at $1,000	11,000	
Four gas buoys at $2,500	10,000	
Gas buoy lanterns	3,000	

Unlighted buoys	$ 1,000	
Freight, erection, &c	3,000	
		$ 70,000

MONTREAL.

Four gas buoys at $2,500	$10,000	
Gas buoy lanterns	3,000	
		13,000

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Improvement of 11 stations at $1,000	$11,000	
Two gas buoys at $4,000	8,000	
Gas buoy lanterns	3,000	
Unlighted buoys	5,000	
Freight, erection, &c	3,000	
		30,000

NOVA SCOTIA.

Sydney bar, apparatus and lantern	$ 1,000	
Brier island, apparatus and lantern	20,000	
Improvement of 74 stations at $1,000	74,000	
Four gas buoys at $4,000	16,000	
Gas buoy lanterns	6,000	
Unlighted buoys	4,000	
Freight, erection, &c	4,000	
		125,000

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Improvement of 10 stations at $1,000	$10,000	
One gas buoy	4,000	
Gas buoy lantern	1,000	
Unlighted buoys	1,000	
Freight, erection, &c	1,000	
		17,000

GENERAL.

Proportion of hire of boats for construction apparatus	30,000	
Unforeseen expenses generally	50,000	
		80,000
Total		$500,000

The second part of the item relates to lighthouse construction proper, of which the principal details of probable cost are as follows:

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Prince Rupert, construction of depot	$160,000
Point Atkinson, new tower	10,000
Holland Rock, new station	6,000
Rose Spit, new tower	5,000
Langara island, new station	40,000
Active Pass, new fog alarm	9,000
West Coast Trails	30,000
	$260,000

ONTARIO.

Cobourg, erection of a new light and fog alarm	$ 5,000
Red Rock, new tower and fog alarm	15,000
Kokanongwi, new range	4,000
Michipicoten, new tower	5,000
Lake Superior, new fog alarm	12,000
Portsmouth, range lights	4,000
	$45,000

QUEBEC.

Flat island, lighthouse	$ 6,000
Bagot Bluff, to compete station	10,000
Little Metis, new dwelling	4,000
Kamouraska, new dwelling	$ 4,000
Natashkwan, lighthouse on the point	5,000
Feroll's Point, new station	25,000
Carleton, to renew the lighthouse	1,200
Father Point, to repair the dwelling	1,000
Cape Chatte, sub. bell station	2,000
	$58,200
Montreal	$30,000

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Campbellton, to rebuild a lighthouse	$1,000
Grindstone island, to rebuild a lighthouse	5,000
Machias seal island, new fog alarm	7,000
	$13,000

NOVA SCOTIA.

Sydney S. Bar, light on pier	$ 8,000
Flint island, new dwelling	4,500
Cape Fourchu, to renew dwelling	3,000
Sambro, to renew dwelling	2,500
Point Prim, to renew fog alarm	10,000
Cape Race	2,000
Scatari, repairs to fog alarm	2,000
Mauger beach, new double dwelling	4,000
Hall harbour, Hampton, Owl's head — new lights	4,000
	$40,000
Prince Edward Island	$ 5,000

Mr. DANIEL. Are these submarine signals of any use except to those vessels supplied with telephone arrangements in the wheel house?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. DANIEL. These submarine bells cannot be heard by vessels unless they have the telephone attachment?

Mr. BRODEUR. Precisely.

Mr. DANIEL. And they have to pay a royalty for the use of that attachment?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Are all the government steamers provided with this telephone apparatus?

Mr. BRODEUR. The most important ones are.

Mr. DANIEL. Are many vessels of the ordinary merchant marine equipped with it?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, for instance, the Allan and the Canadian Pacific Railway lines. The stations are at Negro Point, Anticosti lightship, Red Island lightship, South Sea Shore lightship.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How many lighthouses are there in Newfoundland, what did it cost to erect them, and what is the cost of their upkeep?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are lighthouses at Belleisle island, Cape Race, Cape Ray, Cape Anguille, Cape Norman, Cape Bauld,

Point Rich. I am informed by my chief engineer that it costs about $1,000 for the equipping and $500 for maintenance per year. The more important lighthouses cost about $40,000 each to erect.

Mr. DANIEL. According to the Auditor General's Report, it costs from $4,000 to $5,000 a year to keep them up. Is there any drawback on the material used in building ships in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. There are certain things in the free list, but apart from that there has been for many years a system of drawbacks based on so much per ton. That however, was devised in the days of the old wooden ships, and is not adapted to present conditions. In the case of the wooden ships it remains, but it is not adapted to modern steamships.

Mr. DANIEL. When a very large vessel is built on our inland waters, the amount of duty paid on the material entering into its construction is very heavy, and that may be one of the reasons why it costs so much more to build a vessel in this country than across the water. One way to assist the shipbuilding industry in Canada would be to allow the materials to come in free of duty. As a matter of fact our navigation companies on the Atlantic and Pacific go to England for their steamers because they can get them built there very much cheaper; but if the government would help the industry in the way I suggest, that might go a considerable way towards encouraging the building of these steamers in Canada.

Mr. CROSBY. I did not notice any amount for a lighthouse at Owl's head.

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been decided to build a lighthouse at that point, and there is an amount in the estimates for that purpose.

Mr. ARTHURS. Has the department an engineer who reports on questions of lighthouses and lights before the matter is brought to the Lighthouse Board? And who are the Lighthouse Board? Are its members principally from the maritime provinces or do they include men who are familiar with the conditions of inland waters?

Mr. BRODEUR. Lately, we decided to ask the president of the Dominion Marine Association, which is composed of those interested in shipping on the Great Lakes to join the Lighthouse Board. And the other day, at a meeting of the Lighthouse Board, this gentleman and also the secretary of the association were present. The Shipping Federation is also represented on the board by its president, and there is a representative from British Columbia. Besides these three, there are the deputy minister, the chief engineer—or, in his absence, the assistant chief engineer—the commissioner of lights and the chairman of the Quebec Harbour Commission; these compose the board.

Mr. ARTHURS. Last year and the year before I brought to the attention of the department the necessity for improving the lights on Lake Nipissing, particularly the one at Callender. The application was for a gas buoy at or near the mouth of South East bay. This was refused by the Lighthouse Board, for reasons that I could not understand. I am sure it will appeal to the minister or any practical man that, where there is one gas buoy, the additional cost of the upkeep of another light would be small. There is one on Lake Nipissing, and the application was for another. The lights on Lake Nipissing have been there for twenty or twenty-five years without being improved. The shipping on that lake has vastly increased aside altogether from pleasure boats which are very numerous. There should be a light at the mouth of South East bay and also one at the mouth of South river, going toward the village of Nipissing. It costs the department as much, I am sure, to keep the little lighthouse that is there now—practically a lantern on a pole—as to maintain a modern gas buoy or a lighthouse. I would press upon the minister very strongly the advisability of looking after this matter in some way, because, undoubtedly, the present condition will result in a very serious accident some day and probably loss of life. If the department has an officer of the kind I have spoken of I think it would be advisable to have him go up and make a report on the condition of these lights. I am confident that the report of this officer would be to the effect that the lights should be improved.

Mr. BRODEUR. I might inform my hon. friend (Mr. Arthurs) that a man was sent up there, but, unfortunately, he died.

Mr. ARTHURS. Will the hon. minister say that he will send up another man?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. In the report of the minister at page 13, I find it stated that the New Brunswick agency 'extends along the coast of the province in the Bay of Fundy, including part of Nova Scotia as far as Yarmouth and around the coast on the north side of the province.' The other evening we had some discussion with regard to St. John and Halifax agencies, and the minister said that there were two ships one of which he could not transfer across the Bay unless the Halifax agency were divested of the service of the Bay of Fundy. From

this report of the minister it would appear that the St. John agency already has charge of the Bay of Fundy as far as Yarmouth. If the minister would give the St. John agency absolute control of the Bay of Fundy service, it would facilitate the business and be an improvement all round. I think the committee would be in favour of that change.

The minister referred to vessels constructed outside of Canada. I find, from the report of the minister, that, since 1899, ten ships used in the Canadian service, have been constructed outside of Canada, some of them costing as high as half a million dollars. They are as follows:

Vessel.	Where Constructed.	Date.
'Arctic'	Kiel, Germany.	1901.
'Montcalm'	Yoker, Great Britain.	1904.
'Druid'	Paisley, Scotland.	1902.
'Champlain'	Paisley, Scotland.	1904.
'Lady Laurier'	Paisley, Scotland.	1902.
'Lady Grey'	Barrow, Great Britain.	1906.
'Earl Grey'	Barrow, Great Britain.	1909.
'Minto'	Dundee.	1899.
'Simcoe'	Wallsend-on-Tyne	1909.
*'Cartier'	Great Britain	1910.

*In course of construction.

The construction of these ships involved a large expenditure of public money. The people of the maritime provinces have been for some time pressing upon the government that aid should be given to develop shipbuilding there. It is suggested that this aid should take the form of a bounty upon ships of a certain class, and I think it would be a very excellent plan indeed to give assistance of some kind to enable our people to profitably construct these ships. The minister, a few moments ago, spoke of the question of duties on ships coming into Canada. I have here the Canadian Customs tariff of 1907, and I find that item 589 reads:

Ships and other vessels built in any foreign country, if British registered since September 1, 1902, on application for license to engage in the Canadian coasting trade; on the fair market value of the hull, rigging, machinery, boilers, furniture and appurtenances thereof (as provided in part XVI. of the Canadian Shipping Act), British preferential tariff free; intermediate tariff, 25 per cent; general tariff, 25 per cent.

And item 590 reads as follows:

Vessels, dredges, scows, yachts, boats and other water-borne craft, built outside of Canada, of any material, destined for use or service in Canadian waters (not including registered vessels entitled to engage in the coasting trade, nor vessels in transit between Canada and any place outside thereof), n.o.p., on the fair market value of the hull, rigging, machinery boilers, furniture and appurtenances thereof, on arrival in Canada: British preference, 15 per cent; intermediate tariff, 25 per cent; general tariff, 25 per cent.

Mr. JAMESON.

It seems to me that ships designed for the service of the government would certainly not be regarded as registered vessels entitled to engage in the coasting trade and I do not see how they come in free. However I understand that the minister thinks differently. They are able to construct a ship cheaper in Britain and Germany than in this country, and there is no protection to our people unless you give them a bounty.

To provide for breaking ice in Thunder bay and Lake Superior, and other points deemed advisable for the good of navigation, $40,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of keeping navigation open at Fort William and Port Arthur; Midland and Tiffin on the Georgian bay. One boat is used for Fort William and Port Arthur, and the same boat can serve at Midland and Tiffin. We have called for tenders for breaking the ice, and we only received one tender, to which we gave the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to see the advertisement that was put out for tenders. I have a recollection of previous work in that line, and it seemed to me that the whole thing was a pre-arranged job to put it into the hands of one man.

Mr. DANIEL. What kind of vessels are used for breaking ice here?

Mr. BRODEUR. The work consists in breaking the ice and keeping the passage free for the access of vessels within the limits of the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William. Parties tendering must satisfy the department that they are in a position to carry out the work, and must furnish with their tenders a list of the boats they propose to use. All steamboats employed must be owned and registered in Canada. A lump sum must be mentioned for the work and the tender must be accompanied by a deposite of ten per cent of the amount of tender.

Mr. SPROULE. Who got the tender?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Canadian Towing and Wrecking Company were the tenderers, and they received the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the amount of the contract for one year?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was for three years, $30,000 a year.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of boats are used?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are six or seven boats employed in that business. The contract provides that they shall keep the harbour free of ice.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know something about the dimensions of these

boats, and the horse-power of their engines.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are very powerful boats, and have always been carrying on the work successfully. We have an officer there to supervise the work, and he has always reported that the work was perfectly well done by these different tugs.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard the very opposite report. If I knew the horse-power of these boats I could have some judgment as to their working capacity.

Mr. BRODEUR. I can supply information as to the size of the tugs. The department has never received complaints from any ship owner stating that work was not properly carried on. On the contrary, we have received resolutions from public bodies congratulating the department upon the work which was being done there.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister always has enough friends there, who are financially and otherwise interested, to get up these resolutions. I am told that the whole business is controlled pratically by the son-in-law of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), and that the Bowman firm has been exploiting the treasury for their own benefit in several of these cases. A few of them have these boats there and, as a general thing, it has been claimed that whenever a notice is put up for any tender there are certain provisions put in which practically make it impossible for any outsider to come in and tender for this service. At one time there is one reason and at another time another. I remember one some years ago. The boats must be there at a given time, they must be owned by parties in the place and they could not be brought from the outside because it was at a season of the year when it would be impossible to bring any boats in. The result is that the boats owned in the place are the only ones available, the same parties get the contract because nobody else can tender. I have no doubt that when new tenders are called for there will be the same ingenious device so that the contract always goes to the same parties and practically at their own figures.

Mr. BRODEUR. The only restriction which is being made is that they must be Canadian vessels; otherwise, so long as vessels are powerful enough to carry out the work we give them an opportunity. It is important that these vessels should be powerful.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that these 'powerful' vessels are small tugs that are working around the harbour. I am told that by people who have lived there for the last twenty years, who ought to know, and who, to my knowledge and belief, are perfectly reliable and truthful men.

Mr. BRODEUR. The reports in the department generally go to prove that the contract is being properly carried out, that the ice is removed so completely that there is not the least obstruction to vessels going in there.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw an account in the papers not longer ago than the present session, that a boat was breaking the ice around the harbour, but that she was making very poor progress with it, notwithstanding the fact that the ice was not thick then. I would like to know something about the horse-power of these boats, and then I would have some idea of what their capacity is. It might be a rat power for all we know, if we are merely to accept the statement that they are powerful boats.

Mr. ARTHURS. Has the minister any good reason why the harbours of Midland and Tiffin are selected, and why other harbours on the Georgian bay are not treated in the same way?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are the two ports where the largest shipments of grain take place at the beginning of the winter.

Mr. ARTHURS. That was not true five years ago at the time the work was entered into.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was left to the Dominion Marine Association. It is only two years ago that we commenced this work at Midland and Tiffin. We began first by making a contract for breaking the ice in Thunder bay. Later on the suggestion was made, I think by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that we should also provide for those vessels being able to come into the Georgian bay, and as a result of those representations we decided to enter into a small contract for the purpose of seeing that Midland and Tiffin were also kept free from ice at the opening of the season.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I understand that the minister will give us at a later date the number of these boats, the horse-power of each, and who owns them?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I will give that.

Signal Service—$12,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This service is maintained for the purpose of reporting ships at various points.

To provide for the administration of pilotage and maintenance and repairs to steamer 'Eureka,' $35,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The following is an estimate of the cost of the maintenance of the steamer 'Eureka':

Wages	$7,500
Board	3,000
Fuel	2,100
Deck and Engine	7,500
Auxiliary boat service at Father Point	2,000
Miscellaneous, rent, &c.	12,900
	$35,000

Mr. DANIEL. Is this for the Quebec Pilotage district alone?

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount that is voted does not only cover the Quebec district, but the 'Eureka' is connected with the Quebec district.

Mr. DANIEL. How much of the vote does the 'Eureka' take?

Mr. BRODEUR. $20,100.

Mr. DANIEL. That would leave about $15,000 to run the pilotage office?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. What have you there? Do you pay for a building and two or three clerks?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have, a superintendent of pilots in Montreal and one in Quebec, because the department at these two places is the pilotage authority. There are different organizations in other places. In other places where they have a pilotage authority it is appointed sometimes by the government, and sometimes by public bodies. This amount is appropriated for the administration of pilotage generally and the incidental expenses which may be incurred in connection with the other pilotage superintendents at the two places where the department is the pilotage authority.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister, under the Act, has taken over the pilotage authority at Montreal and Quebec?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, in those two pilotage districts. Formerly they were under the control of the Quebec and Montreal Harbour Commissioners. Very serious complaints were made with regard to the administration of the pilotage districts, and it was decided that the department should become the pilotage authority in those districts.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding House adjourned at 11.25 p. m.

Mr. BRODEUR

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 3, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, I beg to renew my question to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to whether he has heard from Washington if the regulations under the International Fisheries Treaty have been dealt with by Congress?

Mr. BRODEUR. A message was sent during last session by the President of the United States recommending the adoption of legislation which would provide for the putting into force of the regulations. A Bill was introduced in the Senate, but was not finally passed. It is expected that the matter will be taken up during the session of Congress which opens to-morrow. I was so informed in a letter which I received this morning from Dr. Starr Jordan.

RECIPROCITY — ADMISSION OF OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the Minister of Customs inform me whether oleomargarine will come into Canada free of duty in competition with Canadian made butter under the new tariff arrangement when it is completed?

Mr. PATERSON. That matter is not dealt with, as far as I remember.

Mr. SPROULE. It is one of the dairy products, it must come under the arrangement.

Mr. BLAIN. I have had some inquiries about it, and I assumed the minister would be able to say whether it would come in.

Mr. PATERSON. Oleomargarine is at present on the prohibited list, and I do not understand that has been abolished, but if my hon. friend will put a question on the Order Paper I shall get precise information.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 152) respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—Mr. Fowke.

Bill (No. 159) to change the name of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SASKATCHEWAN POST OFFICES.

Mr. LAKE:

1. How many post offices are there in the province of Saskatchewan which are not situated on existing lines of railways?
2. How many are accommodated with daily mails?
3. How many twice a week?
4. How many weekly?
5. How many at longer intervals than once a week?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. 738.
2. Five.
3. 253.
4. 469.
5. Five.

ELORA POST OFFICE.

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. Has the site for the new post office at Elora, Ontario, been deeded to the government? If so, when, and by whom was such deed executed?
2. What price was paid for the site?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. (a) Yes. (b) October 15, 1908. (c) By Udney Richardson.
2. $380.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence, declarations, telegrams, mailing lists, and other documents relating to an application asking for the granting of statutory postal privileges to a newspaper published at New Glasgow Nova Scotia, called the Guysborough 'Times.'—Mr. Sinclair.

For a return showing the amount of money invested by Canadian loan, insurance and other financial companies in bonds, securities and other undertakings in the United States.—Mr. Rutan.

For a copy of all the correspondence in connection with the building of bait freezers at Louisburg and Lingan in the riding of South Cape Breton.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all orders in council, memoranda, papers and documents, relating to the transfer, or any negotiations concerning the transfer of a charter known as the Manitoba and South Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

For a return showing the itemized accounts, vouchers, statements, reports and other papers relating to the salary and expenses of and payments to W. O. Creighton, farmer delegate to Great Britain in 1910.—Mr. Stanfield.

For a return showing all itemized accounts, vouchers, statements, reports and other papers relating to the salary of and payments to W. A. Hickman, immigration agent to Great Britain in 1902 and 1903.—Mr. Stanfield.

SUPPLY—TRANSPORTATION OF FISH.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) for a little information in connection with an answer given to me on the 29th of March in reference to the transportation of fish. I wanted to know what was the amount paid out of that aiding fund for transportation of fish from the maritime provinces westward during the several years, to whom it had been paid, how far the distribution of the fish extended towards the west, and what was more important, the quantity of fish transported and the amount paid for transportation. The minister answered all the questions except that with reference to the value of the fish. It seems to me the whole point is involved there. If we appropriate money to aid the maritime provinces to transport fish into Ontario and the western market the essential thing to know is the transportation of the fish encouraged in that way increased, and if so to what extent. If we get no benefit from the money we pay out we do not need to continue.

Mr. BRODEUR. The information in the department only covers the quantity of fish transported. The express companies charge according to the quantity, and not the value of the article transported.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister ought to be able to state what the quantity is.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think we have that in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. If you have not it is a very odd way of doing business.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will get that.

Mr. FOSTER. If you could give as well a description of the kinds of fish it would be useful.

THE CORONATION CONTINGENT.

Mr. HUGHES. (Victoria and Haliburton). I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following item published in this morning's 'Citizen':

INDIAN CONTINGENT.

473 Native Officers and Troops for the Coronation.

London, April 1.—In the Indian army contingent, which is to come to England for the coronation, the regular army will be represented by 27 British officers, 221 Indian officers drawn from every unit of the Indian army, and 218 Sepoys. The Imperial Service troops—the force maintained by certain of the native states—will be represented by 34 Indian officers. There will be in addition the usual proportion of Indian servants and followers. Now that the exact composition of

the force is settled, arrangements are being made by the home authorities for the camp and other arrangements.

There is to be a contingent from Canada of 600 or 700 men. These are mostly young privates who, in due time, I hope, become men of standing in the country; but very few officers are going. I do not know whether the composition or nature of the contingent is prescribed by the Imperial authorities or by the Canadian authorities; but if it could be arranged that a number of officers, men who have given splendid service in the militia force of Canada, and who have earned the honour, could be selected, I am satisfied that this would meet with the approbation of the force throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. I do not for a moment object to the noncommissioned officers and privates going; they are the men who will in due time become officers of the force; but if there is any possibility of sending some of the officers who in the past have given their services to the country, at great expense and inconvenience to themselves, I maintain that these are the men who should first obtain recognition. If the government have any control over the matter, I would be pleased if they would give it their consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I regret that my colleague the Minister of Militia is not here in his seat to give my hon. friend the information he desires. My impression is that he has already stated to the House the lines on which he intends to select the force for the coronation. I believe it is intended to have 750, all told. I will ask my colleague to look at the observations of my hon. friend, and he will perhaps give his answer later on.

Mr. HUGHES. I see that the great majority of the contingent from India are officers who have obtained standing in the service.

THE NEW PLAZA.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see that the government are calling for tenders for the new plaza opposite the Ottawa post office, and I would suggest that before the contract is let, provision be made for removing the unsightly poles which are standing in that locality.

THE CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. JOHN A. BEST (Dufferin). Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he is aware that some of the census enumerators in the county of Dufferin are going about trying to get signatures to a petition in favour of reciprocity. I would ask if the government is paying these men, or who is paying them, for doing so, or if they have received instructions to go out and get signatures to a petition of that kind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am quite sure that they are not paid by the government. They will not go into office as enumerators until the first of June or thereabouts. I know of no fund in connection with reciprocity except the anti-reciprocity fund.

Mr. BEST. I am aware that they have been appointed by the enumerator for the county of Dufferin.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think they have been appointed yet. The order for the appointment of enumerators is not yet issued.

Mr. HUGHES. Perhaps they are only qualifying for the job.

RECIPROCITY—INQUIRY FOR INFORMATION.

Mr. PERLEY. On the 16th of March last a return was ordered by this House, on motion of Mr. Sharpe (Ontario), calling for a statement showing the average prices of butter and eggs in London, England, for the past five years, in comparison with the prices respectively in the Eastern Provinces, in Montreal, in Toronto, in Minneapolis, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Buffalo, in Boston and in New York. In response to this order, the following answer was brought down last Friday:

Trade and Commerce Department,
Ottawa, 25th March, 1911.
Order of the House.

Sir,—I beg to return you herewith your reference No. 172 for statement showing comparative prices of butter and eggs in London, England, and certain points in Canada and the United States. This department has no information upon the subject. Such average prices of butter and eggs, however, are published in trade papers all over the world which can be referred to by any one desiring the information.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. C. T. O'HARA,
Deputy Minister.

Thomas Mulvey, Esq.,
Under secretary of State,
Ottawa.

This reply simply shows that the Department of Trade and Commerce has not got the statistics in its possession, and I wish to register as strong a protest as I can against the government giving an answer of this kind or of refusing us information of this sort. The motion for this information was moved in the ordinary way in this House, and was agreed to unanimously, and I take it that it is the inalienable right of this House to obtain from the government such information as is necessary for the conduct of the business of this House. This information is required for the discussion

of the reciprocity agreement. It is utterly impossible for any one to express a reasonable opinion on that agreement, from an economic point of view, without having such information. If the ministers who made the arrangement at Washington did not have this information, then they entered into the agreement without really knowing what they were doing. If, on the other hand, the government has this information, I care not in which department it is, then every member of this House is entitled to that information, and the answer which I have read is a very extraordinary answer for the government to give. The only inference we can draw from it is that the government think that every member of parliament should go and dig out this information for himself. We have a staff of clerks employed in the different departments of the government at great expense to this country; they do not belong to the Liberal party any more than to the Conservative party; and if this information is not in the government's possession, it should be obtained. The clerks are here for that purpose, and I submit that we are entitled to the information to enable us to make up our minds in a reasonable way on the very important question before this House.

I have here a book prepared by the tariff commission in the United Kingdom which gives a lot of statistics similar to those asked for in this return. I have also an official publication of the Senate of the United States, White Book No. 849, headed 'Reciprocity for Canada' in which are given a number of statistics regarding relative prices in the United States and Canada, and a great deal of other valuable information. Is this country so poor that information of a similar character cannot be provided for us in order that we may discuss this question intelligently and make up our minds on it in a reasonable way? The government either should have had this information in their possession, before entering into this arrangement, or they have been very derelict in their duty. If they have this information, why not give it to us? They should not have brought this agreement down without producing that information. Or if they have not got it, why can they not obtain it and lay it before the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not catch at first the tenor of my hon. friend's observations, but as he went on I think his complaint was that a return ordered by this House had not been supplied by the Department of Trade and Commerce. As the minister of that department is not sitting here, it is impossible for me or any member of the government to give any information regarding the refusal of that department if it made any such refusal. The matter is a new one, of which we have had no notice, but I shall take a note of my hon. friend's complaint and submit it to my hon. colleague.

Mr. PERLEY. What I submit is that we should not be compelled to resort to the newspapers or the libraries to obtain information which ought to be in the possession of the Department of Trade and Commerce. That department or some other surely must have had these figures before our ministers entered into this agreement, and if so they should be put into the possession of this House, and to tell us to hunt them up ourselves is not treating us with the consideration to which we are entitled.

Mr. LAKE. The Department of Trade and Commerce has given an answer which is not at all satisfactory to my hon. friend especially in a matter of such emergency. The plea that the matter is new and brought on without notice is no reason for not supplying the very necessary information asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we would search the records in vain to find anywhere any such answer given to a demand for information on a matter of paramount importance as that given by the Department of Trade and Commerce to my hon. friend (Mr. Perley). That department has been in existence a considerable number of years, it should be manned by a competent staff and have access to all trade records just as much as any department in the United States or elsewhere. Yet when an order is given by this House for a return giving statistics absolutely necessary for a reasonable discussion of this proposed reciprocity agreement, we are told by the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce to go to the library, and look the thing up for ourselves.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) if he had this information in his hands when he went to Washington and entered into this treaty. It seems to me that it was a very singular procedure on the part of a couple of our ministers to enter into an agreement such as this without being possessed of all such information as my hon. friend has moved for. Take for example the prices of wheat and barley. Does the minister know what was the average price of wheat at Minneapolis, say for the last ten years, and at Fort William? Did he know before entering into that agreement what was the average price of land in the maritime provinces as compared with its average price in the adjoining states? Did he know the average prices of cattle, hogs, &c., in both countries? It seems to me, from the information we have been able to

get from the ministers who went to Washington, that they simply went down there and in common parlance 'went it blind.' They either did not have this information, or else they should have communicated it to us in order that we might be able to reason out whether or not reciprocity is in the best interests of Canada, especially the Canadian farmers. Since the question came before the House, I have been trying to get at the facts, but have not been able to do so simply because I do not know where to procure them. One has by dint of minute research to pick them out from day to day. How different on the other side of the line. There they have official publication giving all the details they deemed necessary for their purpose, whereas we have no information of the kind prepared by this government. The United States authorities had this prepared before they entered into this agreement, but they kept it back until they had the agreement signed by our two bright ministers who went to Washington, and then had all the material at hand to show what advantages this arrangement would give the United States. They were careful however, to hold this information back until such time as they had our government tied hard and fast. From all we can learn, our ministers were not aware what they were entering into, and were not fully prepared to make the best bargain possible in the interests of Canada. I think we are entitled to an answer from the Minister of Customs.

Mr. PATERSON. I have heard the hon. gentleman express his views and he is entitled to all the comfort he can obtain from them.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not think that the hon. minister is treating this House fairly by any means. The people of Canada have the right to know whether or not our ministers, when they went to Washington, had the information it was necessary they should have in order to guard the interests of the Dominion.

Mr. CONMEE. They made a good bargain anyhow.

Mr. LAKE. I think that the government or the Department of Trade and Commerce should be able to give us information regarding the prices of all agricultural products in these twelve other countries, and the British colonies which, under the favoured nation clause, will be able to enter our markets on the same terms as the United States. We should have the average prices of all these different products in these countries before being called on to decide this question.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not think the Minister of Customs is acting within his rights in refusing the information asked for by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples), if the minister has that information. What is the situation in which we find ourselves? It is a most peculiar one. The Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance went down to Washington, apparently without adequate statistical information, and in a very short time entered into an agreement, the effect of which on the people of Canada no one can at present foresee. It is an arrangement, which, in the opinion of a majority of our people, will cripple Canadian industries and lead to very serious trade complications.

That agreement, it is said, was put through in a very short time. The two plenipotentiaries for this country came back and, after practically only one hour's consultation at the Council Board, the agreement was laid upon the table of this House and parliament was asked to ratify it. Now, Sir, I do think that what my hon. friend from Macdonald says is entitled to a great deal more consideration than the Minister of Customs, or the Prime Minister, or any other member of this government, gives to it. If these ministers had the relative information upon which to justify that pact with the United States and without which it could not be justified, they should, immediately the agreement was brought here, and parliament was asked to ratify it, in all fairness and decency, have laid that information on the table of the House so that the opposition, or any member of the House, or anybody in the country, would not have to come begging day after day to extract it from this government. To be met in such a serious crisis as this in the commercial history of this country with what I think is a very discourteous reply to my hon. friend from Macdonald, from the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, is certainly not giving the amount of information which parliament is entitled to have. I should like to know for my own information, and for the information of my constituents, what are the relative prices included in the information which the ministers had before them when they made this agreement. How do the favoured nations benefit by it, to what extent, and what are the relative prices of the commodities which are included in the schedules affected by the favoured nation treaty? Surely, if the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Finance did not go at this matter in a blind manner, they must have had this information, and if they had it they should bring it down and not send impertinent answers when hon. members of this House ask for the information now.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) is certainly within his rights in

asking for this information. He wants information that affects his part of the country, I suppose, more particularly, and I also want it for my part of the country. Cheese, butter, hogs, potatoes and vegetables are the most important commodities in so far as my district is concerned. I cannot believe for one minute that the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) went to Washington without having had all these statements laid before them, showing the business that was being done with other countries in these articles. If my hon. friend the Minister of Customs had these statements when he went to Washington, why does he now not lay them on the table of the House? Why should they not be printed? We have appealed to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and to the government several times to give us some information, so that we could judge as to whether this was a good arrangement or not, but we have not so far been able to get any information other than the little blue-book showing the changes in the tariff. President Taft has submitted to the members of Congress a little book showing the comparative prices or values of farm products in Canada and the United States. He has started at the Atlantic and gone through to the Pacific. Will the Minister of Customs deny that that statement is not correct? It shows that the values in Canada are much higher than they are in the United States. It shows that it would be an advantage to the American farmers to get into this country because the prices of farm products are higher in Canada than in the United States. The Minister of Customs must have had that information when he made this agreement, or if he had that information, he must have known that he was selling out the farmers of this country, body and bones, to the American farmers. Why could he not give us this information? In my opinion the Minister of Customs knows that he was gold bricked when he made this arrangement, and that an investigation made since the conclusion of the negotiations shows conclusively that the statement is true, that prices of farm products are higher in Canada than they are in the United States. The minister finds that the farmers are getting better prices here, he knows that if the tariff wall is thrown down they will get lower prices, and he is afraid to sumbit to this House the information which we are anxious to secure because he knows that it condemns his agreement. The minister could send his officials from one end of this Dominion to the other and get this information, but the very fact that the minister has not got this information and has not laid it on the table convinces me, as it convinces the farmers of this country, that he is afraid to undertake that task because we would not be able to see that the statement that the farmers are getting better prices in Canada than in the United States, is borne out by the evidence. I have no hesitation in saying that the prices of farm products in Canada to-day are higher than they are in the United States, and that the value of farms in Canada is higher than it is in the United States. What is the reason the minister will not give us this information? He has not given us any information except that for which he has been asked in the House. Is he afraid to give us a pamphlet like that which the President of the United States has laid before Congress? Yes, he is afraid to do it. He knows he could not face the farmers with such a statement as that. I think it is time for the Minister of Customs to do something of this kind. He has all that information in his department, we are entitled to it, he should bring it down, and if he does he will never try to shove this reciprocity agreement through.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I think we have proved this afternoon that the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is not in possession of all the information that was necessary in forming the agreement. I asked the plain question on the orders of the day this afternoon whether or not oleomargarine, an article that will come into competition with the butter made by the farmers of Canada, would be admitted free under this new agreement. In the United States, this is a very important industry, so important that the government have a revenue of over $2,000,000 per year derived from a tax upon this adulterated article that comes into competition with the butter made by the farmers of the United States. One would have thought that the Minister of Customs, when he was at Washington would have looked into this question. When an important industry such as that is flourishing in the United States, bringing this adulterated article into competition with the butter made by the farmers of that country, surely my hon. friend, in making this agreement, would have considered whether or not this article was to be admitted into Canada in competition with the butter made by our Canadian farmers. My hon. friend says this afternoon in answer to that question, I don't know.

Mr. PATERSON. I said, No.

Mr. BLAIN. He said, No, then hesitated, and finally he said across the House to myself, 'Put a question on the Order Paper, and I will give you an answer.' One would think that a question like that could have been answered at once by one of the gentlemen who were at Washington with three months' time for consideration. My hon. friend did overlook

that important question when he was considering these things at Washington, and one would suppose there had never been any suggestions in this House that he should learn the facts in respect of this agreement before now.

Mr. PATERSON. I told you.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept that. Finally, however, he said, 'Put a question on the Order Paper.'

Mr. PATERSON. Because there seemed to be a doubt in the hon. gentleman's mind, and I had not the documents before me, and I was going to look this up.

Mr. BLAIN. Then we will have the answer, I suppose. Now there is another point. The United States government are experts on tariffs, as everybody knows. There are a great many regulations that the United States have in respect of their tariff that admit goods free from Canada, and that the Canadian people do not understand. This House should be in possession of that information when we are dealing with these important questions. For example, a prominent cattleman comes into my county every year, and purchases the very best cattle that are to be found, and he takes them free into the United States under a regulation made by the United States government. My farmers ask the question, particularly after the speech of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), when he said that cattle would be worth $14 a head more under this agreement than they are now; they are confronted with that statement of my hon. friend, who I do not think believes it himself. Now, I am asked the question in my county by the farmers: Mr. Blain, will we get a better price for our cattle when this agreement goes into operation? I ought to be in a position to answer that, I should be in possession of the information furnished by the Minister of Customs, or the Minister of Finance, so that I might be able to say to my farmers: The government say that you will get a better price.

Mr. PATERSON. Would you believe it?

Mr. BLAIN. Well, one would hesitate to believe it, that is, in view of such insufficient information as my hon. friend is giving to the House to-day. Yet I would not hesitate to believe my hon. friend. That is about the way it strikes my mind this afternoon. Now, the United States government have regulations of that kind. The fact is that these cattle are purchased every year by United States cattlemen coming from Chicago into the county of Peel, and other counties, they purchase the best cattle in the county, and under regulations of the United States tariff they take these cattle over into the United States absolutely free of duty. Then my hon. friend says under this new arrangement that our farmers will get a better price because we have free trade between the United States and Canada in cattle. Then why does not my hon. friend furnish this House with the facts? The same regulation applies to western wheats. As I understand it, the wheat that the Minneapolis and St. Paul miller requires to grind, under this agreement is admitted into the United States free of duty now. Why does not my hon. friend show over his own signature what the facts are in respect to all these matters as affected by this agreement? These are matters that ought to receive some attention. My hon. friend is a little late in the day in shaking his head. If he had done this before he made the agreement, of course the agreement might never have been made. I am only directing attention to one or two matters concerning which the facts ought to be in the possession of every member of this House. If these facts were made known by the government, the newspapers would not be called upon to make statements from this man, or from the other man, instead of making statements authorized by the government. I say we have just ground of complaint against my hon. friend. I hope we will be able, even at this late day, to give some information to the House for the benefit of the farmers in our constituencies. Naturally they will hold my hon. friend responsible, seeing that he took so active a part in making the agreement. If he will give us the facts we are asking for, I will be glad to communicate them to the farmers of my county.

Mr. PATERSON. I will remind my hon. friend that when we reach the agreement again, he will see that in these matters there may be differences in the administration of our customs laws. It is provided and agreed that if there should be friction in these matters, they shall be made as reciprocal as possible, and if it is necessary on either side to have legislation, the legislation will be had. The matter my hon. friend brings up will be dealt with. For instance they may require certificates from us that we do not require from them, and in some cases we may require certificates that they may think are not necessary. These questions will be the subject of conferences, for which the agreement itself provides.

Mr. PERLEY. Did the hon. the minister, or did he not, in Washington, have the statistics of comparative prices of the various farm products as between the United States and Canada when he was making this agreement?

Mr. PATERSON. We had all the information that we thought was necessary to justify us in making the agreement.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think, perhaps, hon. gentlemen are a little too severe on the Minister of Customs in demanding this additional information; personally I am under the impression that the Minister of Customs never had the information. I do not think, either, that the Minister of Finance ever took the trouble to inquire as to what these common prices were between this country and the United States. They simply jumped into the arrangement that was handed down, cut and dried, by President Taft, who no doubt took the same means of forcing this agreement upon them as he did in Albany a year ago, when he held a club over the head of the Finance Minister and demanded that he should come down or he would shoot, and Mr. Fielding came down. He gave away a lot of our market, and got nothing whatever in return. I presume the procedure at Washington was very much the same. I have an impression from what I can learn that this whole arrangement was presented to the two ministers who went down there, all cut and dried, and they were told, 'You have got to accept it,' and I do not believe there was any alternative offered them. I do not think the question of prices ever entered into the consideration by the two ministers. What did it signify to them? They were to get a treaty, they found one cut and dried, they took it and came back; and inside of an hour after they met their colleagues, it was thrown on the table, and this parliament was told, 'You must take every word of it, you cannot even take the dot off an 'i' or the stroke off a 't,' you have to accept the whole thing. Why, it was not the purpose of the ministers to make an intelligent agreement, they wanted an agreement, and they were bound to make one, and they did make one. Now I believe if they had had the information, they never would have made such a stupid agreement as that. I take the Minister of Custom's silence as indicating that they did not know a thing about the difference between the prices on this side and on the other side; there can be no other conclusion. I do not think the minister will ever make the people believe that he knew what he was doing. They went along hap-hazard, without considering at all what was best in the interests of Canada. Of course they talk about bigger prices in the United States. They are telling the people of this country that if they can only get their commodities into the United States they will get bigger prices; then, if they can only buy in the United States, they will buy cheaper. All their propositions are so extremely absurd and so contradictory, that I am convinced they never attempted to gather any information about these facts, and never got the information. It was a go-it-blind and that was all they wanted.

Mr. PATERSON. I am glad to find that at any rate some few gentlemen on the other side of the House have made up their minds what they ought to do on this question. We may hear from the others by and by.

Mr. BURRELL. I think it must strike every member on this side and the country as well as an extraordinary thing that with such an important matter as this before the country the one little piece of statistical information that the country needs on which to base their reasoning is absolutely denied by the government who are in charge of the whole thing. The Minister of Customs says that they had all the information that they thought necessary, and yet he refuses apparently to tabulate that information in such a shape that the House can understand it and the country base their arguments upon it. It is extraordinary, the minister would hardly think he was justified in going to the length he did, in reference to the fruit industry unless he had posted himself upon the subject statistically and if he had all the statistics in his possession the fruit growers of Canada have an absolute right to have them laid on the table. Seven weeks have elapsed since an important delegation of 800 fruit growers from Niagara appeared before the government. An order was issued that their representations should be printed forthwith, yet seven weeks have elapsed and we have not received the printed copies of those representations, so that the country have neither the information on which the ministers acted nor the arguments advanced by the fruit men.

Mr. MURPHY. When the hon. member drew attention to the printing of the proceedings, on the occasion of the visit of that deputation to Ottawa, I made inquiry and was told that the report was ready for distribution that day.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is it now?

Mr. MURPHY. In the distribution office.

EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS—RECEPTION TO CARDINAL VANNUTELLI.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems to be an hour of complaint about the answers given by members of the government. I would call attention to some answers which I received which in my judgment were not proper answers. These answers are either right or wrong; if they are right, they do

not accord with what has been accepted as reliable information from other sources. On December 5, I asked:

1. By what authority or under what commission was Mr. Justice Girouard appointed to act as Deputy Governor, or administrator of the government, during the absence of His Excellency the Governor General, last summer and fall?
2. What powers were conferred upon him by any such commission?
3. Did he as such administrator send a telegram or message to Cardinal Vannutelli, the papal legate, on the latter's arrival in Canada? If so, what were the contents of such message or telegram?
4. In sending such message or telegram did he act upon the advice of his constitutional adviser?

The right hon. the Prime Minister replied to Nos. 1 and 2, by letters patent constituting the office, and then he went on to deal with the matter of form, which was quite regular. The right hon. gentleman read the Marconi telegram in French and then translated it into English. The translation, to begin with, is different from all translations I saw of it in any of the literature relating to it. The French version was 'gives homages,' or 'homage.' But the right hon. the first minister translated:

The administrator of the government of Canada presents his respects to His Excellency and bids him welcome.

I am not so specially concerned with that as with the other part of the answer.

On the face of it, this Marconigram was sent during the month of August. During that month Mr. Justice Girouard did not act in the capacity of Administrator, as, during the whole of August, His Excellency, was in Canada, but, on the 1st of August, His Excellency the Governor General, before leaving for his trip to the Hudson Bay, appointed Mr. Justice Girouard, Deputy Governor. Mr. Justice Girouard did not consult the ministers of the Crown and received no advice from any of them.

If he was appointed on the first of August and the Governor General left on that day surely he must have been acting in that month, and yet the previous part of the answer says he was not acting, as the Governor General was here and was attending to the duties himself. That may be a typographical error, it may be the first of September or any other month, but that is all the answer I received. I submit that it cannot be a correct or reasonable answer. On the same day I asked another question concerning guards of honour. The answer to that was given by the Minister of Militia as follows:

1. Guards of honour are authorized by King's regulations and orders for the Canadian militia, 1910, to be furnished as follows:—

(a) To attend upon the King and other royal personages, and upon presidents of those republican states in which the Sovereign is represented by an ambassador.
(b) At state ceremonials.
(c) For governors and lieutenant governors administering the governments of His Majesty's possessions on such occasions as are customary within their governments.
(d) To a lieutenant governor of a province on the opening and prorogation of a provincial legislature.
(e) Special guards of honour may be furnished to the Governor General at any time upon the requisition of the military secretary.
(f) On the arrival and departure of a general officer appointed to command the Canadian forces.
(g) In the absence of the Governor General, the administrator of the government in entitled to receive the same honours as those accorded to the Governor General.
(h) When a foreign general or flag officer lands at a military station within His Majesty's dominion to visit the civil governor or officer in command.
(i) When a naval officer of flag rank commanding in chief lands for the first time at a port within his command.
(j) If deemed expedient to receive distinguished personages other than those mentioned in (a), (b) and (c), and on occasions other than those specified in paragraph 1370 of the regulations, where it is laid down when honours and salutes are to be given by troops on parade.

Guards of honour are to be carried out on all occasions where practicable by the permanent force, but, if a unit of the force is not available then by a corps of the active militia.

2. Guards of honour are furnished by officers commanding commands or independent districts under authority of King's regulations and orders for the Canadian militia, 1910.

If guards of honour are required to be furnished for any occasion other than as specified in (1), then special authority for the same must be obtained from militia headquarters.

3. Quebec—Opening of provincial legislature, March 15, 1910. Authority—para. 1391, King's regulations and orders, 1910.

Arrival of Major General Sir John French, inspector general of the imperial forces, 19th May, 1910. Authority given from militia headquarters, 17th May, 1910.

Departure of Major General Sir John French, 8th July, 1910. Authority issued from militia headquarters, 6th July, 1910.

Three Rivers—None.

That is all it says about Quebec. I want to say that I have in my possession a letter from a gentleman living in Quebec, who so far as I know, is reliable, and he says that he was present when the guard of honour was there to meet Cardinal Vannutelli, and that it escorted him through the city and accompanied him to the boat on his departure. I am not going to say that that information is correct, but it certainly con-

flicts with the information given here. The answer also says that at Three Rivers there was none, but I have information there was a guard at Three Rivers. The answer says that at Montreal there was none and I am not going to dispute that. Then the question was put:

On what state occasions or other occasions, if any, is it proper for the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, or Senate, to wear his official robes or apparel outside the precincts of parliament during the recess or when parliament is prorogued?

On all such occasions when he attends any function or gathering in that capacity should he not be accompanied by the Sergeant-at-Arms with the mace?

That was answered as follows:

The government is not aware of any precedents in the matter referred to; although there may have been occasions when speakers of Canadian legislatures have attended such celebrations.

Well, I was not aware that there ever was such a celebration in Canada before. Then the answer continues:

On such occasions it is customary in the province of Quebec for judges of the higher courts to appear in their official costumes, and His Honour the Speaker holding rank as a magistrate——

Not as the Speaker of the House of Commons, but as a magistrate, and I ask myself the question: If he were going on the bench to try a case would he appear there in his official robes as the Speaker of the Commons.

—informs the government that on the occasion above referred to he appeared similarly attired as a mark of respect for the solemnity of the occasion.

Well, that is rather a peculiar answer if it is not somewhat amusing. Then, I asked a question with regard to the administrator of the government, and the answer is that Mr. Justice Girouard was not acting in August as the Governor General was here during all the month of August and attended to his duties, but afterwards the answer says that Justice Girouard was appointed in August. Then it says that Mr. Justice Girouard was applied to for information, but he failed to give it. It does seem to me that when the government is asked to give information on a public question they should surely have sufficient authority to enable them to make any official give an official answer. I am speaking on this matter with a little restraint on account of the lamented demise of Mr. Justice Girouard, and I only refer to it because I am obliged to do so in connection with these other matters. I think the least that could be expected is a courteous reply, but that is not deigned to be given to the House. It may be in the estimation of the person who gave the reply that it was only some insignificant private member who asked the question, and therefore any answer would do, but in my judgment a member of parliament is a member of parliament, and as such is entitled to the courtesy of a proper reply to any proper questions that are put by him. Then, the following question was put the other day by my hon. friend from Dufferin:

1. Did the federal government tender a reception to Cardinal Vannutelli in Montreal during his attendance at the Eucharistic Congress in September last?
2. If so under whose supervision or orders, acting for the government, was it carried out?
3. What members of the federal government attended?
4. How many invitations were issued?
5. What government officials besides the cabinet ministers attended?
6. Did such government officials including the Speaker of the House of Commons, attend clothed in their official robes of office?
7. How much did it cost the country, under whose authority and out of what item of the Supply Bill or estimates was it paid?

The simple answer given to that question by the First Minister is:

The federal government did not tender a reception to Cardinal Vannutelli during his attendance at the Eucharistic Congress in September?

But, I have in my hand the narrative of that gathering in Montreal published by the parties themselves, and it states:

Reception of the Dominion government. Unusual, not in magnitude, perhaps, but by reason of the cosmopolitan character of the guests was the reception given at night at the Windsor by the Hon. Charles Murphy, Secretary of State, acting for the federal government.

It says:

The gathering was large but the composition of it was its striking feature.

And it gives a full account of the reception. The question now is which is right, and which is wrong. I do not say that the answer given by the First Minister is wrong, but one or the other is wrong. Of course, the denial that there was any state reception given covered all the other questions. I draw attention to these answers because they appeal to me as not being proper, or at least not such as give the whole information. They may be absolutely correct so far as I know, but they are certainly not in accord with the information given to me by reliable sources.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have already spoken on this matter, but the House will,

I hope bear with me if I answer my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). There is one portion of the hon. gentleman's observations which I was sorry to hear, and that is when he complained that he had not been treated with proper courtesy in the answer he received. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that there was no intention on my part to be discourteous to him, and if he feels he was treated discourteously I am sorry he did not at the time call my attention to the matter, because I would have deemed it my duty to give him every possible satisfaction. There is nothing further from my mind than not to deal with an old member (and I may say an old friend as I regard the hon. member from Grey) in a courteous manner. I hope he will acquit me of any intention of being discourteous to him.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the answer which I gave to my hon. friend on the 5th December (page 724, 'Hansard') there is a misprint which is very obvious. In the month of August His Excellency was not in the country; I think he came here about the end of August or thereabouts. Then His Excellency went to the Hudson Bay, and he was absent from the capital, but he was still in Canada. When His Excellency was out of the country there was an administrator, but when he was in the country there was a Deputy Governor. That is the difference. The answer which I gave my hon. friend is to be found as follows on page 725, of 'Hansard':

On the face of it this Marconigram was sent during the month of August. During that month Mr. Justice Girouard did not act in the capacity of administrator, as during the whole of August, His Excellency was in Canada, but on the first of August——

That is a misprint; it should be the first of September.

—but on the first of September His Excellency before leaving for his trip to the Hudson Bay appointed Mr. Justice Girouard Deputy Governor.

I think I am correct about this, but I will have it verified again. With regard to the answer given to this inquiry of the hon. member for Dufferin as to whether the government had tendered a reception to His Eminence Cardinal Vannutelli, I can only say that the government did not do anything of the kind, but a member of the government, my colleague the Secretary of State did tender a reception to His Eminence Cardinal Vannutelli.

NEGRO IMMIGRATION.

Mr. THOBURN (Lanark). Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the government to place any restrictions on or to stop altogether negro immigration from the southern states into our Canadian Northwest? We find by the newspaper reports that these people are coming over into Canada by the hundreds; later on they will come by thousands, and so long as we give them free homesteads in the Canadian Northwest they will come by the tens of thousands. I would like to ask the government if they think it in the interests of Canada that we should have negro colonization in our Canadian Northwest? Would it not be preferable to preserve for the sons of Canada the lands they propose to give to niggers? I draw the attention of the minister of the Interior to an article bearing on this question which appears in one of our newspapers. The article is headed: 'Many Negroes Coming Over,' and is as follows:

Winnipeg March 28.—The arrival of a party of two hundred negroes from Oklahoma last week bound for free homestead land in Athabasca Landing district northwest of Edmonton, is raising a good deal of protest throughout the west and the opinion is freely offered that steps should be taken by the Dominion government to put a stop to a class of immigration that the experience of the Southern States would indicate is hardly to be classed as desirable. The party, which came into Canada by way of Emerson last week, was subjected to the most rigorous examination by the immigration officials, who found themselves unable to stop a single member of the party. All had plenty of money, were in perfect health and apparently of good moral standing. They talked freely and stated that they feared neither cold nor privation, and that all they were seeking was free land and a chance to make homes for their families.

The final action of the Canadian government in admitting to that country negro families from Oklahoma whose members possess $5 each is having the effect of furthering the colonization movement among Oklahoma's negroes, especially in Okfusgee, Muskogee and Creek counties, where there is a large negro population.

The first immigration to Canada during the past week was of ninety families, 500 negroes in all, from the vicinity of Clearview, in Okfusgee county. They sold all their property in this state, intending to take up homesteads in Canada. Many other negroes are making preparations to start and indications are there will be a general exodus.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend wants to know what the government is going to do under a certain condition which he has stated. The government can only do as parliament authorizes it to do. Parliament has passed a certain law in regard to immigration, and the government is administering that law. There is no provision in the law to prevent negroes from coming into Canada, and until parliament makes such provision, it will not be possible for the government to take action on its own responsibility. As to the facts of

the case as stated by my hon. friend there is practically no question. There are already in the prairie provinces several settlements of negroes from Oklahoma. When these people came to Canada they get the same rights as anybody else. Any person coming from another country into Canada and having the necessary qualifications is entitled to a homestead, and negroes get free homesteads the same as any other people. So far they have been treated exactly the same as other people have been, both in their admission to the country and in regard to taking up land in the country. They will have to be continued in that treatment until parliament authorizes some other action on the part of the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister give the House information as to the number of negroes in these colonies, where they are situated, and how long they have been accumulating? I think it is fair to say that the House has only within the last few days understood that there was any movement of this kind.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give my hon. friend a comprehensive answer at the moment; but I am aware that there is a negro colony at or near Paynton, in Saskatchewan, on the Canadian Northern line midway between Battleford and Lloydminster. I should think there are upwards of 100 families.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw a statement of a reverend gentleman that there were over 17,000.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is mistaken. At the census of 1901 there were something like 17,000 altogether in Canada. There is another colony of 20 or 30 families on the Grand Trunk Pacific 75 or 80 miles west of Edmonton, around the shores of Chip lake. There is still another colony, and it is to this that the present movement is being directed, near Athabasca Landing, about 100 miles north of Edmonton, with 30 or 40 families. The movement of this spring is the first large, organized movement. Those who came previously drifted in casually. No special attention was paid to their arrival, they passed inspection and got their land the same as other people. There have been objections raised against their being so dealt with, but it did not seem possible for the Department of the Interior to take any other action until parliament had made provision in the law that some other action should be taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this matter is a little more important than the words or the action of the Minister of the Interior would seem to indicate that he thinks it to be. I would be very sorry indeed to see any colour line drawn in the Dominion of Canada. We have quite a large negro population in Canada, some of whom came over, but most of whom are descendants of those who came in the old days, when slavery flourished in the United States. We gave them a hearty welcome and a hospitable one. They have retained generally the respect of the people of Canada, and they have enjoyed all the rights and privileges of free men here. We are glad that they are doing so. But I think the government should recollect that there are some ten millions of a coloured population in the United States of America, in many districts under conditions which are not at all agreeable to the coloured people.

There is a feeling in that country that we in Canada know scarcely anything of, and attempts have been made there to solve that difficulty in various ways so as to assuage that feeling if possible; but now, if an organized effort is made, and if it becomes known that every adult negro in the United States may take up 160 acres of our best land, a migration may be formed, the extent of which, and the result of which we have not the least idea at present. It seems to me that the matter is one of such importance that the minister can hardly say he cannot do anything because parliament has not legislated on the subject. The matter is one which the government ought to take under its immediate consideration and concerning which it ought to define a policy and submit that policy to parliament. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has not been backwards in defining a policy with reference to British subjects who are not of the same colour and nationality as ourselves. He has not been at all feeble in preventing in a most effective way the settlement of our country of inhabitants of the empire who are loyal to us and have fought for British rule in all quarters of the world. If the hon. minister has any intention of meeting this question he can find a way of carrying out that intention; but if not it seems to me he scarcely sees what may come as a result of this movement which has now been started. I do not want to criticise, but I submit that this is something worth thinking about and having a policy about.

Mr. OLIVER. I would impress upon my hon. friend the distinction between legislation and administration. We are at present administering the immigration law as enacted by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend is also the author of the law.

Mr. OLIVER. I am quite prepared to admit that, and accept the situation, but

I want to emphasize the difference between administrative and legislative responsibility and to place myself before the House as having acted so far absolutely according to administrative responsibility. As to legislative responsibility, that is a matter in which my hon. friend will have to assume his share of responsibility.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government any policy on this question?

Mr. OLIVER. The question has only just arisen. Would my hon. friend suggest that we should adopt a drastic policy because of an occasional incident of immigration? We do not know that there is such a campaign being organized as my hon. friend (Mr. Thoburn) alleges. No doubt there has been some talk in the newspapers about such a campaign, but that has only arisen within the last month, and, therefore, we are hardly chargeable with negligence in not having framed a policy to anticipate something which so far is only in the prospective stage.

Mr. THOBURN. Does the hon. minister think that it is in the best interests of Canada that we should have this negro colonization in our Northwest? I should like to draw attention to this clause in the article to which I have referred:

> The opinion is freely offered that steps should be taken by the Dominion government to put a stop to a class of immigration that the experience of the southern states would indicate is hardly to be considered to be desirable.

Would the hon. minister think it advisable that we should change our law so as to enable the government to interdict immigration of this character?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). If the proposition of my hon. friend involves anything, it means that the minister should provide some further legislation which would enable him to exclude from Canada, on account of colour, people who at present do not come within any of the provisions regarding undesirables. Of course, if a man be undesirable within the meaning of the statute, he should be excluded, whether he be coloured or white; but I trust that my hon. friends opposite do not propose to exclude a man simply because of his colour, whether from the United States or any other part of the world. The law we have is very broad. It has ample provisions dealing with the exclusion of undesirables, no matter from what country they come, or of what colour, or nationality. But does my hon. friend pretend that we should exclude a man simply because he is coloured, regardless whether he be an undesirable or not in other respects.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. THOBURN. Will the minister answer my question?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken several times and cannot take up further the time of the House unless with the consent of the House.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I desire to draw attention to the non-fulfilment by the United States of their obligation under the Fisheries Treaty of 1908. That treaty was not of Canadian seeking but like other arrangements, not necessary to revert to at present, was entered into at the solicitation of the United States. At the time it was supposed to be a matter of urgency, and time was made the essence of the contract from the beginning. It was provided that the commissioners should be appointed for three months and that, within six months after appointment, they should draw up a set of regulations to govern the international fisheries. It was further provided that the two governments should enforce by legislation and executive action, with as little delay as possible, whatever regulations those commissioners might agree to. It was also agreed by the Canadian government that they should make certain concurrent regulations with respect to the fisheries on the Fraser river. On the part of Canada, as usual, there was rigid compliance with the stipulations of this treaty. We appointed our commissioner and adopted regulations and made the concurrent regulations respecting the Fraser river. On the part of the United States, however, the whole result of this attempt at fisheries regulation was to secure a draft made by the two commissioners binding upon Canada, to which the Marine and Fisheries Department has adhered, so far as Canadian fisheries are concerned, but to which, in the two years that have elapsed, the United States have not paid the slightest attention. I find that these regulations were transmitted to Congress by President Taft, in his message of February, 1910. In that message, President Taft submitted the report of Secretary of State Knox, in which Mr. Knox said:

> It is appropriate that they should now be transmitted by you to the Congress in order that due legislative action on the part of this government, stipulated for by article III, of the treaty, may be taken.

By the Congress of 1910 no action was taken. Again, in 1911, the regulations were recommended to the consideration of Congress, but Congress rose without any action being taken at that second session. We have no record of any appeal on the part of this government against the breach of faith implied by the failure of the execu-

tive of the United States to secure action by their Congress. We learn to-day, for the first time, that a third attempt is to be made by President Taft to get Congress to consider these regulations. I think the history of this transaction shows the folly of the Canadian government continuing in the course upon which it has embarked of making one treaty after another with the United States without any guarantee, or any attempt to exact a guarantee from the United States, that this treaty will be enforced, that the same code of honour should be applied on the American side as is applied on the Canadian side in connection with matters of this kind.

I may say that there is a very urgent reason, with respect to the fisheries of the Fraser river and of Puget Sound, why this treaty should be put into effect, and it is that under the arrangement existing at the present time, American trap fishermen are taking in wholesale quantities, the salmon on their way to the Fraser river, without any regulations at all such as prevail on the Canadian side for the preservation of this fishery, in regard to a close season, to prevent the taking of fish by destructive methods. So much is that the case that the American commissioner, Professor David Starr Jordan, has sent to Secretary Knox a statement with regard to the operations going on in the state of Washington from which I will read a short extract. Professor Starr Jordan says:

> With upwards of 2,500 square miles of fishing territory, the State of Washington has no patrol vessels, and so far as I know but a single gasoline launch. The present statutes are fairly well enforced in most of the eastern boundary States, notably so in Ohio and Pennsylvania. In Washington they are not adequately enforced. It is claimed that in the current season the fishermen of Washington caught by encroachment on the close season, salmon to the value of upward of $600,000, to which they were not entitled. Part of these should have been taken in British Columbia waters. The others should have escaped up Fraser river to the spawning grounds. In Canada, throughout the boundary waters, the statutes now in effect are rigidly enforced. It does not even occur to any one to violate them. The real need of the boundary situation is less that of stringent legislation than of equal enforcement of law on either side. I see no way to accomplish this except by a federal patrol, corresponding to the Dominion patrol of Canada.

It is such a federal patrol that Congress has been asked to establish, and so far has refused to establish, so that for two seasons after this recommendation has been made we still find our fish being taken without any restriction whatever by trap fishermen in Puget Sound waters. The matter is particularly worthy of discussion at the present moment from the fact that by a subsequent arrangement it is proposed to allow free into Canada the whole catch of these traps if our canners desire to import the fish. It makes it all the more exasperating that the fishermen of the Fraser river should see the fish bound to their river being illegally caught in the United States, being caught without any restriction whatever, and this government making it easier to bring these fish into competition with our Canadian caught fish by a proposal to remove the duty and make them as free in Canada as are the fish caught under strict regulation in Canada at the present time. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the conditions this government might very well lay before the government at Washington the idea that it is well to take one international arrangement at a time, particularly where there are two under discussion affecting the same subject, as the two now under discussion affect this subject of fisheries, that it is due to our Canadian fishing interests to insist that this Fisheries Treaty should be honourably observed by the government of the United States, that it should be put into force and that they should observe the agreed-upon regulations for the preservation of the fisheries in international waters on the Pacific before we agree to any other arrangement affecting the product of those fisheries.

I understand the reason that the Senate of the United States hesitates to give effect to this treaty is that hearings have been given to the fishery interests of the United States affected by the proposals. That is a privilege which the United States commissioner distinctly agreed with the Canadian commissioner should not be given. It was distinctly arranged that the regulations as agreed upon by these two commissioners should go into effect without any change whatever for a fixed period and that if the experience of their operation showed that a change should be necessary it should be made by agreement between the two commissioners. The regulations are in many respects very unsatisfactory to the Canadian fishery interests. It is unnecessary now to go into detail as to the matters of dissatisfaction. They were discussed in this House on a previous occasion, but, since the American interests are being heard by the Senate at Washington with a view to a modification of the regulations in their interest, it seems to be more than ever incumbent that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should arrange with Washington that a similar privilege on this side of the line should be allowed and that the proposal made in this House two sessions ago to refer this matter to our Committee on Fisheries, as it has been referred at Washington to their Committee on Fisheries, should be adopted so that we could hear our interests and learn from them what we

should do to make these regulations effective for the protection of Canadian interests as well as the protection of American interests. When I discussed this question before with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he told me that this was a matter altogether impossible, because it was an affair of honour between him and the government at Washington that these regulations should be adopted precisely as they stood. Now, it seems to me that as this pledge of honour has not been fulfilled at Washington, we are absolved from being any more strict with regard to our share of this matter than they are with respect to their share, and I would ask the minister whether he will not take into consideration a representation to Washington under which, without any charge of breach of faith, we might submit this matter to our Committee on Fisheries, so that we may discuss there the amendments which I think should be made to these regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on this question, but I suppose I will be permitted to offer a few remarks in answer to what has been said by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor). This Boundary Waters Treaty, as my hon. friend has stated, has been under consideration for some time. Some two years ago it was agreed that a joint commission should be appointed by the United States and by the British authorities, for the purpose of framing fishery regulations to apply to the boundary waters. Dr. Starr Jordan was appointed on the American side, and Professor Prince was appointed on our side. Both set to work and framed a set of regulations, which were to be submitted to both governments. It was necessary on our part to pass legislation for the purpose of putting in force those regulations after the issuance of the proclamation contemplated by the treaty. This was done last year. In the United States it is contended that those regulations must be submitted to the Senate. It is contended in the United States that the treaty-making power is vested, not as in Great Britain, with the King, with the advice and consent of his counsellors, but the treaty-making power in the United States is vested in the President and the Senate of the United States. Therefore, in order that a treaty may come into force it is necessary not only that the President should sign it, but that it should be approved by the Senate, since the treaty-making power is vested in the President, on the advice and consent of the Senate. The regulations in question were submitted to the United States Senate, but so far they have not thought fit to approve of them. That is the way the matter stands at the present. When I was in Washington, in the month of January, in connection with the settlement of the objections made by the United States to our legislation concerning the treaty coasts under the treaty of 1818, I took the opportunity of discussing with the Counsellor at Law of the Secretary of State this whole matter. There was one objection made by some members of Congress which strongly appealed to me. It seemed that a mistake had been made in framing the regulations concerning one of the boundary waters. Different provision was made as to the size of the mesh for pound-nets and the size of the mesh in seine-nets. It was stated that so far as we were concerned there was no objection to this difference being adjusted, and on my assurance that the matter would be remedied, I was promised that the President would send a message to the United States Senate, recommending the adoption of the regulations which were based on the treaty. The message has been sent, I had the pleasure of reading it a few days ago, and I find that the President urged strongly the Senate to pass the necessary legislation. The Senate, however, adjourned without taking the final steps; but it is expected, as I have already informed my hon. friend, that during the session that is to open to-morrow the question will again be taken up by the Senate. We must recognize that there are difficulties in the United States with regard to making treaties that do not exist in Canada. I admit that the regulations that were concurred in by the two commissioners, and that we have adopted, are not up to the standard of the regulations I would like to see introduced. They are not as severe as they should be, they do not go so far as our own regulations go in respect to the preservation of the fisheries. At the same time, they do not affect the preservation of our fisheries, because we have taken power to maintain the regulations which exist to-day with regard to the preservation of our fisheries. But these regulations were a step in the right direction. They tended to concentrate power in the federal authorities of the United States, which was formerly exercised by the different states of the union. For instance, my hon. friend knows that the various border states, like Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota, have been in the habit of framing their own regulations, and a good deal of divergence exists between them. In most of those states the regulations are not up to the standard of those we have put upon our own statute-book. I think we ought at least to be satisfied with the fact that the treaty has been made. Now, I would like for my part to see them expedite their legislation and to approve of the regulations, but we must all realize that

in this matter the authority of the United States Senate is supreme. The President has taken all the steps which are necessary to urge upon the United States Senate the necessity of approving of these regulations, and putting the treaty into force. Now my hon. friend would like that we should refer this matter to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. I think that would simply mean the creation of new difficulties, and I think the House will agree that the matter had better be left as it is as far as we are concerned. We expect that the American authorities will soon pass the necessary legislation in order to put in force those regulations, and to bring the treaty into effect.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—amount required to pay pensions, $300 each, to pilots, $7,800.

Mr. BRODEUR. The increase from $4,800 to $7,800 is to cover the cases of men who were superannuated last year and others who are to be superannuated this year. A number were superannuated last year for whom we had to take a supplementary vote.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the age at which they are superannuated?

Mr. BRODEUR. Sixty, but if before that age a pilot is found to have defective eyesight or other disqualification, the pilot association puts him on the superannuation list and we decide whether or not this decision is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the rule of superannuation at 60 absolute? There is a great difference in men at 60.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we do not necessarily put men on the superannuation list at 60 because some men at 60 are equal to others at 40. The government exercises its discretion as to whether the reports on the man in question justify superannuation.

Mr. DANIEL. Is a medical certificate required in all cases?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes, and we generally require them to be very strong in order to avoid paying pensions that are not deserved.

Mr. SPROULE. How many pilots are now on the superannuation list?

Mr. BRODEUR. Those mentioned here and those mentioned in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there a special test of eyesight for colour blindness when the pilots are first appointed?

Mr. BRODEUR. When we became the pilotage authority in 1905 or 1906 we gave positive instructions that every year these men should be tested as to eyesight. That is a great improvement on the former system and even on what is done in the case of masters and mates.

Mr. DANIEL. Are the men sent to an eye specialist or has the minister a medical man appointed?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have our own man, Dr. Pagé, of Quebec, to test their eyesight. I have a good deal of confidence in the doctors generally, but I thought it would be better that we should have certificates from the one medical man under our control.

Mr. DANIEL. That is all right so long as he is a specialist in that.

Mr. BRODEUR. He is one of the best doctors in Quebec.

Mr. BARNARD. Are these men in a compulsory pilotage district?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have no compulsory pilotage in the Dominion, but there is compulsory payment of pilotage dues.

Mr. BARNARD. That is about the same thing. I suppose the dues go to the payment of the wages of these pilots?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. It is practically the same system as on the Pacific coast in connection with the Victoria and Esquimalt Pilotage Board.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. Would the minister consider placing on this pension list a man named Beddington whose case I mentioned to the hon. gentleman two years ago, and who was discharged by the pilotage board on the ground that he was no longer fit to continue his duties on account of having the palsy? The case was the subject of much discussion in that part of the country at the time, and there was a general feeling that this man had not been well treated. The minister told me on a previous occasion that there was no provision for superannuation, but it appears to me that Mr. Beddington's case is similar to the case of the man mentioned here, and possibly the hon. gentleman can make some provision for him.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may state briefly the history of how we came to pension the Quebec pilots. They obtained many years

ago under legislation very extensive powers which permitted them to control almost everything in connection with pilotage. Complaints were made by the shipping interests on the St. Lawrence as to the manner in which these pilots were discharging their duties but we could not deprive them of their charter and so we had to negotiate with them. The St. Lawrence shipping interests wanted to extend the pilotage district and to provide for an annual inspection or examination and the pilots were willing provided compensation was given them, and one of the terms was that we should give them a pension on retirement. The pilotage association had the right to pension the old members but they were not doing so, and because of the charter they had we had no right to say who should be or who should not be a pilot. The situation was serious as the whole trade of the country was affected, and we thought it advisable that the government should provide pensions. My hon. friend (Mr. Barnard), has several times brought to my notice the case of Mr. Beddington, and although the case seems to be a hard one the matter is absolutely in the hands of the district pilotage authority and we have no jurisdiction. I do not consider Mr. Beddington's case similar to the present one.

Mr. BARNARD. There is a similarity which the minister has overlooked in that from time to time there has been a strong agitation on the part of the Victoria Board of Trade to do away with compulsory pilotage dues altogether and representations have frequently been made to the government to that effect. The minister in the course of correspondence, I think suggested, that by getting rid of Beddington they might reduce the number of pilots and in that way to a certain extent allay the outcry for doing away with the pilotage system altogether. I think Beddington is entitled to consideration at the hands of the government. Are the St. Lawrence river pilots the only pilots in Canada pensioned by the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. The only pilots pensioned are those of the Quebec pilotage district but not the Montreal district.

Mr. BARNARD. I would again ask the minister to make some provision for Beddington. The medical certificates were favourable to him, but nevertheless he was dismissed and deprived of his sole means of livelihood. It is an extremely hard case and one in which the department should render natural justice by making the provision for him, particularly as they are making this provision for men in a similar class of life in other parts of the country. The fact that the government find it expedient to pay the Quebec pilots a pension because they originally had given them too much power, fits the situation so far as Beddington is concerned. I think that some consideration should be given to this case.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is mistaken in stating that there was a letter from me or the department suggesting that this man should be pensioned or dismissed. I do not remember any such letter. However, I will look into the matter, and if the department is in any way responsible, I shall be glad to take into consideration the remarks of my hon. friend.

Mr. BARNARD. What has been done with the application of the Board of Trade for the abolition of the pilotage system in that district, and what is the minister's intention with regard to it? This matter has been agitated for two or three years, and I would think that by this time he had come to some conclusion.

Mr. BRODEUR. As my hon. friend is aware, pilotage dues are compulsory in all parts of Canada where there are pilotage districts. If we had not pilotage dues, the pilots might not keep themselves familiar with the parts of the rivers which they have to navigate. That is why we have had laws compelling shipping companies to pay pilotage dues whether they used pilots or not. The same system is in force in the old country. To cease collecting the pilotage dues would be a very serious departure, and before taking that step I would desire to have further reasons to convince me that it would be in the interest of shipping.

Mr. BARNARD. I take it, then, from the minister's reply that there is no intention at present of making any change?

Mr. BRODEUR. The policy of the government is embodied in the Bill that I introduced the other day. I know there is a good deal of divergence of opinion on the subject in Victoria; some people want the system changed and some are opposed to any change. In some districts, in St. John, for instance, a change in the system would cause a very serious disturbance of conditions, If, however, it is found that Victoria really wishes to do away with the system of compulsory pilotage, I am willing to consider that; but in view of the fact that the system has been in force generally throughout this country for many years, and that the same system exists in other countries, I do not think that it would be advisable to make any change just now.

Mr. BARNARD. How does the minister expect to find out whether the people of Victoria want the system or not?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose through the pilotage authorities.

Mr. BARNARD. Are the pilotage authorities under salary?

Mr. BRODEUR. The members of the Board are not paid; but generally the secretary is paid a small allowance.

Mr. DANIEL. In St. John, the Board pays the secretary out of the earnings of the pilots. When may we expect the hon. minister's Bill, No. 155, to be brought up for a second reading and referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Bill is not yet printed in French. As soon as it is ready, my intention is to ask that it be read the second time and referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, where it can be discussed, and where an opportunity can be given to any persons to appear and give their views upon it.

Mr. DANIEL. Will that be done before the Easter recess?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. If that Bill is put through, will there be the same discrimination against Ontario vessels as now obtains, or will they be put on a parity with vessels of other provinces in so far as the payment of pilotage dues is concerned?

Mr. BRODEUR. There will be no discrimination at all, but all will be put on the same footing. All vessels of a certain draught will be obliged not only to pay pilotage dues, but to take pilots.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will that in any way lessen the responsibility of the vessel owners? In other words, will the placing of a vessel in charge of a pilot place any of that responsibility on the pilot's shoulders?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no provision in that respect. The liability of vessel owners will be the same as to-day. When they take a pilot, they are just as responsible as they would be if the vessel were under the control of the master of the ship.

Mr. EDWARDS. The captain of a vessel who has navigated these waters year after year would no doubt consider himself just as capable of handling it as a pilot, and probably more so. The placing of a pilot on board does not in any way, I understand, lessen the responsibility of the captain, and the vessel has to pay pilotage dues to this close corporation in Montreal, no matter whether a pilot be really required or not.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a provision in the Bill to enable masters to take charge of their vessels when in the St. Lawrence on one condition, and that is that they pass before us an examination, and I understand that this is acceptable to the Dominion Marine Association.

Mr. BARNARD. But the vessel would have to pay in any case.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, when the master has become qualified by examination, and takes charge of his own vessel, there is no need to take a pilot on board or pay any pilotage dues.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this apply to every part of Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. It applies to the two pilotage districts of Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. CROSBY. Why should it not apply also to St. John and Halifax?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have never had any request from St. John and Halifax to make pilotage compulsory there.

To provide for maintenance and repairs to wharfs, $5,000.

Mr. DANIEL. There was an appropriation made for the purchase of some wharf property in St. John for the use of vessels of the department. Has anything been done in that matter?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been engaging the attention of the department. We are trying to find a suitable locality. Negotiations are going on, and if we can find a locality, I think there is a vote in the estimates for that purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. There was a vote last year of $50,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is there not a vote this year in the Public Works Department?

Mr. DANIEL. I think it was put in the Public Works Department.

Mr. CROSBY. I draw the hon. minister's attention to the condition of a wharf at East Chezzetcook. It is a substantial and well constructed wharf, but nothing has been done to it for a number of years, and it is in urgent need of repairs. If it be not put in proper repair soon, it will become useless. There are also two wharfs, one at Moshers river and one at Port Dufferin. In these, surface planking is absolutely necessary. Of course if these repairs be not attended to in time, the department will have to stand a much heavier expense later.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall take a note of my hon. friend's remarks.

To provide for the establishment of telephone reporting stations along the St. Lawrence river between Montreal and Quebec, $24,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of connecting life stations by telephone or telegraph for the purpose of facilitating communication with ships.

Mr. JAMESON. Is there any report of what has been done in connection with this service?

Mr. BRODEUR. The report will be found on page 239 of the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Mr. JAMESON. Is the report of Captain Bernier yet printed?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that it will be ready in a few days.

Mr. JAMESON. Is there any reason for the delay which has taken place in connection with it? I spoke to the minister last session with regard to this report, and the minister told me that he expected it would be out very soon. This is a report in connection with the 'Arctic' and the voyage of Captain Bernier to the Arctic regions. I see that there is a short report of Captain Bernier in the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but I would not wish the minister to confuse this with the report that I am looking for. This short report is dated April 5, 1910, and in the last clause of it he says:

I have prepared a detailed report which includes the report on the annexation of the northern lands.

That is the report we want to get, that is the report I am interested in, and I would like to know very much what it contains. So far the minister knows that all the information that we have had in this House is the information which appears on the tablet which will be found in the lobby leading to the library, and the extent of the information which we have from that tablet is not very great. The tablet itself, however, announces a concrete fact, and I think it is a matter of sufficient importance for the government to give the House and the country all the information that is contained in Captain Bernier's report. The tablet or memorial, bears the following inscription:

Winter Harbour Melville Island,
C. G. S. 'Arctic,' July 1, 1909.

This memorial is erected to-day to commemorate the taking possession for the Dominion of Canada of the whole Arctic archipelago lying to the north of America from longitude 60 W. to 141 W. up to the latitude of 90 N.

J. E. BERNIER,
Commander.

This subject is one that I think of sufficient importance for us to know something more about; at all events it has involved a somewhat expensive service, beginning in 1906, and continuing up to the present time.

A few evenings ago the House was asked to vote the large sum of $59,000 for continuing this service for another year, and we voted that money without the report Captain Bernier had made to the government being placed in the hands of members of this House to show what he had actually done during his previous visit to these regions. In 1906 we expended for this service $63,849.86; in 1907, $34,706.39; in 1908, $55,733.94; in 1909, $36,942.75. In 1910 there was voted $59,000. I cannot say how much of that has been expended up to date, because the report is not out yet. In 1911 we have been asked to vote, and we did vote the other evening, $59,000, making a total of $309,232.94. All we have to show for this expenditure up to date is a report made in 1907 and the memorial tablet erected in the corridor leading to the library.

The minister, the other evening when this vote was being asked—and it was very briefly discussed because it was just as the House was closing—gave us a very important statement in connection with it. Speaking of Captain Bernier's expedition, he said:

As there might be dispute some day about these islands being part of Canada, we thought we should assert our sovereignty.

And so Captain Bernier was sent to the Arctic regions for the purpose of asserting the sovereignty of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. What sovereignty has Canada?

Mr. JAMESON. Well, let us say the sovereignty of Great Britain.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the whole thing is a superlative farce.

Mr. JAMESON. Well, there may be two opinions about that. We want to know what is contained in this report in order that we may be able to judge whether it is a superlative farce or whether it is a positive farce. But the great difficulty is that the report has not been brought down, and we do not know what it contains. The minister said that Captain Bernier was attempting to make the northwest passage during the present visitation which he is making to the northern regions with the view, it may be, of preventing poaching.

In the report of Mr. G. L. Jennings, who is commanding the Mackenzie river subdistrict of the Northwest Mounted Police, he states that there is considerable, of what I suppose to be, poaching going on, on the other side of the continent. He says at page 149 of the report of the Northwest Mounted Police for 1910, referring to this very matter:

In August, 1909, the steamer 'Karluk' arrived at Herschel island. She is an indepen-

dent whaler, the stock of the venture amounting to $32,000, being owned by the captain, the officers, and some merchants of San Francisco. The 'Karluk' cruised in the neighbourhood of Baillie island and Banks Land until the close of navigation. She returned to Herschel island on September 23, having killed 11 bowhead whales, 8 of which I understand were taken in Canadian waters, north and east of Cape Parry. The value of this cargo of 11 head is, at a low estimate of the present low price of bone, $85,000. The 'Karluk' is wintering at Herschel island and will return to the eastward by first open water. As she will have the field to herself for at least six weeks before any other ships can arrive from the westward the chances are that she will make another large catch and will no doubt leave in the fall of this year for San Francisco with a cargo of bone valued from $150,000 upwards.

He goes on to speak of the trade that is developing there and says that unless some Canadian traders locate there it will fall into American hands. But the point I wish to bring to the minister's attention is that while Captain Bernier is perhaps ice bound in Hudson bay, or in the waters adjacent thereto, American fishing is going on near the head waters of Mackenzie river, and there does not seem to be any systematic effort to prevent poaching:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have been somewhat reluctant to break in on the hon. member (Mr. Jameson), but the item before the committee is for the establishment of telephonic communication between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. JAMESON. I think that possibly it may be that, strictly speaking, this discussion will be out of order, but if you, Mr. Chairman, will permit me, I shall be through in a moment. I have thought this matter of such importance that the minister would like to have it brought to his attention, and I think it also well that the committee should understand the position. Just one word in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, and it is to say that after the statement the minister made to the committee the other evening with regard to this voyage of Captain Bernier to the Arctic regions, and as to the work which he was doing there in collecting license fees from American poachers, a statement appeared in the New York 'Sun' to the effect that the license fee which was being collected was $50 in each case. I would like to ask the minister whether there has been any collection of this license fee from those whalers who are operating on the coast to the north-westward, or whether any attempt has been made to enforce any such collection. So far, the minister told the House $500 had been received in all.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think we have collected anything from the whalers at the mouth of the Mackenzie river, but there have been some collections made at other points. If Captain Bernier succeeds in making the Northwest passage he will have an opportunity of making these whalers pay the fees. I must tell my hon. friend that the report was handed to me on Friday last. But there were some maps which were not included, and that is the reason which delayed the distribution. But it will be done in a few days.

Mr. DANIEL. While on that matter of a report, I may say that Captain Bernier took with him as historian a Mr. Vanasse. He has been with him on each trip. So far, I believe, Mr. Vanasse has made no report; at all events, I have seen no published report made over his signature.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a report of Mr. Vanasse, I have seen it myself. A few days before he left, Mr. Vanasse handed in a report to the department, and it has been sent to the printers. He was desirous that the history should comprehend a longer period of time.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the total expense likely to be in connection with this telephone service?

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount expended last year was $22,180. The work is completed.

To provide for telephones at different points throughout the Dominion in connection with aids to navigation, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of connecting lighthouse stations by telephone or telegraph lines in order to facilitate communication with ships.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there anything in this vote for the purpose of increasing telephone communication in connection with the new life-saving stations?

Mr. BRODEUR. Part of this vote will be applied to that purpose. It is for the purpose of connecting life stations with the telephone and telegraph stations. Colonel Anderson is looking after this part of the work.

Repairs to maritime road, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a road on the north side of Gaspé for the purpose of giving access to the Gulf telephone line. The sum of $1,000 has been spent. The money is expended by day labour under the supervision of Commander Wakeham. The road is on the north shore of Gaspé, running between Metis and Gaspé, several hundred miles.

Mr. DANIEL. How much has been spent on it now.

Mr. BRODEUR. Only $2,000 or $3,000. This is to make repairs which are abso-

lutely necessary on the road in order to give access to our life station.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it a highway road or is it a special road?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a highway road.

Mr. JAMESON. Do I understand there is a road leading from the high road to your station.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. And this expenditure is in connection with the road leading from the high road to the station?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have been anxious to get some information about the wireless telegraph stations which the minister promised me.

Mr. BRODEUR. That item will be discussed under the Naval Service, but in the meantime I hand my hon. friend a copy of the contract, and also a statement giving the cost of our stations with the Marconi Company.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the maritime road, which is under discussion, a municipal road?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a road running along the Gaspé peninsula, from Metis to Gaspé, some hundreds of miles. In much of this country there are no municipalities, and it is important to our lightkeepers that the road should be kept in proper shape in order that they may have communication with the outside world. This is the fifth year in which this vote of $1,000 has been taken. It was reported to the department that $5,000 should be expended to put this road in proper repair through the sections where there are no municipalities.

Mr. BLAIN. Who constructed the road in the first instance?

Mr. BRODEUR. The federal government I think or the government of the Union.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice on page O-108, that $903 was spent on this road last year, most of it for labour. One man, Mr. Veit, was employed for only six days at $3 per day and travelling expenses; the others were all labourers who received from $1 to $1.75 per day.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is all under Commander Wakeham. The travelling expenses in that item would hardly cover the salary of Mr. Veit. That might be for travelling expenses for some of the workmen.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister does not seem to have much information about the road. Is it a provincial or a municipal highway, and what length of roadway does the government undertake to assist in keeping in order and repair?

Mr. BRODEUR. Our expenditure is of course made in the unsettled districts.

Mr. CROSBY. I understood that this road was from the main road to the lighthouses?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. And now I understand this $5,000 has been spent on the highways?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. Is this a mail or post road?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the mail route. The communication by which the mail is delivered from Matane to Gaspé.

Mr. CROSBY. If the federal government is going to construct municipal roads in one province they should do so in every other province. In Nova Scotia we have very bad roads, and it would be very satisfactory if the federal government would put them in order. Take the road in the western part of Halifax county going to the lighthouse along Herring Cove, and after you get to Sambro it is in exceedingly bad repair. There are lights and life-saving stations along that coast; the road is not even a post road, and if this is to be the policy of the government we have a fair claim to ask them for help.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is that road used for?

Mr. CROSBY. For the convenience of the fishermen and the light-keepers and the life-saving stations. I do not suppose any of the officials of the department were down there because they are too precious, and they could only travel that road at the risk of their lives. There is another road at Peggy's Cove lighthouse which is exceedingly dangerous.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does it connect the lighthouse with the main road?

Mr. CROSBY. Yes. I wish the minister would keep these roads in repair.

Mr. DANIEL. I may inform the minister that the road to Cape Spencer, in St. John county, is in a dreadful condition. It is full of boulders and stones and there is hardly a roadway there at all. Then, part of the road to Point Lepreaux light is almost as bad, and if it is the policy of

the department to assist roadways leading to the lighthouses, I submit these two roads for the consideration of the minister.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that we have already expended money on the roads mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel). I will have my officers report on their present condition and if necessary repairs will be made.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister seems to be in a happy mood for receiving applications for expenditure on municipal roads. Surely, the roads the minister has referred to must be used by some one else than the lighthouse officials?

Mr. BRODEUR. These roads are generally for the use of the light-keepers, and I suppose it is only fair we should pay a share of the expense.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is paying the other share?

Mr. BRODEUR. If there is an organized municipality it would pay. This road was originally built by the government and it is only fair we should contribute towards its maintenance.

Mr. BLAIN. What money was expended by the government for the construction of these roads, what has been expended for maintenance, and on how many miles of such roads has money been expended by the government? The minister told us that this road is 600 or 700 miles long and that the municipalities maintain some parts of it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think I said it was 600 miles long.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You said 750 miles.

Mr. BRODEUR. If I said that it is a mistake. Any one who is au fait with the Gaspé peninsula will know what the length of the road is. If part of that road connects the main road with our light station, and if, as we have done in several cases, we have expropriated property to make that road it is our duty to maintain it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). How many rights-of-way has the government expropriated?

Mr. BRODEUR. We expropriate very often.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). In this case?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some of these lighthouses have been in existence for years and I cannot give the particulars off hand.

Charter of steamers for Lime Kiln Crossing to be employed keeping the channel open, Detroit river, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to maintain a patrol for the regulation of traffic at the Lime Kiln Crossing. The necessity for this arose because of the dredging operations in that locality and the congestion of traffic. Last season it was not necessary to expend any of this vote, but it is considered advisable to have money on hand in case of an emergency.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What steamer did you charter?

Mr. BRODEUR. We did not charter any last year. Some years ago the American government obtained authority from this government to dredge at the Lime Kiln Crossing in Canadian territory. Regulations were passed for directing the traffic in these waters and the patrolling was at first done by the American government, but as it was in Canadian waters I thought we should do that ourselves and we chartered a boat for that purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this a police boat?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. The regulations provide that the boats going down the river have to pass on one side and the boats going up the river have to pass on the other side, and we have a tug there for the purpose of seeing that this regulation is carried out.

Mr. BARNARD. For how many seasons does the minister expect that this work will have to be kept up?

Mr. BRODEUR. We do not know exactly because the Americans are now dredging another channel on the other side of the river, and when this is completed, it will not be necessary to maintain a police boat there.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not see why the minister wants $10,000 for this service when he spent only $4,000 on it last year.

Mr. BRODEUR. We do not know what may happen, and we have to provide for contingencies.

To provide for the purchase or construction of a lighthouse and buoy steamer for River St. Lawrence to replace the 'Shamrock,' $175,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Shamrock' is an old boat and a very slow one, and this vote is for the purpose of purchasing another one. Public tenders have been called for, and the contract will probably be awarded in a few days.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). How many steamers has the minister between Montreal and the head of the lakes looking after the buoy and the lighthouse service?

Mr. BRODEUR. Four.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). A few years ago this whole work was done by one steamer.

Now the minister has four steamers and a floating blacksmith shop, which is in charge of another tug, besides two or three big scows. About once a week they stop at Gananoque from Saturday till Monday with a big gang of men. It is costing to-day $5 where it used to cost $1 to look after the lighthouses between Montreal and the lakes. The expense at present is something awful.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot agree with the criticism of my hon. friend. It is true, some years ago the number of boats was less than it is to-day. There were then no gas buoys. We have installed them in the St. Lawrence, and with very good results in the interest of navigation. In 1895-96 there were no gas buoys; now we have 79, and since we have established that system the traffic has greatly increased. Instead of vessels being obliged to lie up at nights, they can continue on their route, and in that way we have almost doubled the transportation facilities of the country. We require some boats to look after this system, both on the St. Lawrence and on the Great Lakes. Formerly we chartered a boat for the purpose of provisioning our lighthouses on the lakes; but this was a very expensive and unsatisfactory method, which could be carried out only at certain times of the year. Now we have a vessel which is engaged all the time in inspecting and looking after our lights, so that if an accident occurs it can be attended to at once. We had to put another boat there, and since then everything has been going on very nicely, and the aids to navigation are kept in proper shape.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I asked for a return of the cost since 1896 and previous to 1896 of the lights west of Montreal, but have not been able to get it. When I do get it I am satisfied it will show that the cost is $5 to $1 what it was before.

Mr. BRODEUR. That return was brought down.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Between Montreal and Kingston, the cost is $5 to $1 compared with what it used to be. The minister promised, when establishing the acetylene gas business, to reduce the cost, but it is five times what it formerly was. He has not dispensed with the lightkeepers in many cases, and the 'Reserve' and the 'Scout' with a blacksmith shop and a big barge with a derrick on it, are moving up and down the river and through the islands between Kingston and Montreal all the time, and what they are doing no one can tell.

Mr. BRODEUR. The report was brought down some time in December or January. In 1895 we had only 238 lights; now we have 366. At present the aids to navigation are 520, and they were only 270 in 1895.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds).

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What do you call aids to navigation? Do you mean the steel buoys which the department bought at a tremendous price and which are no better than the painted ones?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are much better.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). At night time we cannot see them, and the painted buoys were just as good.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let my hon. friend compare our harbour with places where the Americans have a lighting system, and he will find that ours is much superior. Let him go to the Detroit river.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You have built a system to make somebody rich, buying these buoys at extravagant prices instead of using what we had before and which answered the purpose just as well.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, we are getting the business for it. Just look at the freight tonnage.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That has not been increased by putting on these gas buoys.

Mr. BRODEUR. To a certain extent it has, because we are giving better facilities.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You had the facilities before and just as few accidents, and the river was just as well lighted throughout the Thousand islands.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the size of the boat?

Mr. BRODEUR. 170 feet long, 32 feet beam, draught 10 feet, and speed 12 knots.

Mr. CROSBY. Is there any chance of building her down in your department at Halifax?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at our department, but we are calling for tenders, and I hope that the contract will go to a Canadian firm. I am extremely sorry to find that we have no tender from Halifax, but that is not our fault.

Mr. CROSBY. Would it not be a good plan for the government to build that ship themselves in their own dockyard. They have a splendid place, abundant facilities, and the latest kind of machinery for doing all kinds of work. I would like to see the department making some good use of the dockyard there, and I think it would be only fair for the minister to try and build one ship in it. Then you have men in Halifax, Pictou and Yarmouth, good marine engineers who are constructing marine engines all the time. Now that the minister is building some ships on the upper lakes, he ought to build a ship in the dockyard of Halifax.

Mr. BRODEUR. The policy of the department is to call for public tenders. The tenders are in and are now engaging our attention, and the contract will probably be awarded this week. I would be very glad to see some one from Halifax taking sufficient interest in naval construction to put in a tender for those ships, but I am afraid that none has tendered. As to the government undertaking its construction, I doubt whether that would be advisable, seeing that we have in this country several shipyards belonging to private parties who are willing to tender. It would be just as well to leave that to private initiative.

Mr. CROSBY. The ship will be built in Canada anyhow?

Mr. BRODEUR. I hope so.

Mr. CROSBY. But the minister is not certain. Instead of having this built in England, the government would do better to undertake the work themselves and build it in their own shipyards.

Mr. BRODEUR. We shall be guided by the tenders which are in, and I have every reason to believe that the contract will go to a Canadian firm.

Mr. CROSBY. Is the time for tendering up?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this boat to be built of steel?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. What will be the length, depth and width?

Mr. BRODEUR. Length 170 feet, 32 feet beam and 10 feet draught.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Was there a vote last year to cover this expenditure?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but we did not use the money, because we are just making the contract.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You do not say it is a revote.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a revote.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any tenders from outside Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. I would not like to give any information now because the tenders are under consideration, but I think there are.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not think there would be any harm in saying whether there were tenders from outside of Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think there are.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I have just sent upstairs and I find that there are no returns brought down in my name. There are returns brought down in the names of Mr. Monk and Mr. Blondin, but they do not apply to the district west of Montreal. They have reference to the district between Quebec and Montreal and the river and gulf of St. Lawrence. The return I asked for has not been brought down yet.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am surprised, because I was almost sure that all the returns affecting my department had been brought down.

For the purchase or construction of a lighthouse and buoy steamer for the Pacific coast, $200,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a revote. The contract for the construction of this steamer has been awarded to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, a Canadian company, for $260,000. The other night I was very much criticised for having given a contract to Vickers, Sons & Maxim. Vickers, Sons & Maxim were lower tenderers in this case than the Canadian shipbuilders, but I gave it to the Canadian company.

Mr. BARNARD. What is the size of this ship?

Mr. BRODEUR. The dimensions will be as follow: length, 200 feet over all; beam, 43 feet; draught, 12 feet; speed, 12 knots.

Mr. BARNARD. Is she to be constructed of steel or wood?

Mr. BRODEUR. Steel.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like to ask the minister if he does not think it would have been very much more advantageous to the service in that province to have used the 'Kestrel' for this service, and to have built a proper fisheries protection cruiser. He could have built a cruiser, or possibly two small ones, for the same amount of money, and thus have provided a fishery protection service. The 'Kestrel' has done this work at different times and she is just as good, if not a very much better ship than the present lighthouse tender—the 'Quadra.' I would ask if that would not be a far better disposal of that amount of money than to build this new ship?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Barnard) is mistaken with regard to the 'Kestrel' being used for this service. The 'Kestrel' is engaged in the fisheries protection service.

Mr. BARNARD. She does not protect anything.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I think she is doing fairly good work. I do not think she would be of any use however for the lighthouse service. That requires a dif-

ferent boat entirely and the 'Kestrel' would not be suitable. We are doing a great deal on the Pacific coast, though little was done in the past, and in view of the large amount of shipping which is being carried on it is necessary to provide better aids to navigation. We have one boat there which has been engaged in lighthouse service—the 'Quadra'—but it was found necessary that a new one should be placed in this service. So, we called for tenders, and the contract has been given to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company.

Mr. BARNARD. What I stated was that the 'Kestrel' had relieved the 'Quadra' from time to time, and I think that is the case if I am not very much mistaken.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never heard of it, and the commissioner of lights informs me that he does not remember it.

Mr. BARNARD. I think he is mistaken.

Mr. BRODEUR. He may be.

Mr. BARNARD. However, in connection with this question, I want to point out once more, as I have already twice done during the present session, the necessity for at once providing permanently for better fisheries protection on that coast. Since the last time I mentioned this matter in the House I have seen some reports of fishery poachers again operating on that coast, and apparently without very much attempt on the part of this department to stop that poaching. I will quote from the 'Colonist' newspaper of March 22, and possibly in quoting that I will show the minister how much use the 'Kestrel' is for the purpose of fishery protection. The article is as follows:

The fish poachers have seemingly extended their operations from the the west coast of Vancouver island to the Queen Charlottes according to advices brought by the steamer 'Amur.' Arrivals by the Canadian Pacific railway steamer from the islands state that two gasoline auxiliary United States fishing schooners were sighted with their dories out fishing within the three-mile limit off Rose harbour close to the whaling station. The schooners were well within the three-mile limit, poaching on the British Columbia fishing grounds. The Dominion government's fishery protection cruiser 'Kestrel' was lying at Queen Charlotte city when the 'Amur' called there.

My hon. friend's protection cruiser. the 'Kestrel,' was within hailing distance practically of these schooners that were poaching, and yet, through no fault of the men in charge, but probably because the 'Kestrel' was too slow to catch them, they were not interfered with. This question has been agitated by the people of that province for a number of years. They have been put off with promise after promise by the department for the same length of time. Votes have been put into the estimates annually and never expended, until to-day the situation is a disgrace to this government. To show you what our friends on the other side of the line think in regard to this matter, I will read you another short extract taken from the 'Colonist' of March 25, just the other day, which publishes a statement from the Seattle 'Post Intelligencer.' The quotation is as follows:

The halibut schooner 'Montana,' which has been building at the shipyards of Markey & Wilson, in the east waterway, was launched at 7 o'clock yesterday morning, says the 'Post-Intelligencer.' The 'Montana' is being constructed for W. H. Butt, of Seattle, and will be used off the coast of Vancouver island the coming summer. The vessel is 81 feet long and 18 feet beam. She will be able to carry 90,000 pounds of halibut under deck. She will be equipped with an 85-horse power Imperial engine, and her bunkers will hold fuel enough for a 4,000-mile voyage. She will be ready to leave for the north in about three weeks.

Now, I say it is the business of the minister and of his department to see that if that vessel does leave for the north in three weeks, she does not go to the west coast of Vancouver island, and if she does, it is further the business of the minister and his department and his officials to see that she does not carry any 90,000 pounds of halibut. This grievance has been going on unremedied for so long a time that one gets almost tired mentioning it. I understand that the minister has some votes in the supplementary estimates this year for the purpose of chartering some vessels for this service, and I want to tell him that is not sufficient. He cannot hope by chartering vessels to stop this poaching, he needs a permanent force there all the time. Now, last year he chartered a vessel for the fisheries protection service which, as a matter of fact, is a tugboat, and he paid $21,645 for doing it. That is an extravagant way of doing the business, because this will need to be a permanent matter. Every time he charters a vessel he uses her for two or three months, and then she is laid off. The result is there is an interregnum, during which the poachers do just as they please along the coast. If the hon. gentleman wants to stop this, the only way he can do it is by organizing a proper patrol of the whole coast, and to do that he must have a proper and regularly organized force. I submit further, that he will find it very much less expensive by going to work and ordering his boats now. In the past he has promised us cruisers and other kinds of boats, and given us nothing. This matter is an outrage on the people of the province of British Col-

umbia, it has gone so far, according to reports that come from there, that even the Indians on the coast, who see these poachers coming ashore and breaking the game laws, want to know why the Dominion government cannot protect the fisheries which belong to them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the reports mentioned by the hon. gentleman are somewhat exaggerated. That question does not come up under this item, but I may deal with it. We have been doing our best to protect the fisheries. My hon. friend complains, and other complaints have been brought before the House, that some of those poachers who come ashore, were stealing game from the province. It is not our duty to protect the game of British Columbia, that is a work which pertains to the provincial authorities. If there is any lack of protection or enforcement of the game laws of the province of British Columbia, certainly my hon. friend is not justified in charging this government with it. We are looking after the protection of the fisheries, and we are doing it so well that I think nobody can seriously complain. We had some fishery protection vessels there, but they were not found numerous enough, and at the request of some members of this House, I do not know whether my hon. friend is one of them, we chartered a vessel to look after the protection of the fisheries, with very good results. Immediately after the 'Rainbow' arrived in this country we gave her instructions to look after the fisheries. The 'Rainbow' has done so, and the other day she seized an American vessel which was fishing within the three-mile limit on the north shore of the island of Vancouver, off Cape Scott. The matter is now before the courts, and will soon be adjudicated. I hope we will succeed in proving that this vessel was within the three-mile limit, and that the seizure was valid. My hon. friend will admit that there has been a good deal of exaggeration in the reports in regard to poaching. People think that a vessel is fishing within the limit, when, as a matter of fact, she may be outside of it. Three miles is a short distance from the shore, and people imagine that the fishing is going on within the three-mile limit when it is outside.

Mr. BARNARD. With regard to exaggerated reports, I think the minister has very much underestimated the situation in which they are exaggerated. It is a matter of common knowledge all along the Pacific coast cities that that poaching goes on practically unchecked, and has gone on for years; and I am much mistaken if a great many representations have not been made to the minister by boards of trade and other official bodies to that effect. With regard to his suggestion that I am complaining that the game laws of the province of British Columbia are not enforced by the Dominion government, he is either very dense or is trying to misenterpret what I said. That is not my complaint at all. What I am trying to point out is that the fishermen are actually so bold that they come into the harbours along that coast, anchor their vessels and go ashore, and commit breaches of the game laws. They leave their vessels and go ashore and there is no one to check them.

Mr. BRODEUR. What can we do in a case like that?

Mr. BARNARD. I am not asking this government to enforce the game laws, but to stop these men from fishing. If you stop them from fishing they won't come ashore. That is the situation. I am not asking the minister to enforce the British Columbia game laws; as has been shown frequently, the provincial government are well able to take care of their own game laws. But I say the minister and his department have so far neglected to stop this poaching, they have brought the administration in that particular into contempt, and not only into the contempt of the business people of the province, but into contempt even of the aborigines who are not supposed to know very much about it.

River St. Lawrence ship channel, $900,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to make provision for ship channel dredging, for the maintenance and improvement of the shipyards, as well as renewal of machinery and plant. We have now in the service six elevator dredges, and we are building a new steel elevator dredge, which will be completed during the next season of navigation. We have also one hydraulic dredge and two suction dredges. I may say that the department is contemplating increasing very materially the expenditure on this work. For some years there has been an agitation among the shipping interests and in the country generally in favour of deepening the St. Lawrence to 35 feet. To-day we have a 30 foot channel at high tide from Montreal to the sea. When we remember that at one time we had only a 10 foot channel in some parts of the river, we are able to appreciate the extent of the work which has been done. Our purpose is to deepen this channel to 35 feet. We will require some new dredges for that purpose, and this vote is to cover that expenditure. So far the cost of dredging the St. Lawrence has been $3,549,460.78 and the cost of the plant $2,696,741.16. This work consisted in dredging the 27½ foot channel between Montreal and Quebec to 30 feet. This was decided on in 1897. It included

the widening of the straight parts of the channel to a minimum width of 450 feet and the curves to 600 and 750 feet, and at Lake St. Peter to 800 feet. This also included work below Quebec. Until 1906, no work had been done below Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. Do the items that are now under construction and investigation in the Privileges and Elections Committee come under this vote?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I think we should leave this open until that committee reports.

Mr. BRODEUR. The investigation has nothing to do with the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel. I might make my statement with regard to the work and then allow the item to stand.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it is a rule of the House that an item under discussion in the committee cannot be discussed here. I would ask for the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I know of nothing that would prevent the item being discussed. There is a rule which would prevent a discussion here of the matter still before the Privileges and Elections Committee.

Mr. BLAIN. The money for the work being investigated in that committee will be paid under this item, and therefore I think it is a direct violation of the rule.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is in connection with this item a great question of policy, whether this committee would accept the idea of deepening the channel to 35 feet. We might discuss that and then allow the vote to stand until the committee reports.

Mr. DANIEL. I think it would be advisable to go to some other item just now. None of the members from Montreal are here and others interested are absent. Then there is great force in the contention of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). There has been evidence that work was done on Mr. Lanctot's house and on other buildings in the city of Sorel with which the government have nothing whatever to do. It is quite a large question in itself.

Mr. BRODEUR. The engineer who is in charge of this work came to Ottawa for the purpose of discussing this great question of the increase of the depth of the St. Lawrence, and it would be a pity to have that question set aside to-night.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not think there can be two minds on the deepening of the St. Lawrence, and therefore I think we may fairly go from this to other items of the minister's estimates. No one can hesitate about making the St. Lawrence channel, the great summer highway waterway of Canada, as deep as it can be made. I think the committee take this Sorel matter into consideration to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) has hit the nail on the head. There are no two opinions about the deepening of the St. Lawrence ship channel; we are all in favour of that, only we think it is costing too much owing to the reckless way in which the minister does the work. I find at O—134 he gave an order to the Lymburner Company, Montreal, for brass condenser ferrules, $25; steel ranges, three at $35 each; Chapleau range, $100; parts of John Bull steel range, $38.85, and so on. Two years ago the same Lymburner was asked to supply belting for the custom house, Montreal, and he charged $800 odd, and before the Public Accounts Committee the manufacturers of the belting showed if the Minister of Public Works had applied to them they would supply it for $200, and Lymburner had a rake-off of $600 on $800 worth of goods. And the Department of Public Works, in face of that, continued to deal with Lymburner. Then, the Minister of Public Works goes to his friends, McAvity & Sons, of St. John, N.B, and buys $4,000 worth of supplies for the Montreal ship channel, and they have to pay freight on it and send it up to Montreal. The whole thing wants investigating from top to bottom, and we must have an explanation why the government continues to deal with Lymburner who, as was proven before the Public Accounts Committee made a clean steal of $600 on $800 worth of a purchase.

Mr. STANFIELD. Lymburner is up before the committee this year.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Yes, and the government have gone to work and appointed him purchasing agent or inspector of buildings, or something like that in Montreal. Unless the minister promises he will not purchase from this man we should not let these items go through. The Minister of Public Works stated plainly he would have this matter inquired into, and make a report, but he never did so, and then he appointed Lymburner one of his officials in Montreal, and he purchases from the firm of Lymburner & Co., in which he says he has an interest. Why does not the Minister of Public Works, instead of buying from his political friends, McAvity & Sons of St. John, N.B., go to his friend Mr. Lewis of Montreal who, the hon. member for Grenville said, was their political agent in Montreal, and handled the party funds. The minister did not deny that statement.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, I deny it most emphatically.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Deny what?

Mr. BRODEUR. That he is the political agent of the government.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He is not the political agent of the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly not?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). My friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) said he was the financial agent for the Liberal party in Montreal.

Mr. BRODEUR. He is not, and the hon. member for Grenville made a lot of insinuations like that the other night.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). They were not insinuations, they were plain statements.

Mr. BRODEUR. He stated we were giving contracts to the firm represented by Mr. Lewis, but as I pointed out a few minutes ago, notwithstanding that Vickers, Sons & Maxim put in a lower tender than the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, we gave the contract to the Collingwood Company. That shows what truth there was in the statement made by the hon. member for Grenville.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That does not disprove the statement made by the hon. member for Grenville, and he defied the minister to deny it: that Mr. Lewis was his purchasing agent, and that this vessel was increased a foot in width so that she could not go through the canal. The minister did not deny that statement when it was made. This vote should stand over until we know more about McAvity and Lymburner.

Mr. BRODEUR. These same accounts were referred to the Public Accounts Committe, and the committee has reported.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The committee has not yet reported.

Mr. BRODEUR. We will welcome any investigation with regard to the purchases made from Lymburner or any one else.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You will get it.

Mr. CROSBY. I think the minister should go on with some other items.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the committee is of opinion that we should not discuss this big question of the St. Lawrence ship canal because there is an item of $400 in dispute I will go on with something else.

Magnetic observatory, $3,200.

Mr. DANIEL. Where is this observatory?

Mr. BRODEUR. At Agincourt, near Toronto.

Mr. DANIEL. What is that observatory for?

Mr. BRODEUR. For observing the magnetism of the earth.

Mr. DANIEL. What kind of observations are made at this place?

Mr. BRODEUR. Observations of the magnetism of the earth. My hon. friend can see the report of Mr. Stupart at page 198 of the Marine report.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of what practical use is all this going to be?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been going on for many years. I have no doubt that these scientific observations will bring some good results.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Last year $1,674 was spent on this. Why is it necessary to ask for $3,200 this year?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have explained how it is proposed to be spent.

Mr. HUGHES. What instruments are used in this observatory?

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot give my hon. friend the information.

Mr. HENDERSON. The salaries of these officials are very low—$500 and $600. They surely cannot be high-class scientific men.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are not working the whole year. Besides, some of them are paid out of two votes.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Out of the next vote Mr. Stupart gets a salary of $3,100, and he is paid here $85 for expenses.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Stupart is in charge of both the meteorological office in Toronto and the magnetic observatory at Agincourt. He goes there occasionally, and is paid his travelling expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Why should he be paid his laundry account?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose that is part of his expenses. It is a very small item.

Mr. HENDERSON. How long has this observatory at Agincourt been established? I never heard of it before.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think in 1840. I am under the impression that it was at the same time that the meteorological office was opened. We rent a house for the purpose at Agincourt.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of what particular advantage is this place for an observatory?

Mr. BRODEUR. Probably because it is far from the city. No doubt there were good reasons.

Mr. HUGHES. Who owns the house?

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say.

Mr. BLAIN. In the Auditor General's Report it appears that Mr. Menzies, who works at the Toronto office, is the agent for it, and that the government rent a room in his house for this purpose.

Mr. BRODEUR. I see that we pay to Mr. William Menzies the rent of a house, so that I suppose we rent the whole house. However, I shall make inquiries and find out why observations have been carried out in that place. I suppose they could not be carried on in the city.

Mr. HUGHES. Would it not be well to find out the facts before passing the item?

Mr. BRODEUR. The whole responsibility lies with the director. He has been running this establishment many years, and I have every confidence in him. The director is Mr. Stupart, a very good man.

Mr. DANIEL. No doubt the matter is all right, but no one seems to know anything about it. In the Auditor General's Report I find that this item costs $1,674. What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no increase. It is the same vote that we have always had.

Mr. DANIEL. You are asking more for the instruments.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is an item of $1,100 for the instruments. I must admit that I have not looked very closely into this matter because I relied entirely on the report of the director, and I am sure he would not recommend anything which should not be accepted. However, I shall inquire and find out if there is anything not proper in this matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister might inquire at the same time how long this institution has been established. He says there was an observatory there in 1840, but at that time the place was practically a wilderness and Toronto only a very small town. I think he has made a mistake and should have said 1894 instead of 1840. I recollect something of a discussion about 18 years ago regarding the establishment of an observatory out there, but I think my hon. friend is about 40 years out in his date.

Mr. BRODEUR. The reason I gave that date is because the meteorological office was established in the 40's, and I thought that this magnetic observatory might have been established at the same time. It is possible, however, that the two were combined in Toronto, because Toronto was not then the big city it is to-day. No doubt these observations are better taken out in the country than in the city.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course it is only reasonable that it should be away from the city where it would be subjected to electrical influences which might interfere with the correctness of the observations.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister bring the particulars with respect to William Menzies as to whether this is one and the same person or not?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no doubt it is the same person. Mr. Menzies is one of the officers of the meteorological service, and I suppose that he makes observations at the magnetic observatory.

Mr. BLAIN. Where does he reside?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know, whether he resides at Agincourt or not.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps he has his summer residence at Agincourt.

Mr. BRODEUR. He may have his summer residence at Agincourt.

Mr. BLAIN. If that is right surely my hon. friend would not tolerate this condition of things. At page O—109 of the Auditor General's Report he will find this entry:

Menzies, Wm., Agincourt, rent of hse., 9 m. to Mar. 31, 1910, at $15, $135.

Then the Auditor General gives the salary of William Menzies at the central office, Toronto, as $1,420. Would my hon. friend think it a proper thing for an officer residing at Agincourt to rent his house to the department for $135, or at the rate of $15 per month?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think there would be a very serious objection to that. I remember that when I was practising my profession in Montreal I lived for years twenty-five miles from the city, and I could be at my office every morning earlier almost than all my confrères. So, I do not think it would be a very serious objection. He may live in the country and attend to his business in the city of Toronto.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not my point, and the minister knows it very well. I am not concerned whether Mr. Menzies should live in Agincourt or Toronto. The point is whether William Menzies is receiving this large salary at the central office in Toronto and whether he is renting his house to the government at $15 a month or $135 for nine months?

Mr. BRODEUR. The only question is whether the rent we are paying is too large or not. Fifteen dollars a month does not seem to me to be a very extravagant price.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the principle of his renting his house to the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not see any very serious objection to that. An officer of the government might lease a property which he has to the government. He is not the director of the service. The director is Mr. Stupart. This man might be the owner of a property in the country which is needed for our purposes.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What salary is Mr. Menzies getting?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1,420.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Does he not get something out of the other vote?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not out of the two.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What are these two salaries and to whom are they paid?

Mr. BRODEUR:

Salaries detailed under central office, meteorological service, $1,230.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Who is the $1,230 paid to?

Mr. BRODEUR. To two persons.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Yes, and Menzies is one of them.

Mr. BRODEUR. Menzies is one of them.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). How much goes to Menzies?

Mr. BRODEUR. $690.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). And then, out of the other vote, he gets $1,420?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the two votes give him $1,420.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I do not see how the minister makes that out.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then you are asking for a double amount; you are asking for $1,230 and $690 in the vote, and then, in the next vote you are asking for $1,420.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, out of the other vote we are simply paying the difference between $690 and $1,420.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). My hon. friend then is asking for too much money because he is asking for $3,700 for three men: Menzies, $1,420; Davidson, $1,000; and Tweedie, $1,150. That makes $3,570. He does not give the names, but he puts in $1,230 and $690 and the $1,230 is for Menzies. Add that $690 to $1,420 and you get $2,110 a year.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, my hon. friend is wrong. Let us take the magnetic observatory. We have:

Salaries detailed under central office, meteorological service, $1,230.

Now, in the meteorological service there is paid to William Menzies, $1,420. Then, of this amount of $1,420, there is $690 which is being paid out of the appropriation for the magnetic observatory.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then why does my hon. friend ask for two votes?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not ask for two votes, because when we come to the meteorological service I ask simply for the difference.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What difference?

Mr. BRODEUR. Between $690 and $1,420.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then why do you extend the $3,570?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken. The salaries of the observers appear under the heading of 'Central office, Toronto.' Mr. Tweedie has nothing to do with the magnetic observatory.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am bound to accept the Auditor General's Report in preference to the statement of my hon. friend, and he has charged this amount of money as having been paid to Mr. Menzies last year. He has charged $1,230 to the vote for the magnetic observatory, $690 was paid to Mr. Menzies and then he has charged the meteorological office with $1,420 paid to the same man. Who is wrong, the minister or the Auditor General?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think anybody is wrong.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds).. Look at the Auditor General's Report page O—109. The Auditor General has paid out $1,230 and he says that the salaries are detailed under the central office, meteorological service. Then, under the heading of 'Central office,' the names are given but not the amounts.

Mr. BRODEUR. Out of the vote for the magnetic observatory two observers are being paid their salaries in part—William Menzies and W. F. Davidson. Those men are also employed in the meteorological office in Toronto, and they receive a certain salary there, Mr. Menzies receiving in all $1,420. Of that $690 is paid out of——

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I guess the minister has found out that he has made a mistake and that the Auditor General is right.

Mr. BRODEUR. $1,420 is paid in Toronto and $690 is paid out of the vote for the magnetic observatory.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That is what I have been arguing all the time, and the minister stated it was not so.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is perhaps the fault of the Auditor General who has stated that these salaries will be detailed in the

next item, but he does not seem to have done it.

Mr. BLAIN. What is Mr. Menzies' total salary?

Mr. BRODEUR. $2,110.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The minister stated a moment ago that it was only $1,430.

Mr. BLAIN. When Mr. Menzies is receiving this salary, does the minister think it is fair that this same officer should rent a house to the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that Mr. Menzies works the greatest part of the year in the Toronto office, and the balance of the year at Agincourt making magnetic observations. His salary is $1,426 for his work in Toronto, and $690 for his work at Agincourt. He resides in Toronto, and only goes to Agincourt at certain parts of the year to make magnetic observations.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is it customary for the government to pay an employee $175 a month, and then rent his house from him?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose the house is under our control, because the instruments are kept there.

Mr. JAMESON. May I ask the minister what useful purpose is being served by this service, which he says has now been in operation for forty years?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no doubt that the service has been of great use to the country in giving information as to the weather prospects. I see by a report which has been made with regard to magnetic observations, there was a question as to whether the instrument used in Canada was as good as that used in the United States. If I may judge by the report which we had in our hands from Mr. Stupart, these observations are of a scientific character, and are used by scientists to a large extent.

Meteorological service, $143,000.

Mr. BURRELL. With regard to this expenditure for meteorological stations, it has been suggested, in discussing this matter in British Columbia, that the government might well deem it worth while to pay a small fee to these men who have charge of the various stations. Now the practice has been, I understand, to get certain men to take charge of meteorological work, to provide them with instruments, and they are to keep a record and make an annual report. I believe a great many of the men are good men, and there is a lot of good work done. I do not know whether the minister quite understands how important this work is in what we call the semi-arid belt of British Columbia. An accurate knowledge over a long period of the total annual precipitation is one of the first things that is required. We find that men coming in to make big investments, especially for fruit-growing purposes, in parts of our semi-arid belt, attach great importance to this information. In some districts there may be a precipitation of 10 or 12 inches, and in other parts of from 14 even up to 20 inches. This difference will make a considerable difference in the value of that particular section for certain purposes, as to the necessity of irrigation works, and so on. The present practice is this: That a man who is given one of these instruments in charge by the government, will do his work faithfully for a year or two, and then perhaps he may fall sick or may go away on a holiday, and he is not in a position to pay other men to do his work. There is consequently a hiatus in the observations, that renders valueless the whole of that work, which, to be of value, must be carried on over a consecutive period of years. I would like to impress upon the minister that the great importance of this work would justify a nominal fee or salary, a small sum paid to the men who have charge of that work, especially in the fruit district which stretches from the Kootenay district to west Yale.

Mr. BRODEUR. Are there not some stations to-day in that district?

Mr. BURRELL. There are quite a number, where I presume the work is carried on under the direction of the head office in Victoria. As I understand it, these men who are occupying sub-stations report to the Victoria office to Mr. Baynes Reed. But it seems to me that the importance of the information, if carried over a period of years, is so great as to justify the minister in paying more attention to this service that he has been doing, because we have hundreds of thousands of acres in that belt the value of which is affected by the result of these observations of the rainfall in different districts. I think the government would be justified in making a small appropriation of that kind.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be glad to take into consideration the suggestions of my hon. friend. I was under the impression, however, that reports were being constantly made without interruption. If there are cases to the contrary, I will see about it.

Mr. BURRELL. I am not speaking of any specific cases. But I do know that one of the first questions asked by capitalists coming into that country, and by investors generally, is as to the average annual precipitation in these districts, and in many cases they fail to obtain the information. However good and reliable the man may be who is in charge of a station,

if he goes away, he is not able to turn that work over to somebody else. As the minister can see one break will destroy the value of the whole record. If the man was sick or away he would be responsible and would have to pay some one to keep the record?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is right.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister has not given any explanation as to the increase of $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The increase of $4,000 is largely to cover increases of salaries and I think it may cover the case to which my hon. friend has alluded. The salaries will be as follows:

Central office, $35,928; chief stations, $12,480; telegraph stations, $14,275; special stations, $7,849; temporary stations, $6,536; miscellaneous stations, $540. The telegraphic tolls amounted to $36,000; instruments and apparatus, $3,000; postage, $800; printing and stationery, $7,000, and then there are the other miscellaneous expenses. The entire increase of $4,000 is for the purpose of giving increases of salary to these men. I think it may cover what my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) has brought to my attention.

Mr. BURRELL. I hope the minister's assurance is satisfactory. It is very important in what we call the dry belt in British Columbia. While it is of importance everywhere it is vital where the rainfall is not sufficient because we are embarking millions of dollars in irrigation systems in that country. I suppose that $3,000,000 have been spent for irrigation in the semi-arid belt in British Columbia.

Mr. BRODEUR. I realize how important it is and if this item is not sufficient I think I will ask the director to provide for a supplementary estimate.

Mr. JAMESON. Can the minister tell in what percentage of cases the forecasts have been correct?

Mr. BRODEUR. In 92 per cent.

Mr. JAMESON. I think that shows the value of this service to the country. The great difficulty of course is that many people who would be benefited by promptly receiving the information are not in a position to profit by it. A few evenings ago I pointed out to the minister that it would be a great advantage to our fishermen if when these forecasts are being telephoned to different stations they could be sent to all the fishing stations along the Atlantic coast, at least which have telephone communication.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are actually looking into the question the hon. member has raised.

Mr. JAMESON. I urged this on the minister last year and also this session and I hope he will do more than look into it. If he considers the large number of people who are every day at the mercy of wind, sea and weather he will see that he is not doing his full duty to the fishermen and others who would be benefited by this information if he withholds it from any section of the country, even if some trifling additional expense is entailed. I do not think people will cavil at the expenditure of a few thousand dollars so long as they get results and the money is honestly expended. No better result could be achieved by any expenditure than the placing of that information at the disposal of people on the coasts. It would really add little to the expense and it would round out the system and make it of use to those who would benefit most by it.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are increasing our service every year. Of course we cannot expect to cover all places at the same time, and I do not know if we will ever be able to establish these stations at all places. We are trying to take the most important places one after the other. This is rather a large amount we are spending, $143,000, and proves the interest the government take in this question. Every year we open some new stations.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some years ago the morning trains running out of Toronto carried on the side of the car discs which indicated to the farmers the weather forecasts for the ensuing 24 hours. The information thus conveyed was of great value to the farmers, particularly during harvest time. I do not know whether that was done by the railway companies themselves or by the government. Has that service been discontinued?

Mr. BRODEUR. My impression is that this service was given by the railway companies themselves. Perhaps the railway companies might be induced to return to the system which supplied useful information to the farmers living along the railway.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I can inform my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) that it was not in 1840 that magnetic observatory was established, because I find no mention of it in the Auditor General's Report for 1896. In that year the expenditure on the Meteorological office was $15,000, and now it has risen to $27,900, or an increase of $13,000.

Marine Hospitals and care of sick seamen, $73,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. We impose a tax upon shipping to recoup us for this expenditure. We generally collect sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. CROSBY. Generally more.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is about even. We have reduced the rate.

Mr. JAMESON. Will any new hospitals be established this year?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am opposed to establishing any more of these hospitals. My experience is that the seamen can be better cared for in regularly established hospitals.

Mr. JAMESON. How many marine hospitals are there in existence?

Mr. BRODEUR. Victoria, Yarmouth, Pictou, Chatham, Lunenberg, Louisburg.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister is not going to extend the system?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not favourable to it. We have made arrangements in Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax with the regular hospitals to care for the sick seamen. When British Columbia entered the union one of the conditions was that we should maintain the marine hospital at Victoria, but recently the legislature passed a resolution stating that they would consider it a compliance with that condition if the marine hospital were discontinued and the care of sick seamen given to the general hospital.

Mr. JAMESON. There is also an arrangement in force by which sick seamen are taken care of, not in hospitals, but by persons appointed for that purpose. In what places is there an arrangement of that sort?

Mr. BRODEUR. The number is large and it would not be possible off-hand to give that information in detail.

Mr. JAMESON. That information does not appear in any departmental report.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would not like the minister to say positively that no new marine hospitals would be established. I agree that wherever there is a suitable general hospital it would be better to send the sick sailors there, but there are places on the coast where there are no hospitals of any kind and where great hardships are endured by sick sailors. In the town of Canso, one of the most important fishing ports in Canada, and where hundreds of vessels come week after week, there are generally a number of sick seamen. Canso has no railway communication with the outside world and no hospital of any kind, and the sick sailors have to be kept in boarding houses, where the accommodation sometimes is very bad. There is not much chance for a man suffering from severe illness to recover, if he is living in a small house of one or two rooms where there is no possibility of proper attendance. I think the minister ought to consider the advisability of establishing small marine hospitals at such places. Some time ago an application came from Canso for something of that kind. I have known men to be brought in sick in fishing vessels for whom it would be almost impossible to find accommodation; nobody wanted them. Men have died because they could not get to the hospital at Halifax. If there had been a proper place where they could have been attended to when coming in sick from the sea, lives could have been saved. If we maintain this service at all, we should provide accommodation at points where no hospitals are available.

Mr. JAMESON. That seems a very reasonable presentation of the case, and I think the committee would be interested in hearing the minister's reply to it. If his policy is not to construct any more hospitals, I think it would be well for the public to understand that. On the other hand, if he can make his policy a little more elastic, I would like to lay before him some facts in regard to other parts of the province.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have given the committee my view of these hospitals. At the places where we have them, they cost us a good deal more money than we get in revenue. We must remember that this money which we collect from the shipping interest is trust money, and they have something to say about the way in which it is administered. The law itself fixes the conditions under which this money is to be expended. Recently some doubt was raised as to whether we had the right under the law to use some of that money for the purpose of paying the funeral expenses of a deceased seaman, and I am asking the House, in the Bill which I introduced a few days ago, to give authority for such an expenditure. I do not think it would be possible for us to establish a hospital at places where the revenue was not sufficient to maintain it, because the shipping interest would object. It is not a matter on which we are absolutely free, because this is trust money, and has to be administered in the best interests of those who have contributed the money.

Mr. JAMESON. I quite appreciate the fact that this is trust money; but the lives of the fishermen and the seamen of this country should be of as much importance to the government as the expenditure of trust funds. The minister has taken the position that because these are trust funds,

therefore no further expenditures can be made to provide for the safety, comfort, and well-being of sick and distressed seamen, the very reason for which the fund was created. That seems to me to be an untenable position. The case as presented by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) seems to me to be unanswerable. I would like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that since 1896 there has been a vast accumulation of these trust funds. The amounts received by the government year after year have been very much in excess of the amounts they have expended. The report for 1910 shows that over $200,000 of a surplus should be in the hands of the government, and I would like to know where that money is. I cannot find any reference to it among the trust funds mentioned in the Public Accounts. If there is a large amount of money to the credit of this fund, why should it not be expended for the purpose the hon. member for Guysborough has mentioned? The whole question is one of such importance that we should not pass this item until we understand whether or not the minister, in cases where it is obviously impossible to give proper medical care and treatment to sick and distressed seamen, will relax his policy so far as to make proper provision for their care and comfort.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are always doing that. In all cases we take the necessary precaution to give to the seamen proper treatment. But there are a great many abuses in connection with that. Men who pay us a few dollars very often saddle their seamen upon us. We have, therefore, to be very careful in the administration of the law. The shipping interest has represented that they would be in favour of abolishing absolutely the system of paying these dues, and assume the care of their own sick seamen, because they claim that this is an undue tax upon them. There is a great deal in what they represent in that respect; and I do not know but the country will some day put that charge on the vessel owners themselves. If we proposed to make some large expenditures in the construction of marine hospitals, the shipping interest would be certain to be up in arms against it, because it would mean an increased tax upon them. In other countries no such thing exists, but the ship owners look after their own sick seamen.

Mr. CROSBY. I think that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Guysborough is a good one. The difficulty is that our fishermen ought to have some assistance in the way of hospital protection frequently have no chance at all to go to a hospital either at Halifax or Pictou, because the vessels on which they work do not pay dues.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is their own fault. They ought to pay dues.

Mr. CROSBY. They are not compelled to pay.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are not, but they might take advantage of the Act and pay them.

Mr. CROSBY. Still that is not the fault of the poor fishermen who ship on these vessels. They do not make it a point to see that the vessel on which they engage pays dues; and the fishermen off one of these vessels who requires hospital treatment is just as much entitled to it as any other man. Take the man who goes on a fishing schooner of from 40 to 100 tons. He does not know that the schooner does not pay the dues. Should he fall sick or be injured, he is put on shore and has no place to go to. Some provision should be made to meet cases of that kind. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that in Canso and its vicinity, where there is a number of places at which fishing vessels call, some place should be chosen in which to put a marine hospital, also in the vicinity of Digby, and some regulations should be made for the protection of our sick and injured fishermen. I thought that the revenue from these dues was greater than the amount expended.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we decreased the tax a couple of years ago, and since then there is barely a small surplus, if there is any.

Mr. CROSBY. What are the rates now—2 cents a ton?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was a reduction made two years ago of half a cent.

Mr. CROSBY. That would make it 1½ cent per ton. I think that the minister should accept the suggestion of my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), and my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and provide some way for taking care of our fishermen.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the supplies for these hospitals bought by tender?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the quantity is too small.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total number in the different hospitals?

Mr. BRODEUR. 3,629.

Mr. BLAIN. The supplies for that number would be considerable.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are not all in the marine hospitals of the government. Some are in the public hospitals. In the large places we have made arrangements with public hospitals to receive the seamen. In other places where there are no hospitals, we make arrangements with private houses to receive sick seamen at so much per day, so that the amount of supplies purchased is very small. Take the case of Douglastown where there is a hospital; the coal will be $12.50, wood and sundry supplies, $21.80. Then, there is telephone service, salaries of the attendants, medicines, &c. In Nova Scotia the hospital at Lunenburg costs $1,196.07; Louisburg, $1,191.48, and North Sydney, $1,167.60. So, as my hon. friend sees, the amount which is spent at each of these places is very small. That would certainly not justify the department in advertising for supplies because the advertisement would cost more than the amount of money which is being spent for the supplies in these places.

Mr. JAMESON. I was speaking a few minutes ago about the surplus in connection with this trust fund. I find that between the years 1896 and 1909, according to the report of the minister himself, the receipts amounted to $826,259 and the disbursements to $619,355, so that the balance in hand would be $206,904. This is a trust fund and, in so far as I am aware, without some special legislation in that behalf, it could not be applied to any other purpose than the purpose specified in the Act, which limits its use to the care and comfort of sick and distressed seamen. Here is a surplus then of $206,000 in the operation of this service during the past thirteen years. With that surplus in hand I cannot see that the minister would be justified in refusing any reasonable extension of the service. I do not know where this money appears in the accounts. I do not see it in the trust funds, in the public accounts. I presume it has been carried over from year to year in the consolidated revenue fund because, as a matter of fact, it is not represented in any particular account as a trust fund. But, if it is a trust fund, as the minister states and as the Act states also, it must be available for this service. I think it would be very unreasonable for the shipping interests to say that this trust fund should be used for any other purpose than the care and comfort of sick mariners, and I do not think that the minister could expect that they would take such an unreasonable view. So, I merely desire to register the opinion which I entertain of the matter and it is that with this very large amount of money on hand available for this purpose it is not treating the seamen fairly to withhold from them the comforts and privileges which might properly be provided by a proper expenditure of this fund in their interest. I am sorry that the policy which the minister has announced to-night is of such a character that our seamen and fishermen will be debarred from the advantage which might accrue to them by a proper and reasonable expenditure of this fund in their interest.

Shipwrecked and distressed seamen, $3,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of assisting seamen wrecked and in distress in foreign countries.

Steamboat inspection, $54,000.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You have an increase of $700; what is that for?

Mr. BRODEUR. We thought it advisable that the inspectors should receive a small increase in their salaries and this additional amount is for that purpose.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to ask the minister whether it is simply for the inspection of the boilers and machinery of the steamers, or whether it extends to a general inspection, such as the inspection of life-boats and life-saving apparatus generally.

Mr. BRODEUR. It covers not only the inspection of boilers, but the inspection of hulls, gear, life preservers, boats, &c.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to point out to the minister that in the opinion of a good many people there are a number of steamships, some of them receiving subsidies from this government, that are not properly equipped with life belts of a satisfactory character. Some years ago, it will be remembered, that a terrible accident occurred in American waters and as a result of defective life belts that this accident was attended with great loss of life. The other day we had an instance near Nova Scotia when the steamer 'Bruce' went ashore. It has been stated to me—I do not know whether the information is accurate or not—that one of the passengers found the life belts so defective that although he tried three of them none was strong enough when tied to retain its place on his body, that, as a matter of fact, he could not get proper appliances on the boat for life-saving purposes. That may or may not be correct; I am not stating it as a fact, but merely as a report which has come to me. But, I know there is very grave suspicion in the minds of people generally that enough attention and care are not bestowed upon the life belts on some of the steamers which are plying about our

coasts, and that some day there may be a very serious casualty which will result in great loss of life. Then, I think that if the department is looking after the inspection of the hulls and the equipment of these vessels special attention should be paid to life-belts and to life-saving apparatus. I know that it is perhaps rather an unusual thing to overhaul all these belts, but the minister will see, and I am sure the committee will appreciate, the great importance of having them in proper condition for use. A number of them are transferred on those boats, many of them are old. I know some of them have been in the service for many years, and I doubt whether they would be sufficient in case of accident to give people a fighting chance for their lives. I hope the minister will give instructions to his officers to see that every ship plying out of Canadian ports is equipped with life belts which are proper and sufficient.

Mr. BRODEUR. The administration of this branch of the service is in the hands of the chief steamboat inspector, Mr. Adams. Mr. Adams is very severe, and I am sure he is taking all possible precautions in order to ensure the safety of every one who embarks on those ships. Of course he has several inspectors under his control. Coming now to the accident which occurred the other day to the 'Bruce', the 'Bruce' is not a Canadian registered ship. So far as my information goes, she was registered in Newfoundland, and consequently must have got a certificate from the Newfoundland authorities.

Mr. JAMESON. Is she paid a subsidy by this government?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed she was. We are obliged under the law to accept the certificates which are issued by the Newfoundland authorities. If the vessel obtained a certificate from Newfoundland, we have no right to ask for another one. At all events, the wreck commissioner has left for the purpose of making inquiry into all the circumstances surrounding the wreck, and we will not fail to bring to his attention the statement which has been made by my hon. friend to the effect that some of the life-saving apparatus was not in proper shape.

Mr. BLAIN. Are vessels on the lakes inspected as well?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Brodeur, House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 4, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General the following communication:

Ottawa, April 4, 1911.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable the Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on the 4th inst., at 3.15 o'clock, to give the Royal Assent to certain Bills, which have passed the Senate and the House of Commons during the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
D. O. MALCOLM,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

BRITAIN AND RECIPROCITY.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that a dispatch has been received in Ottawa stating that Sir Edward Grey announced in the British House of Commons that the British government had made a demand on the government of the United States that the United States should grant to Great Britain and all her colonies, the same tariff concessions that the United States propose to grant to Canada under the reciprocity agreement. If that is so I would ask the intention of the government in regard to it.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be a matter entirely between Sir Edward Grey and the British Ambassador at Washington, and I would not care to offer any opinion concerning it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the government received any such message?

Mr. FIELDING. I did not understand my hon. friend to say that any message came to us in the matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. A message has been received in Ottawa this afternoon.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not aware of any such message. The terms on which goods would be admitted to the United States from Great Britain would be a matter of negotiation between the British authori-

ties and the American government. We would have no right to negotiate concerning that.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was received from His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General by the gentleman usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

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

The House having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that when this House did attend His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.
An Act respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.
An Act to amend the Immigration Act.
An Act respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.
An Act respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Canadian Western Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company.
An Act respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.
An Act to incorporate the Capital Life Assurance Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the London and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.

Mr. FIELDING

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Ontario Northern Timagami Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Pacific Northern and Omenica Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.
An Act for the relief of Matilda Emo.
An Act respecting the Globe Printing Company.
An Act respecting the Athabasca Northern Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Indian River Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.
An Act to incorporate the Canadian Intermountain Railway Company.
An Act respecting the National Weekly Indemnity Company and to change its name to 'The Merchants and Employers Guarantee and Accident Company.'
An Act respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railways Company.
An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.
An Act for the relief of George Addison Brown.
An Act for the relief of Gertrude Maud Grant.
An Act for the relief of Mary Hamilton Johnston.
An Act for the relief of Dalton Mabel Stapleton.
An Act for the relief of Lorne Forbes Robertson.
An Act for the relief of Cecil Ernest Freeman.
An Act for the relief of Ethel May Hornell.
An Act for the relief of Paulina Verena Meyer.
An Act for the relief of Maggie Florence Sadler.
An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.
An Act respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Kettle Valley Railway Company.'
An Act respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.
An Act to incorporate the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company.
An Act respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the British Columbia and Central Canada Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate Banque Internationale du Canada.
An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the

financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1911, and the 31st March, 1912.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply. He said: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we shall all rejoice that the facts and figures which it may be my duty to submit to the House to-day will help to tell the continued story of that progress and prosperity which Canada has now happily enjoyed for a long period. Possibly at some previous times there have been some doubts on occasion as to whether or not there was that progress and prosperity which has been claimed, but if there ever was any difference of that kind it certainly does not exist now, for on all hands we have the testimony that the condition of Canada is a very prosperous and satisfactory one.

The Public Accounts submitted to parliament at the present session were for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1910, a period which expired a little more than a year ago. I shall not at this day occupy much time in commenting upon the operations of that year, but there are a few striking points in connection with them of which we may well take note in passing. The estimated revenue for that year, 1909-10 was $97,500,000, accompanied, however, by a hope that under favourable conditions the revenue might reach the round mark of $100,000,000. These favourable conditions did occur, and the revenue reached the hundred million dollar mark and passed it. The actual revenue for that year was $101,503,710.93, being a little more than $4,000,000 in excess of the estimate, $16,000,000 and more in excess of the previous year and nearly $5,500,000 in excess of the revenue of the record year of 1907-8. Thus, so far as the revenue was concerned, the operations of the year were eminently satisfactory.

If we turn to the expenditure side, we shall find an equally satisfactory state of affairs. When our revenues have been buoyant we have felt justified in making liberal provisions for the public service, but when a check comes upon the revenue, then, although it may be only for a time, it is well that we should apply the brakes to expenditure. In the year 1908-9 such a check did come upon our revenue and there was a substantial reduction; our revenue fell off about $11,000,000. In consequence of that, it was thought well to apply the brake somewhat severely to the expenditure of the following year. Happily the check on our revenue proved only temporary. After a short time the revenue continued to grow again, but in the meantime we had endeavoured to check the expenditure with, I think, satisfactory results. The estimated expenditure chargeable to income for 1909-10 was $81,000,000. The actual expenditure of the year was $79,411,747, or $1,588,252 less than the estimates, and $4,652,485 less than the expenditure chargeable to income during the preceding year. In these figures we have the evidence that when the check came upon the revenue, we were able to put the check upon the expenditure too, and there was a very substantial reduction of expenditure in that year.

The surplus estimated for the year was a generous one, $16,500,000; but with a large increase of revenue and a substantial dimnution of expenditure, the surplus naturally grew to a larger figure, and instead of it being the sum counted on, the actual surplus of the year was $22,091,963, which was a record surplus for this Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that after the payment of the sinking fund?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, sinking fund is always chargeable to income.

Mr. FOSTER. That was over and above that?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that is my understanding.

We have to consider now the capital and special charges for the year 1909-10. In that year we expended $35,971,911.94, a pretty large sum, on what is called capital and special account. Nearly two-thirds of that we provided out of the revenue for the year. The balance added to the debt was $12,338,267.16. Note that in that year we paid out of our revenue all the ordinary expenses of what we call consolidated fund, all the charges for railways and canals on capital account, all the charges for public works on capital account, all the charges for railway subsidies, all the charges for Dominion lands, all the charges for militia on capital account, all the charges for bounties, and also $7,600,000 towards the cost of the Transcontinental railway. In that year we spent on the Transcontinental railway $19,968,000; but we added to the public debt only $12,338,267. In this hurried glance at the accounts of the year 1909-10 we shall see that the year was a very prosperous one: first, in the matter of liberal revenue; second, in the fact that the expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund showed a substantial reduction; and, third, in the fact that although we spent a very large sum on capital account, we were able to provide for nearly the whole of it out of our revenue, making an addition to the public debt which, having regard to the large outlay of the year, was a very moderate one.

Turning now to the year 1910-11, which has just closed, we ought to be able to estimate a little more closely than usual.

But it should be remembered that with our vast territory, and with the business of our country scattered over such a wide area, it becomes necessary to allow some time to pass for the collection of the accounts. Some weeks will still elapse before we shall be able to close the accounts of the year, so that the figures which I am able to give at the moment will differ materially from the figures which will ultimately be included in our blue-books; but we can form a fairly close estimate.

I have here a statement of the actual revenue for the year 1909-10 and a corresponding statement of the estimated revenue for the year 1910-11, just closed, which it will be understood is necessarily incomplete and is subject to later revision. This statement is as follows:

	1909-10 Actual Revenue	1910-11 Incomplete. Revenue
Customs	$60,156,133 98	$72,704,010 34
Excise	15,253,352 65	16,651,118 06
Post Office ..	7,958,547 72	8,642,090 19
Dominion Lands	2,885,999 67	3,023,872 83
Railways	9,647,550 69	10,368,596 30
Miscellaneous.	5,602,126 22	3,276,538 08
Total	$101,503,710 93	$114,666,225 80

We estimate that when the accounts are closed the revenue for the year 1910-11 will reach $117,500,000.

The expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund to the 31st of March is $75,590,195.74; but of course many accounts have yet to come in, and that sum will be largely exceeded. We estimate that when the accounts are closed the expenditure of the year chargeable to consolidated fund will be $87,000,000. This will be an increase over the previous year of $7,500,000; but there are one or two facts which must be taken into account before we regard that as an actual increase. It may be remembered that in the last session of parliament I spoke of the intention of the government to make a change with regard to certain items which had been charged to capital account. It was, I informed the House, our intention that certain charges for the militia which had generally appeared chargeable to capital, should be charged to income account; also, that the item of Dominion lands, which from time immemorial had been charged to capital account, should be transferred to income. Then, the naval service might properly also be charged to income. On these accounts we have for the militia $1,289,644, and for the Dominion lands $936,171.75. These two items, formerly chargeable to capital, are included in the charges against income. There is also included the naval service on which we expended $1,369,211.94. If then we take these things into account, the transfers from capital to income and the new item for the naval service, we will find that the actual expenditure of the year has not been increased by $7,500,000, but may be roundly stated at $4,000,000.

The estimated revenue for the year ending March 31, 1911, I place at $117,500,000. The estimated expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund will be $87,000,000, and this will give us a surplus of revenue over the ordinary expenditure of the government of $30,500,000.

There might be circumstances under which a large surplus of that character would be open to criticism. If it were the result of increased rates of taxation, or of burdensome taxation, it would be. But when, as a matter of fact, our rates of taxation are lower than before, although, owing to the flourishing condition of the country the amount collected is much larger; when, as a matter of fact, the rates of customs taxation are lower, and substantially lower, than they were in former years; and when this surplus comes to us from a system of taxation which is not open to the charge of being generally burdensome, I think we do well to take the surplus obtained in this way and use it in paying some portion of our capital and special charges, which otherwise would have to be represented by additions to the public debt. By this liberal surplus we are able to provide, as I have already shown, for very large expenditures which, in the ordinary course of events might properly be charged to capital and added to the debt.

I have spoken of the revenue, the expenditure and the surplus of the year. This is a surplus on the expenditure that is chargeable to income. Let me say a word or two with regard to that form of expenditure which is known as capital and special expenditure. We voted for the year just closed, for the Transcontinental railway, $27,000,000. Our estimate is that the actual amount of expenditure for that service for the year will be $24,000,000. We shall expend, as closely as we can estimate it, on public works, railways and canals chargeable to capital, railway subsidies, bounties and other minor charges of capital and special character, $11,500,000. Add that to the $24,000,000 for the Transcontinental, and we have an expenditure on capital and special account of $35,500,000. If we set that against the surplus of $30,500,000 and the payments into the sinking fund of $1,100,000, we find the amount which, as the result of the year's operations, has been added to the public debt. These figures show that we have provided for all the ordinary services of the government on a liberal scale, we have provided for public works and railways, railway subsidies, and bounties and various services chargeable to capital account, and have provided even

for the Transcontinental railway almost as much as was expended in the year, making a total of $35,500,000 spent on capital and special account, and yet we have added to the public debt of the Dominion only $3,900,000.

The debt of the country, as I have had occasion to remark previously, is only a burden in proportion to the number of shoulders to bear it. And if we view the debt of Canada in that way, we shall find that there is every reason to be gratified and no reason to be alarmed. The net debt of Canada on the 31st March, 1910, was $336,268,546.33. The estimated increase of debt for 1910-11, as I have stated, is $3,900,000, which would make an estimated net debt at March 31, 1911, of $340,168,546.33. Now, if we apply the net debt of Canada year by year to the population of Canada, we shall have a very clear idea of how far the debt of the country is a burden upon the public. I have here a statement beginning with the year 1891, and showing for that year and for the twenty years succeeding, the population and net debt with the net debt per capita:

NET DEBT PER CAPITA.

Year.	Population.	Net Debt.	Net Debt per Capita.
1891..	4,844,366	$237,809,030.51	$49.09
1892..	4,889,266	241,131,434.44	49.15
1893..	4,935,748	241,681,039.61	48.96
1894..	4,983,903	246,183,029.48	49.40
1895..	5,003,839	253,074,927.09	50.57
1896..	5,086,061	258,497,432.77	50.82
1897..	5,141,508	261,538,596.46	50.87
1898..	5,199,267	263,956,398.91	50.77
1899..	5,259,491	266,273,446.60	50.62
1900..	5,322,348	265,493,806.89	49.88
1901..	5,413,370	268,480,003.69	49.59
1902..	5,537,500	271,829,089.62	49.08
1903..	5,712,190	261,606,988.87	45.79
1904..	5,890,066	260,867,718.60	44.29
1905..	6,091,136	266,224,166.60	43.70
1906..	6,323,557	267,042,977.75	42.23
1907..	6,655,904	263,671,859.96	39.61
1908..	6,863,500	277,960,859.84	40.49
1909..	7,145,040	323,930,279.17	45.33
1910..	7,489,781	336,268,546.33	44.90
1911..	7,785,000	*340,168,546.33	43.69

* Estimated.

Thus it will be seen that while, in a young and growing country like Canada, there must be from time to time some additions to the public debt, the additions in our case have been very moderate, and, when considered in proportion to the population of the country are seen to be still more moderate. There is another way in which to measure the proportionate diminution of our public debt. Twenty years ago it would have taken six years revenue to pay the net debt; ten years ago it would have taken five years' revenue to pay the net debt; to-day less than three years' revenue would pay the whole net debt of of Canada.

Since the date of the last Budget Speech (December, 1909), large obligations of the Dominion have matured and been dealt with. On the 1st January, 1910, the 4 per cent Reduced Loan of 1885 for £6,443,136 2s 9d., or $31,356,595.88, matured and was dealt with as follows: $11,915,343.35 redeemed in cash; $8,990,771.45 converted into 3½ per cent loan 1930-50; $9,603,597.84 held in its own sinking funds and cancelled; $846,883.24 held in Investment Account and cancelled. It will thus be seen that of this loan a large portion was redeemed in cash, a portion converted, and a portion cancelled through the operation of the sinking funds.

There was also matured and paid off on the 1st February, 1910, £1,000,000 of Treasury Bills.

Notice had been given that on the 1st July, 1910, the 4 per cent loan of 1885 for £4,000,000 would be redeemed. This was a loan issued in the year 1885 at 4 per cent, redeemable between 1910 and 1935 on the government giving six months' notice. As this loan was bearing 4 per cent interest it was considered advisable to replace it by a loan bearing a lower rate of interest. For this purpose a loan of £4,000,000 3½ per cent stock, redeemable, as in the case of other 3½ per cent loans, on the 1st July, 1950, with the option to redeem at par on or after the 1st July, 1930, on giving six months' notice, was issued at the issue price of 99 per cent.

On the 1st October, 1910, the £1,500,000 of the 4 per cent loan of 1875-8 guaranteed by the imperial government fell due. To provide for this maturity, and also for the purpose of meeting £3,500,000 of treasury bills, due 1st July, 1910, an issue of £5,000,000 3½ per cent stock, redeemable on the 1st July, 1950, with option to redeem at par on or after the 1st July, 1930, on giving six months' notice, was effected at 99½ per cent on the 5th May last.

The next maturity to be dealt with is the balance outstanding of the 4 per cent loan of 1874. This was a loan of £4,000,000 issued in 1874. A part of it was paid off, and the balance, £2,500,000, was extended to the 1st May, 1907. In April, 1907, a further offer to extend the balance outstanding for four years, or to the 1st May, 1911, was given with the option to convert into 3 per cent stock. This option expires on the 30th April, 1911. The amount of the loan so far not converted is £1,635,958. This outstanding amount will be paid off in cash on the 1st May next.

We have thus cleared off all the heavy maturities of the year 1910. Provision is practically made for the payment in cash on the 1st May next of the loan already referred to maturing that date.

There is to-day no temporary loan of any kind outstanding.

In this connection I may say a word

on the subject of sinking funds. In the earlier history of the Dominion it was the practice to attach sinking funds to all the loans, and, with the exception of one small loan there was a sinking fund attached to all loans in these earlier years. But after the year 1885 that policy was changed; sinking funds were abolished, and from that time on for many years no sinking funds were attached to the loans. As these old loans matured the sinking fund attached to each was found a most convenient and advantageous thing, and as a result of our consideration of the question of re-establishing the sinking fund system, sinking funds are attached to our recent loans. In the olden times the sinking fund was one-half of one per cent, except in the case of the imperial guarantee loan, when it was 1 per cent. In July, 1909, we issued a loan of £6,500,000, 3½ per cent stock, and to that we attached a sinking fund of one-half of one per cent. We also extended that sinking fund to two previous issues of the same class; one of £3,000,000 issued February, 1908, and another of £5,000,000 issued October, 1908; both of these being of the same class as the loan of 1909, 3½ per cent stock redeemable 1930-50. We have thus fourteen and a half million pounds sterling of recent loans which have been brought under the operation of sinking funds, and the additional amount we have put into the sinking fund by reason of this change now stands at $695,024. There was no particular demand for this from the money market. I have no doubt we could still have obtained our loans without sinking funds, but I am of opinion that even from the money market point of view it was well we should restore the policy of earlier years and attach sinking funds to our loans. We propose, therefore, that as respects loans which may hereafter arise, unless something shall occur to change the policy, that we shall attach sinking funds to them as was done in the earlier history of the Dominion.

In a previous budget speech, I think the last one, I discussed the question of what I thought was a proper subject for borrowing: the things which we might reasonably borrow for, and the things for which we should not borrow. Speaking generally one may say that the things which are chargeable to capital account are usually considered the things for which a government may properly borrow. I think, however, that we might accept that principle only with a modification. I laid it down, not as a rule, but as an object at which we should aim, that we should only borrow for great and important public works such as the National Transcontinental railway. I do not mean to say that under no circumstances would we be justified in borrowing for other purposes, but my idea was that we should endeavour to pay out of revenue not only our ordinary expenditure, but other expenditures which had formerly been charged to capital or special accounts, such as our Public Works, Railways and Canals capital account, bounties, &c. I thought we should endeavour to confine our borrowing to a great national work like the Transcontinental railway and pay all the rest out of our revenue. I am glad to be able to say that has been done, and that we have accomplished more than I set out to accomplish in that way. As I have pointed out, in 1909-10 we spent on the National Transcontinental railway $19,968,064.31, but we only added to the public debt in that time $12,338,267, and in the year just closing we spent $24,000,000 on the National Transcontinental railway, but we shall only add to the public debt $3,900,000. I have already mentioned that we have made a change with regard to certain items being charged to capital account. The expenditure for Dominion lands for a great many years was chargeable to capital account though the revenue from Dominion lands appeared in the ordinary income. We announced last session that we would charge Dominion lands hereafter to income account, also, that portion of the militia expenditure which for some years had been charged to capital account, and also, that we would take the new Naval Service under our care as chargeable to income, and not to capital.

I propose now, in view of the fact that the bounties are pretty well running out, that that which will remain will not be a very heavy charge on the public treasury. I think that from this time forward we may adopt the rule that all these charges for bounties shall hereafter be charged to income and not charged to capital or special account.

With regard to these bounties, as they have been the subject of very much discussion of late in one form or another, I may give the House some information concerning them. I think that the bounty system dates back as far as 1883. In the session of 1883 the first bounty legislation with regard to iron and steel was passed. At one time we granted bounties for the encouragement of the beet sugar industry, but they ceased a good many years ago, and were not renewed. In 1884 we began paying bounties for the production of manufacturing industries, and we have thus for 28 years been assisting in one form or other the iron and steel industry by way of bounties. The following table gives the amount paid for bounties during the year 1910, and the year 1910-11 to 31st March, which however is incomplete:

BOUNTIES.

	Bounties. paid during 1910.	1910-11 to 31st Mar. (Incomplete.)
Pig iron	$573,999	$261,434
Steel	695,722	350,456
Manufactures of steel	538,812	468,461
Lead	340,542	138,913
Manila fibre	61,507	37,288
Crude petroleum	203,589	147,814
Total	$2,414,171	$1,404,366

In the case of the bounties on pig iron, steel and puddled bars, the bounties expired on the 31st December. There is an exception to that, however, in the case of iron produced from Canadian ore by the process of electric smelting. It was provided when the last extension of bounties occurred, that as respects that particular form of industry the bounty should be extended to the 31st of December, 1912. So far as I am aware, however, no operations have been carried on under that provision. The bounty on rolled round wire rods which has been carried on expires on the 1st July, 1911. The provisions of the present statute giving a bounty of 75 cents per 100 pounds on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada were extended to the 30th June, 1913, the amount of the bounty being limited to $500,000 in each calendar year. That bounty, therefore, has some time to run. There is a bounty of three-eighths of a cent per pound on manila fibre used in the manufacture of binder twine, due to a discrimination by the United States in the Philippine Islands by which the manufacturers of manila fibre in Canada were obliged to pay a duty which their American competitors were not obliged to pay. That bounty is not limited as to date. There is also a bounty of 1¼ cents per gallon on crude petroleum which was established on the revision of the petroleum duties some years ago, and there is no limitation as to date. Since the inception of the bounty system in 1884 to the 31st March last the total sum paid in bounties has amounted to $21,031,700, as follows:

TOTAL BOUNTIES PAID—1884 to 1911.

Pig iron	$7,707,648
Puddled iron bars	113,674
Steel	6,706,990
Manufactures of steel—	
Wire rods	2,541,711
Angle beams, &c.	101,264
Lead	1,610,733
Manila fibre	243,254
Crude petroleum	1,911,075
Beet root sugar	93,284
Law costs	2,067
Total	$21,031,700

I do not desire to present any elaborate system of statistics at the present time, yet, I think it would be well that I should, in a few striking figures, indicate the great progress which we are still able to note in the trade and financial affairs of Canada. I propose to give you figures briefly only for three periods—1900, 1905, 1910—so that we may at a glance see something of the great progress which has been made. I, therefore, beg to present the following statement:

TOTAL TRADE OF CANADA.

Year.	Total Imports into Canada.	Total Exports from Canada.	Total Trade.
	$	$	$
1900	189,622,513	191,894,723	381,517,236
1905	266,834,417	203,316,872	470,151,289
1910	418,730,764	309,682,431	728,413,195

Mr. FOSTER. Does that statement include coin and bullion?

Mr. FIELDING. The statement of the total imports includes everything. I propose to present a few figures now with regard to trade with Great Britain and these will not include coin and bullion.

Mr. FOSTER. Merchandise only.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

TOTAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

Year.	Imports (Home Consumption, Coin and Bullion excluded).	Exports (Produce of Canada, Coin and Bullion excluded).	Total Trade with Great Britain (Imports Home Consumption and Exports produce of Canada, Coin and Bullion excluded).
	$	$	$
1900	44,279,983	96,562,875	140,842,858
1905	60,342,704	97,114,867	157,457,571
1910	101,068,534	145,505,186	246,573,720

These figures of our trade with the world and our trade with Great Britain give us at a glance some idea of the tremendous expansion of our business. For the year 1910-11, to the 28th February, an incomplete return representing only eleven month, our total trade was $687,376,352. For the corresponding period of the previous year it was $610,577,981, showing, on a statement for eleven months, an increase of $76,798,000. So, it will be seen that the figures which I have given for the periods 1900, 1905 and 1910, may still be reasonably applied to the trade currents of the year; we have every evidence that they are still increasing.

For the year 1911-12, upon which we have just entered, one can only speak generally. It is impossible to make estimates with any degree of accuracy and in all my experience in budget speeches I have though it better to be general in this respect. Let me say, however, that we have no reason to fear that this year will not be in every respect a satisfactory one. The estimates now before the House call for a liberal expenditure and we shall still have supplementary estimates to come which no doubt will add materially to the bill of fare. But, we have every reason to believe that the revenue will be abundant and that we will find it sufficient to meet all our ordinary expenditures and also a share of the expenditures of a capital and special character.

We know that in a country which is so largely agricultural as Canada very much depends upon the condition of the crops, and no man can at this date foreshadow what that condition may be, but we have no reason to doubt that the blessings of Providence in respect to generous crops will be extended to us in this year as in the past. We think that the outlook in every respect is one that should give us much hope. Desirable immigrants are coming in. I emphasize the word 'desirable.' We have surely reached that stage in our affairs now when it is quality rather than quantity that we want in regard to immigration, and we have good reason to believe that the Department of the Interior is using every legitimate effort to see that the immigrants who are coming into the country are of the best class. We are getting capital in abundance. Population and capital are the two things that a new and growing country need, and the country has every reason to be satisfied with its condition in this respect. With every prospect for business activity, with every ground for hoping for good crops, with trade and commerce flourishing, with the outlook so good generally, we have every reason to look with confidence to the future. There are those who will say: That being the case, let well enough alone.

Some hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. I say that is not a sound motto for any country in this progressive age. The business man never accepts the motto to let well enough alone. In the time of his greatest activity and his greatest prosperity he is looking for opportunities to open up new fields of business, and as it is with the individual so it should be with the nation. 'Let well enough alone' has never been the motto of the Dominion of Canada. In all times past, when we have had a prosperous condition of affairs, when my predecessors in office were able to make statements perhaps hardly so rosy as that which it is my pleasure to make to-day, but nevertheless hopeful and encouraging statements, they were not content to let well enough alone, and why should they preach that doctrine to us to-day? If we are to adopt that policy let us cease building railways, abolish our subsidies to steamship lines and cease to send trade agents to foreign countries. We are seeking new markets everywhere; our steamships run to all countries, many of them heavily subsidized; we are sending our trade agents over the civilized world; we are doing everything that is inconsistent with the policy of 'let well enough alone' because when things are going favourably that is not a reason for doing nothing, it is rather a reason for being alert to avail ourselves of other opportunities. We need new markets in all directions. We need them for the surplus products of Canada as it is to-day, and we shall need them in even greater degree for the vaster surplus of Canadian products to come to us from the great west in the near future. For these reasons we have endeavoured to enlarge our markets in all directions and it did not seem to be wise, while we were sending agents to Africa and China and the distant parts of the world, to close our eyes to the opportunities lying much nearer home. Into that I do not wish to enter to-day.

Every prospect for Canada to-day is bright and hopeful. With peace and progress and prosperity at home, with the friendliest relations with the great republic lying alongside of us, with the warmest attachment to the great empire of which we are so proud to form a part, the Canadian people can look forward to the future with every hope and every confidence.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, we have listened with interest to the remarks made by the Finance Minister in presenting briefly the salient points of the financial year preceding the one that has just ended and also the one which ended on the 31st of March last. I hope my hon. friend will not make a precedent of his action of last year. It is now some fifteen months or thereabouts since this House and the country has had an exposition of its financial position from the Minister of Finance in the Dominion parliament. That is a step which I should be sorry to see made a precedent. The Minister of Finance came to an indulgent House and a warm hearted opposition and asked for $46,000,000 or $47,000,000 of supply for the next year, that is our current year, before he had deigned to make an exposition to the House of the financial stewardship he had undertaken for the past year. That

is not a precedent which I think ought to be established and I leave it with that expression of opinion in which I feel sure the whole House will agree. The Minister of Finance may not find so willing an opposition at another time, and it would become a question, and should become a question with an opposition as to whether it should encourage such slovenliness on the part of a Finance Minister and a government.

With the story that the Finance Minister has told of increasing revenues and increasing expenditures, pari passu with increasing revenues, with larger foreign trade in both volume and value, and with general prospects in the country indicating continued prosperity and development, no one on this side of the House and no one in the country sympathizes with any feeling of less pleasure than the Minister of Finance himself has had in detailing it to the House. We on this side of the House and the citizens of Canada generally, are glad that Canada has a large measure of prosperity. We hope it may never be the fate of any succeeding Finance Minister to have to give other than a favourable story of the year's progress in Canada to a parliament that is waiting for his words.

Whilst we rejoice in that and are glad we are careful not to become idolators and bow down and worship these men as though they were gods and the authors of all this prosperity. We find the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues before us and we consider them no more than plain ordinary citizens like ourselves. We do not know that they have any special connecting wires with an all-wise and bountiful Providence by which they establish communications and, acquire information enabling them to take steps which shall be especially beneficial to themselves while they are in office. We do not look at them in that way, we look at them, in the prayer-meeting phraseology, as poor fallible creatures like ourselves with a fair amount of wisdom and experience. very, very liable to make mistakes, very, very liable to yield to temptation and very, very prone to blunder into situations thinking they are stepping almost into the Promised Land, situations from which, when they have once plunged into them, they with tears, and in sackcloth and ashes pray for some means of deliverance. In some such hole as that my right hon. friend and his colleagues, through the ministers who sit one on each side of him, have the extreme felicity of finding themselves on this very date.

The story of 1910 has been told us in the blue-books and the minister, of course, has not attempted to throw any light upon that; that is a reading out of the pages that have been before us all. It may, however, not be unwise to make a comment here and there, to stick a pin in occasionally at this passage and the other, not so as to destroy the feeling of content at the story of 1910 but, by way of admonition, if possible to point a moral and adorn a tale which shall be beneficial in succeeding years to those who may be conducting the affairs of this country. Old history is still old history and I do not propose to go far back in connection with that except just to remind my hon. friend how exceedingly juvenile he was or how exceedingly inexperienced he was, or how exceedingly unveracious he was when, in 1896 and thereabouts, he promised to govern this country with some millions less of yearly taxation than it had been governed with by his opponents at that time in the government, to recall to his mind how he was going to marshall his army of good, pure, Grit free-traders and march upon this great citadel of Ottawa, where were entrenched the men who would dare to propose $40,000,000 as the yearly expenditure of this Dominion of Canada, who were draining from the pockets of the poor people of this country at that time some $27,700,000 of taxation per year.

Just to remind my right hon. friend that it is not safe always to attempt to forecast the future or to use against your opponents a weapon which comes back in future years upon yourself, I have to say that the gentlemen who were going to rule this country by taking from the people taxation of less than $27,000,000 annually, come down to-day, and, with clapping hands and shouts of approval hear the Finance Minister tell us that next year he is going to take $89,355,128 out of the people of this country as taxes. We were sinners beyond redemption when we proposed to take $27,700,000; these are saints beyond praise when they propose to take $89,355,000. So things have changed. There is an increase of taxation amounting to about 195 per cent as between the year 1896 and the year 1910-11. Then, the total revenue of the country in 1896 was in the neighbourhood of $36,600,000. We were vehemently denounced because we raised so much money from the people of the country. The revenue this last year has been $101,503,000, and next year my hon. friend is looking for about $117,500,000. So that in the matter of taxation and in the matter of revenue, including taxation, there have been vast strides forward in this country. Not only have our railways to a certain extent increased, not only has our trade increased, and it is well and pleasant to dwell upon these features, but we must remember that our taxation also has increased; and I absolutely dissent from the state-

ment of the Minister of Finance that neither the burden nor the rate of taxation relatively has been raised in this country. The burden of taxation has been raised relatively, and the incidence of taxation, that is, the real rate that the people pay on the goods that come into this country, is higher to-day than it was in 1896, as I will endeavour to prove before I get through with my remarks. The Minister of Finance was wonderfully prolix in showing how small a thing the debt of the country was, distributed amongst the 7,500,000 people of Canada—that it amounted to only about $44 per head, and that the interest necessary to carry that amount of debt was for each one a bagatelle. I noticed, however, that he did not dwell so much on the figures of population relative to expenditure and taxation. Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen opposite, in the taxes they took from the country, the amount of which has enabled them to keep the debt from increasing as much as it otherwise would, had maintained them during the term of their administration at the point at which they stood in 1896, as they promised to do—in fact, they promised that they would lower them—they could not have told the story which they told to-day of the comparatively small increase of the national debt, although it is $100,000,000 greater; they could not have told the story they have told to-day as to the expenditures and the improvements they have made. It will strike the people of this country a little forcibly when I tell you that these hon. gentlemen, since they came into the administration of affairs, have taken in taxes from the pockets of the people $280,000,000 more than they would have taken in the same time if they had raised each year only the amount that we raised in 1896, and which they condemned. It will also strike the people of the country, and may be some members of this House, that if hon. gentlemen opposite had expended simply $41,702,000 per year, which we expended in 1896, and which they declared was too large, they would not have been able to tell the story that they have told to-day. In the time that they have been in office they have spent over and above what they would have spent, at the rate of $41,700,000 a year, the immense sum of $472,000,000. That is another aspect of the matter. They have increased the expenditures, over and above what they would have been on the normal rate of 1896, by $427,000,000, and they have increased the taxation, over and above the normal rate of that year, by $280,000,000. That is the reason why our debt is not $100,000,000 larger than it is. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is coming back to saner methods. After a long while of obstinate persistency, he has consented to put the bounties into the consolidated fund expenditure, where we always kept them, and out of which he never should have taken them. At long last, he proposes now to do the right thing, though he has not indicated any repentance for his sins of all these years in the past. He is going to put some other expenditures into the consolidated revenue fund.

Why is he enabled to do it? Because he is taking more out of the pockets of the people; that is what makes it easy for him to do it. He talks about capital expenditure, but much of that is a matter of principle, and some of it a matter of practice. When Canada had a population of 3,000,000 with a country just as large as to-day, and with no facilities for transport and development, it would have been arrant madness to have asked these people, in any single year or series of years, to put their hands down into their pockets and equip this country out of their yearly taxes. That would have been neither reasonable nor just. That deep laid widely extended mechanism of development, then started, was not merely for the men of that generation, but was intended to develop Canada for all generations to come and it was only reasonable that the generations to come should bear a portion of the burden. But when we have a large surplus and determine not to return any of it to the people in the way of lessened taxation, it is comparatively easy not to borrow but to pay for things which, in former stages of our development, could only have been met out of borrowings on capital but which now can be met out of ordinary revenue. That the debt of Canada should be $336,000,000 is something which bears heavily on the country. But our present taxation taking from $70,000,000 to $90,000,000 each year from the people, is a far heavier burden for which there ought to be good reasons or else a portion of it ought to be remitted.

I want to take up for a moment just one or two points regarding the surplus. The Finance Minister says that from this time on he is going to pay for Dominion land expenses out of revenue. In looking over his accounts I find that he gets a portion of that surplus of $22,000,000 by charging bounties of $2,414,000 to capital or special account as he calls it. But he did something else last year. In 1908 my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) told the country he was going to provide for the building of the Hudson Bay railway by the sale of Dominion lands and brought down a measure to that effect—not by leasing these lands, not by renting them, by which he might get a revenue, but by selling them and thereby raising a capital fund for the building of this railway. But what do I find? From 1908 up to the present, whilst millions of acres of land have

been sold and millions of dollars paid by the purchasers, every dollar of that capital has been put into revenue so as to swell the surplus. Can the hon. minister find anything in economics which would justify a man in selling his capital and treating the proceeds as current revenue for the year? It is just as if a man had two large mills out of which he made a profit every year. One of these mills he sells at $50,000. Would any rule of business justify him in adding that $50,000 to the revenue account of the current year? What dividends could be paid and what terrible confusion could be created if business were carried on in that way. Yet we have a sample of it in the present administration. In the surplus of last year, there is over $1,600,000, the proceeds of the sale of lands, the year before that the same amount, and this year probably two or three million dollars more. All these capital sums got from the sale of Canada's possessions are treated as revenue, while at the same time the cost of administering those lands is charged to capital. Now I hope to see the Minister of Finance go a step further and bring forth works meek for repentance by putting the sales of that land into a fund out of which the Hudson Bay railway shall be built, and treating it as capital and not as revenue. What has the Finance Minister to say in defence of conduct of this kind? With his authorization, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) declared that the Hudson Bay railway was to be built at an estimated cost of some $25,000,000, and to be paid for out of the proceeds from the sales of Dominion lands. And the whole country applauded and none more than hon. gentlemen on that side. The Minister of the Interior got his Bill through, and has been selling these lands, and to-day there is not one cent left of all the money he got from these sales. It all went into current account, and was spent on different services in the country. I leave the Minister of the Interior and his colleagues to settle that matter among themselves. But I ask whether it is an honest method of conducting business. You get parliamentary authority to sell our lands in sufficient quantities to net some $25,000,000 under pledge that the proceeds shall be used to build the railway, and then you put all that money into current account and spend it on dredging and every other kind of current services. When we come to pay the bills for the Hudson Bay railway we must go to the money markets of the world and borrow it. It is simply a brazen breach of faith.

The Finance Minister was rather troubled about that surplus. He thought that $30,000,000 of surplus was so large that the taxpayers might make a demand for the lessening of their taxes, especially that large portion of them who were brought up under the teachings of the Finance Minister himself. All the time the Finance Minister was going about and telling the people what was right to do, he was a sturdy opponent of surpluses. And so was Hon. David Mills, so was Sir Richard Cartwright, so was the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself and all the members of his cabinet. The moment you get a surplus that amounts to anything, these teachers told us, it is warrant positive that you ought to reduce taxation and give relief to the taxpayer. To-day my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has a different doctrine, but, then, what is there in this wide world of business and politics in Canada on which he has not a different doctrine from that which he had twenty years ago. Why, he has even changed his faith in the national point of view. That is, I suppose he has. I heard him say but a little while ago that he was overjoyed at the stability and prospective permanence of this Dominion, this great confederation. I must believe him. And yet I could not but remember that it was not many years ago that he led a determined campaign to break up this Dominion, to smash confederation into atoms. Not content with attempting to take his own province of Nova Scotia out, he tried to inveigle Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick into the same evil path, and was quite angry when he could not succeed. However, he vowed: Let them go, let them sacrifice to their idols, let them walk in their own paths; but as for me, I will take Nova Scotia out, come what may. Is it that my hon. friend, as he grows older, grows wiser. Or would he yet say, if I asked the question: I still believe Nova Scotia would have been better off if she had been taken out of the union? But after all, has he changed his view? After all, is not the policy he has to-day before this House the same in essence as that which he advocated in 1886? I read, not three months ago, in the Halifax 'Chronicle,' which, I suppose, gives the views of my hon. friend now as it did in those times, the old geographical argument. You cannot fight against geography runs this argument; why not let British Columbia deal with the States to the south of her?—why not let the northwest deal with the adjacent States and the maritime provinces deal with the New England States? That was the argument before confederation. That was the argument in reference to Nova Scotia in 1886, if my hon. friend had been strong enough or straightforward enough to carry out the policy he declared he was convinced was the proper policy for Nova Scotia. So, it is possible that to-day, by another and devious way he is operating to bring about the same condition for all sections of this Dominion that he tried to bring about in 1886 for his

own province, and for all the maritime provinces if he could have persuaded them to join with him?

Now, as to the surplus, I quote my hon. friend, not his very words, but the sense. He said: If this surplus of $30,000,000 had been got by burdensome taxation, or by virtual increase in the rate of taxation, then, possibly, we should have no right to continue it; but the rates and taxes are lower to-day than they have been in the past. Now, we have discussed that question from my standpoint in this House, and other hon. members have discussed it. I have here a return which was prepared by the government, and which gives the quantity, value and duty, the average duty rate and the average unit price in 1896 and 1910.

Of articles imported into this country which are subject to ad valorem duties, a comparison of the list shows that of the 156 articles mentioned therein, on 29 the rate paid in 1910 was higher than that paid in 1896, on 34 it was practically the same, on 11 the reduction in 1910 upon the rates of 1896 was less than 1 per cent, on 11 others not more than 2 per cent, on 15 others from 2 to 3 per cent, and on 22 from 3 to 5 per cent, with the remaining items running below a 5 per cent reduction. This shows, on the whole, a very trifling dimunition of the ad valorem rates of 1896.

When, however, we compare the average rate on dutiable imports in 1910 and 1896 which stood at 26·71 per cent and 29·79 per cent respectively, and remember that the prices of goods have advanced on an average thirty or forty per cent between the two periods, it is apparent that even this small reduction of three per cent in rate is far more than counterbalanced by the enhanced price of the articles on which the rate is enacted. The hard fact stares us in the face also that the estimated taxation for the year 1910-11 is $89,350,000 as against $27,700,000 in 1896, or $11.50 per head of the population in 1910 compared with $5.40 per head in 1896.

With these facts and figures in mind there need be little doubt as to the rate and burden of taxation under the present government as contrasted with its predecessor.

I now desire to spend a little time over the matter of trade. The general figures for our trade are very satisfactory. They are, however, the figures of the foreign trade only, and I would like to suggest to the Minister of Finance whether it is not possible and exceedingly desirable that a Finance Minister shall be in a position to tell us something each year of the conditions and progress of the interprovincial trade in this Dominion.

I am not prepared to say what is the proportion that foreign trade bears to inter-

Mr. FOSTER.

provincial trade in Canada, but I am quite certain that it is many times greater than the foreign trade. It is the life-blood which circulates constantly from one limb of this country to the other, forcing itself through all parts of the body and giving it vitality and growth. It is the trade which, in almost its entirety, is the result of two productions, each one of them productions in Canada. For instance, your British Columbia fruit grower raises his fruit in Canada, sends it to the producers of meats, or cattle, or grains, in the prairie provinces. The prairie provinces raise their cattle, their meats and their grains and send them in exchange to the province of British Columbia for the fruit which they have raised—two productions, both in Canada, one in British Columbia and the other in the Northwest. The interchange between them makes the trade, all the profits and all the advantages remain in the country itself, and, more than that we have the population, the labour, the home building, and the absolutely essential accumulation of wealth in the country itself. That is why I think that a Minister of Finance who does not try to give, even if it be an inadequate, yet a somewhat approximate idea of the immense stream of interprovincial trade and commerce which is going on between east and west, north and south in our Dominion, fails to give the country an adequate idea of what it is doing. Trade between a country outside of Canada and Canada itself necessitates one production and one set of profits absolutely outside of this country. The other production and the other set of profits that belong to it are all that remain in this country. Whatever tends to encourage the volume of production of what the different provinces need in the different sections and parts of this country and which leads to the interchange between the different parts of the country of these products, is for the upbuilding of the county. Whatever tends to discourage it is not for the upbuilding of the country but has the contrary effect. Nobody is foolish enough to argue that the time ever can come or should come when there will be no foreign trade. Have all the development possible of interprovincial production and trade and you will have an increasing quantity of foreign trade. All the same, it is the duty of every country to strive to make the most possible of production, and interchange within the limits of the country itself, and as far as possible to relatively lessen the interchange with foreign countries. The first thing then which we note in scanning the trade figures that we have is an entire lack of anything which will give us any idea of this internal production and trade which are so important. The figures of foreign trade are magnified and looked upon as the chief if not the sole indices of progress and advancement. Again

I notice with reference to these figures of foreign trade that the balance of trade against this country in its last year's operations is $90,567,876. That is taking home products and home consumption alone into account. It would be better for us if instead of this being an adverse balance of trade, it were a favourable balance of trade. Argue as you please as to what off-sets that adverse balance of trade in the way of unseen imports and exports let that be what it may; it is yet fair to say that so far as possible we ought to strive to reduce the adverse balance of trade against this country. The only way we can reduce it is by exporting more and making more in the country itself. The first criticism upon that state of things, namely, the large increase in our imports as compared with our exports, leads one to ask why the policy of the country should not bring it about that more should be made in this country by the people of the country out of the resources of the country, and consequently less imported from abroad, with the result that more would be had to export abroad and the present adverse balance of trade would be reduced. Smile as much as we like, or look as wise as we like, and we often do both to conceal our lack of knowledge, we cannot get away from the fact that as far as possible the trade policy of a country should aim at stimulating the productions in that country itself out of its own raw material or out of raw material imported from abroad, employing its people, building up its homes and adding to the wealth of the country. Whatever we can make in that way in Canada with Canadian labour and with Canadian capital we ought to aim at doing, and so import relatively less and so have less of an adverse balance. I find in connection with the United Kingdom that our favourable balance of trade is $44,146,518. That looks good, but it is not as good as it ought to be. When we come to the United States of America, what do we find? We find that last year we imported from the United States $217,500,000 worth, that we sold to them $104,000,000 worth in round figures, and that there was an adverse balance against us of $113,000,000 odd. In our commerce with France we have an adverse balance of $7,500,000, with Germany an adverse balance of $5,869,000, and that with all foreign countries we have an adverse balance. We add all these up and after subtracting from the result the favourable balance of our trade with the United Kingdom, it leaves us, as I said, $90,000,000 to the bad, as the adverse balance in our world trade.

Well, the sooner we can remedy that, and the more we can remedy it the better. There are some rather striking things in connection with it, and I want to speak of them just here. It is a striking thing that with reference to certain food products of this country, Canada is getting very closely to the point where she finds it difficult to supply her own people, and she is fast leaving the point of large exports to foreign countries and especially to Great Britain. It rather stunned me when I made a calculation of the figures this morning. Take these exports. Of eggs in 1900 we exported $1,450,000 worth. In 1910 we exported only $41,766 worth.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. But the highest record year was in 1902 when we exported $1,733,242 worth.

The comparison in these products is shown, in round numbers, in the following table:

Article.	Exports.			
	1900.	1910.	Record Year.	
Eggs	$1,450,000	$ 41,766	(1092)	$1,733,242
Butter	5,000,000	1,000,000	(1906)	7,000,000
Cheese	19,800,000	21,607,000	(1903)	24,712,000
Meats, bacon and hams	12,700,000	6,800,000	(1903)	16,000,000
Beef and mutton	223,000	117,000	(1901)	819,000
Canned meats	309,000	193,000	(1905)	3,500,000
Pork	45,009	48,780	(1904)	446,507
Total of provisions	40,000,000	30,000,000	(1903)	54,000,000
Live animals	12,000,000	12,000,000	.....	.....
Total of animals and their products	56,000,000	53,000,000	(1903)	69,000,000

From this table the House will see that there is a very great falling off in our exports. A ready answer to that, but not a satisfactory one, would be that we are consuming more of these ourselves, but is it a fact that we are satisfied not to have

our exports in these lines increase pari passu with our general progress in the export trade? There seems to be something the matter with reference to these products, and in some way or other there is not that stimulus, there is not that production of these which in an eminently agricultural country like Canada there ought to be. We ought to keep pace with the home consumption needs of this country, and at the same time increase our exports. The facts are that we are decreasing our exports almost to the vanishing point, and if the present tendency continues the time will rapidly come when we will have to import these articles. Yet some gentlemen talk about the great necessity for opening and extending markets for these very same commodities.

The only thing that saves us in the agricultural line is the exportation of grains and their products. The total export of agricultural products in 1900 was $27,000,000, and in 1910 $90,000,000. That is satisfactory. The exports of grain in 1900 were $18,000,000 and in 1910 $56,000,000. That you say is satisfactory. Wheat flour shows $2,700,000 in 1900 running up to $14,800,000 in 1910. That is eminently satisfactory because wheat flour is not only an agricultural product but it is a raw product turned into a partly manufactured article, and we have all the advantages that accrue from the doing of that work in this country.

The total exports of grain products increase from $3,000,000 in 1900 to $16,000,000 in 1910. Now, although that is satisfactory in one respect yet when you come to think of the area of new lands that we are adding each year to the cultivable area, thus producing the larger quantity for that export, a certain amount of that satisfaction is taken away. It would be strange indeed if, when we were bringing millions of acres of new lands out of the rough into the producing condition, we should not largely increase our exports.

But when we go back to the old and stable and settled agricultural products and find our exports dwindling and our home consumption calling for almost everything we produce, the condition is not so satisfactory.

Another unsatisfactory situation has developed to-day, not by the fault of Canada, but by the fault of this government itself, that is the disturbance and unsettlement of trade conditions in this country. The Finance Minister sang us a song to the refrain 'Let well enough alone,' and his view of letting well enough alone was to tear up all our railways, do away with our steamship lines and stop all our mechanism of development and transport. That, he said, would be letting well enough alone. I think that would be tearing well enough all to

Mr. FOSTER.

pieces. Does he mean to say that is a fair way to meet our argument? Here we are with an immense production and an immense mechanism of transport and distribution going on swimmingly. Some one says that is an unexampled progress, let well enough alone. Oh, the minister says, if you mean to adopt that principle of letting well enough alone, you must go to work and tear up your railway tracks and take off your steamship lines and destroy all the mechanism of production and transport. Not at all. We admit the principle that progress must always be our motto, that there must be a constant impulse forward. But rashness may imperil the present situation of progress and development, and you cannot excuse that rashness by singing a parody upon the refrain 'Let well enough alone,' with the interpretation given to-day by the Minister of Finance.

As I listened to the opening words of the Minister of Finance, that every thing in Canada was prosperous, giving the prospect of permanency and great development, and as he went on with his story, it impressed itself more and more upon my mind as to why, in that condition of things, where there was no doubt, no contingency, and no risk, the whole frame work and service of our business and trade should be disturbed, dislocated, unsettled, by a rash jump into a new venture the outcome of which the Finance Minister himself is absolutely unable to see. There is unsettlement, there is no doubt about it. I want to ask the Finance Minister one question, the answer to which is historical and a proof of the value of stable settlement. When was it that this Dominion of Canada, as to its constituent parts, began to make real and settled progress? It was when the people made up their minds to join together and make one country. Up to that time the provinces did not know what their future was to be, and there was the searching after something from the country to the south of us, every province diverse, no union. When out of that period of doubt and uncertainty we made up our minds to join our fortunes, to adopt the national idea, that settled all uncertainty for ever, and we commenced to make real progress. When in 1878 we undertook to establish the principle of protection and the National Policy so-called, it was a step in the direction which wise men thought was necessary, and which the event proved was salutary; but when we established the principle in 1879 in our first tariff, matters were not settled, because nearly one-half of the people of this country and a great political party were fighting against it, sworn to defeat it. We are told that progress was not very great at first. How could it be, with near-

ly half the people fighting for the destruction of that policy, and capital, which is always sensitive, not knowing what the outcome was to be? Election after election was fought on that. Gradually greater confidence arose, but up to 1896 nobody knew for certain what the settled tariff policy of this country would be on a change of government. 1896 came, followed by 1897 and 1898. Then it was settled that the policy of this country, not the policy of a party, was protection, a fair and adequate protection. Then things went ahead. They could not go ahead to the same extent before that. Then great progress took place—why? Because the principle was settled, and settled as we supposed forever; and everybody said, now we can set full sail and dare the ocean, for the old threatened storm of opposition to our trade policy has passed away. There was another instance. The time was in this country when it was a struggle between parties as to our transport system. The Liberal-Conservative party wanted to build railways; the Liberal party opposed it. The Liberal-Conservative party wanted to give subsidies to steamship lines; the Liberal party opposed it. The Liberal-Conservative party wanted to build and widen the canals; the Liberal party criticised it. And, Sir, until these gentlemen came into power there was that war between the factions of this country on the policy of transport development. They came into power, sobered when they assumed the responsibilities, made wise when they got down to the people and found out what they really wanted in a practical way; and these gentlemen became the sponsors for an advanced transport system east and west, even more liberal than that which the Liberal-Conservative party had favoured before. Then things went ahead. The country said: that settles it; here is a nation united, with a fair protection, with an east and west transport system to our own sea-board; with all these things settled, why should not the country go ahead? Now, what has happened? Every one of these policies is unsettled. No man can look out into the future and say how any of them is to be decided. One party in this country, I believe the strong majority, says: put through this newfangled policy, and you will break up the confederation into its original elements as far as trade and commerce and intercommunication are concerned; you will break up more than that. This policy is the first half of what is intended to break up what we supposed was the settled policy of this country as to adequate protection for the industries of this country. You have knocked off half of it; and thousands of men who are to-day supporting the party opposite are howling for the destruction of the other half. And on the other side of the line is an administration which is forcing on this Dominion as fast as they can force it free trade in all products. The transport system, which ran east and west, is now proposed to be tapped by north and south lines. So that you have everything to-day in a state of unsettlement and disturbance from the confederation and unity and integrity of this country down through the protective and the transport systems of the country. That is what these gentlemen have done, and I tell you that the sooner we get to the people of this country, and the sooner we settle this thing, the sooner we shall get into such stable conditions as will enable Canada to go ahead and leave even her past progress in the shade in the future great progress which shall come to her. This pact has unsettled not only the trade in our country, not only the trade as between us and the United States, but the trade as between us and Great Britain. It has unsettled what we supposed were the well-ascertained relations existing between us and the empire as a whole.

In the matter of trade it has thrown an apple of discord into the whole British Empire, that is undoubted. The Finance Minister pledged himself to the British ambassador that he was not going to impair the British preference. But he has impaired it, and he knows he has; and what is more, the British people know now that he has. He knows that the cable which he sent over will not, in the face of the facts as they are coming out from day to day, prove to the British people that he has not disturbed the imperial preference. It is not fair trade that he proposes even. Do you mean to tell our farmers that when New Zealand, Australia, France, Denmark, Austria-Hungry and Switzerland and Argentina can send their butter, cheese, and natural products into our market free of duty, whereas our products are not allowed to go into these markets on the same terms—do you mean to tell our farmers that that is fair trade? It is not; it is unfair trade. They have impaired the imperial preference in many respects. Just look at the absurdity of it. This government is treating with Australia to have a preferential system of trade between the two, and then is throwing open to Australia and to the world our Canadian market and thus giving away the very thing on which we relied to make a preferential arrangement. The point I wish to make is that despite all that Providence has done for us, despite all our great resources, despite the enterprise exhibited by our people, despite all the progress we have made and are now making, the government comes forward at this inopportune time with a proposition which imports disturbance and discord into our whole national trade situation.

Now, I have just a few concluding remarks to make of a general character. I do not know that they will be accepted, but I intend to make them. I make them because I have given some study to public affairs for the last 25 or 30 years, and there are some things which I think the Finance Minister and the government at this time ought to at least set about doing. It is one thing to frame your tariff schedules and gather in your taxes from year to year. It is quite as important to expend these revenues honestly, economically and on intelligent principles. I do not see any greater field for useful work than this, and I do not see any greater object which a government ought to have at heart than to accomplish this in some sort of business and common sense way. We must recollect that conditions are very different from what they were. When we were a small country with a small revenue and a small expenditure, each minister himself had a greater check on the work of his department than he has to-day. The government had a greater check, and so had parliament; but when these operations are multiplied a hundredfold, my view is that these checks are to-day absolutely inadequate and that something more ought to be supplied. What check have the ministers over an expenditure of some $100,000,000 extending all over this country, and on most diversified objects? Under present conditions they are almost entirely at the mercy of others. They cannot give this expenditure the personal supervision which they could an expenditure of a fairly moderate amount, either in its planning, or its carrying out. That applies to the different great departments of this government, and to the minister of each of these departments. With the outside work he has to do, with the cabinet work which takes up his time, no minister can have that check which ought to be had over the administration of his own department in the way of expenditure. But you will say the cabinet checks the minister. That used to be the case when we had a smaller expenditure, and when practically every item came before the cabinet and was explained, and passed upon by the cabinet. But to-day that would be absolutely impossible. It is not attempted to be done except in some very special instances, and the result is that the supervision and check of the cabinet over departmental expenditure has largely passed away. Is not that true? I appeal to the Finance Minister himself. But you may say that ultimately the House of Commons will be a check. Yes, it used to be, but it is not any longer to any considerable extent. When I first came to this House, the items in supply were criticised by men on the government benches as well as in the opposition. But to-day once the estimates are on the table, tell me, have you ever seen a government member attempt anything at all in the way of criticism of any of these estimates. Why, they are not even in the House when the estimates go through. The minister who is putting through his estimates is left alone by his followers, and has the whole business to attend to by himself. And on the opposition side, whatever may be our energy and disposition to work, it is impossible, under present conditions, when $115,000,000 of estimates are turned loose on the House, without any information in the estimates themselves, it is absolutely impossible for the opposition to exercise any effective check. All they can do is to wheedle out from the minister in charge, who is anxious to give no more information than he is absolutely obliged to give, what details they can. Do you mean to tell me that that is an efficient check on expenditure?

Now, ought there not to be a check on expenditure? There ought to be. And where can it be found? Here you have, for instance, millions of dollars being spent every year for the construction of public buildings. And on what principle is this money spent? There is no proper principle on which it should be spent but one: build a public building because the public service needs it and cannot be properly carried on without it. Is there any other reason for providing a public building when it has to be paid for, not with the party's money, not with the government's money, but with the people's money of which the government are the trustees? There is no other reason, no other principle, no other foundation of action but that. And yet, that is not the principle that is followed. Day after day we go through the estimates here when public buildings are under consideration, when large expenditures are initiated and no public need can be shown for the buildings proposed. I do not wish to labour that point, but only indicate a remedy. It seems to me that what ought to be done is to have some system of co-ordination. There ought to be a board in some way established before which all large claims for public expenditures of that kind should go for investigation and impartial report. Not that that board should have power to decide; the duty of the board should be to gather the information and give it impartially from a business standpoint in the form of a printed report, and then the minister and the House could do what it pleased about it. In some way or other a co-ordinating board of that kind will have to be appointed if we wish to reduce this wasteful, unwarranted expense in public buildings.

In the matter of transport there is the same confusion of ideas, the same lack of

plan, the same absence of continuity and system. Consequently, what is done in reference to our transport to-day is not necessarily a step onward in what is to be done the next day; we are not working out a perfect system of transport. On this question of transport you have the Minister of Public Works working, building harbours and dredging. You have the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine doing other portions of the work. And you will find the officers of these ministers working upon the same area and with regard to the same object but in entirely different ways. And so you have confusion, lack of system, lack of continuity. We have had commissions on transport and splendid reports from them, but we have not carried out the recommendations of the reports. Why? Because of this lack of co-ordination of which I have spoken. And I am sure the broad statement will be accepted in this House, and I think it will be accepted in the country, that a large portion of the money which is expended nominally for improving trade and transportation routes is actually a matter of patronage and is given to the member, or the county, or the district because it is thought that it will help the party. Now, what I would like to see is one of the best boards that ever was established in Canada, far higher in ability even than your Board of Railway Commissioners, where finance, trade, transport and the best scientific engineering skill shall all be represented. And before that high board all plans and propositions to aid in the development of transport and trade facilities should be brought for investigation and fair report, so that the ministry themselves and this parliament might have the information which otherwise they cannot get, and then make the final decision as to what should be done.

Besides that, I should like to have another board. I should like to have a tariff commission for this country. I think we need it: I think the events of the last six months or a year have shown that we need it. By a tariff commission I mean, not a commission that shall fix tariffs and make schedules of rates, not at all, but a tariff commission of undoubted ability which shall get at the foundation information with reference to prices and processes in this country, and in the other countries with which we compete. This board should find out the cost of raw material, the cost of working up the raw material, taking labour and everything else into account. It should take into account both the cost of production and the cost of distribution. It should learn the aids, the abnormal aids, which certain governments give to their manufacturing industries to enable them to compete unfairly with other countries. Appoint a commission of that kind and you would get a body of information upon which the government can form sound opinion, and by which they can be guided in bringing down proper tariffs, and you have also a basis of information which would enable this parliament to judge the same. You would have information which we sadly lack to-day. A man gets on a platform in the northwest and says: We are being bled to death by the makers of agricultural implements; it only costs so much to build them and we have to pay so much more; away with the manufacturer! We have another man who says: Hold on, my friend, there are differing conditions in this matter. Do you know the facts sufficiently well, do you differentiate between the different elements in the problem? The cost to the manufacturer may include more than you allow for and the cost to you covers more than the manufacturer's price. And so one man says that the cost is so much less and the other insists that it is so much more. The only way is to have an authoritative examination which shall be an answer to both. This examination must distinguish between the cost of manufacture, the cost of transport at different distances, the cost of distribution, and other expenses. Suppose I am a farmer in the Northwest, and I buy a reaper. I say: This reaper costs me too much; the manufacturer is bleeding me white, he has no right to exist. But do I know that it is the fault of the manufacturer entirely? What does the transport company charge for carrying from the place of manufacture to the place of distribution? And what does the distribution machinery cost to get the article comfortably into the hands of the consumer? Here are three things which should be differentiated, and each should be held responsible for its own share of the total cost. And without the information we are only combating one another with assertions and windy arguments, threats against the manufacturer that the duties shall be lowered because his charge is too high, and general assertions that the state of things is not as represented, but that the charge is fair and just, and cannot reasonably be lowered.

No farmer that is sane and sensible wants the industrial man to work for him for nothing; he is willing to give the industrial man a fair profit upon his capital and his work. What he quarrels with is the impression that he is giving him more than a fair profit. How it would settle things between us all if we had some authority of standing and repute and undoubted attainments who could tell us where we stand with regard to these matters. In order to get that we must have more than ministers. I know

just as well as the Minister of Finance does what a complex thing this making of tariffs is. He travels around the country, just as I did in 1893, and we listen to manufacturers, and farmers and labouring men, and we think we are becoming awfully wise. We get long papers sent into us, and what does the Minister of Finance do with them? Well, he does with them the same as we did; there is a little hazy recollection as to the general view taken, but outside of that there is very little else. And when they come—just as the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Customs did—to frame a tariff they do it by rule of thumb, or worse, and if they are honest enough they will say so. That is not the way a tariff should be framed, but that is the way a tariff will be framed until we have the body of information that is necessary to put us on a fair and scientific footing. That is why I favour a tariff commission. My friends opposite are very fond just now of admiring the United States; let them admire it a little in useful ways, and let them have a tariff board as the United States has. When they met you two gentlemen down in Washington they had the most elaborate tables of information that were ever got together by any government. When you went there you had nothing, absolutely nothing that was fit to cope with it, and you have not much more to this day. If you had it what right have you to keep it from parliament? We have asked you for it and demanded it, but you have not given it. You have looked wise and you were wise because you had not the goods to deliver, and you had not the goods in Washington, and so all you can do is look wise. But in that, our friendly opponents in Washington had the advantage of you, and that is an absolute proof of the necessity for a tariff board. Now, I have given you my views and there is more in them than at first appears, but at all events they are worth thinking over. The thing which it is almost impossible to keep in the mind of a practical legislator is that he is not dealing with his own money, or the party's money, but the people's money and that he ought not to make one single expenditure of the peoples' money that he would not as a trustee make for an estate which he had in his hands. That is a fair assumption. But, on both sides, we have been going on with the idea that the money we get into the public treasury is to be used for party advantage. What did the Minister of Railways boldly say the other night? He said: If I have advertising to give or supplies to buy, I will deal with a friend of the party. Reason that out, and put it into a general proposition, and it means that the money of this country is for the party and the government to do what it likes with: doing fairly well if possible by the country, but taking mighty good care always to help the party. I tell these gentlemen that this kind of expenditure will be the death of their government if they do not curb extravagance, and wastefulness, and expenditure made without warrant of any kind. In the matter of transport, you will get somewhere when you co-ordinate all your efforts in a uniform and systematic development of the trade routes of this country. Do you mean to tell me that anything like a Newmarket canal would ever have got a dollar of money from this parliament if it had to be reported upon by some such body as that to which I have referred; never in the world. Do you mean to say that the Port Colborne business would have gone on with an expenditure of now more than $2,000,000, and a practical admission by the Minister of Railways last year that it was not going to be of very much use anyway. Sir, there is from one end of this country to the other a steady malversation of the public funds, a using of them where they ought never to be used, and a sad lack of check on extravagant expenditure. I do not see any other way to remedy it than to call to our assistance the best and strongest men, put them upon the work, and say to them: That is your business; leave politics alone, never mind whether one man is hurt or another hurt, your duty is to make an absolutely exhaustive examination, to make an honest and fair report. Such information would give us something to go upon whether we be a minister, or a government, or a parliament. I had intended to say something about the still wider subject of the conservation of the resources of this country, and I would have treated it on the same lines.

Mr. PATERSON. Take it up after six o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether you call it a conservation commission or not, it should be composed of the very highest and most resourceful body of men we can get in this country, men who would sit up higher than partisanship, higher than sectionalism, and who would have under advisement and under their constant supervision all the great resources of this country: Our lands, our forest, our fisheries, our mines, and our running waters, and who would use every resource of science and every exertion of human endeavour to give us adequate tabulation of them, the best plan of administering them, the best methods of renovating and rejuvenating them. Thus would they help us to keep for this country, protected from waste and safe from exhaustion, these great natural resources, which, if they are fostered and cared for, will make us a great nation and for long centuries, but the dissipation of which will be one reason why

this country cannot look forward to a strong and permanent and progressive future.

Mr. PATERSON. Are you coming back after dinner hour?

Mr. FOSTER. And now my hungry friend the Minister of Customs can go home and take his biscuits.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

STERLING TRUSTS CORPORATION.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Sterling Trusts Corporation.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Mr. Speaker, this Bill has come back from the Senate with two or three minor amendments, but, I submit, they are not of such importance as would justify us in referring it back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. Section 5 of the Bill, as it left this House, provided that the company shall not commence business until at least $200,000 of stock has been bona fide subscribed and $70,000 paid. The Senate inserted the word 'five,' making it $75,000 to be paid. I presume that was a simple clerical error to begin with. Section 11 of the Bill provided that:

> Moneys, properties and securities received or held by the company upon trust or as agent shall not be liable for the debts or obligations of the company.

The Senate cut out that clause entirely, I suppose, on the ground that that is the law in the event, and it is not necessary to enact it in the charter of the company. Section 15, referring to provincial laws, has been also cut out entirely by the Senate. Section 18 of the Bill as it passed this House, was as follows:

> The powers granted by this Act shall expire, and this Act shall cease to be in force, at the end of two years from the passing thereof, unless the company goes into actual operation within such two years.

The Senate has put in the words 'for all purposes except the winding up of the company.' I would ask that the Bill be considered now.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no option in the matter if the amendment is other than clerical or unimportant. Otherwise the Bill must be referred back to the committee. It is for the House to decide.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it had better be referred back. The amendment seemed to be more than merely clerical.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not have a copy of these amendments and we cannot exercise our judgment upon them.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). If I may be permitted to say a word again, to my mind there are nothing but really minor amendments made by the Senate.

Mr. SPROULE. The rule says:

> When any private Bill is returned from the Senate with amendments, the same not being merely verbal or unimportant, such amendments are, previous to the second reading, referred to the standing committee to which such Bill was originally referred.

If you cut out a lot of the Bill it is not an amendment that is merely verbal.

Mr. NESBITT. When my hon. friend (Mr. Martin, Regina) says that the amendments are unimportant, I presume that he means that they are unimportant to anybody except the company, and if the promoter and the company are willing to accept them it cannot make any difference to us.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the amendments to this Bill are very important.

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is any doubt about the matter I have to rule that the amendments are important, and the Bill will have to go back to the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

IMPERIAL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Imperial Steamship Company.—Mr. McKenzie.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will there be any objection to this Bill being referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries? It is a matter pertaining to marine.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not hardly think that is according to the rule. It lays down the class of Bills that goes to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines, that which goes to the Banking and Commerce Committee and it provides that all other Bills shall go to the Private Bills Committee. This certainly is a private Bill other than a Bill affecting a railway, canal or banking corporation.

Mr. BRODEUR. I simply made the suggestion as it is a Bill affecting marine, and perhaps it would be better that it should be examined by that committee. Of course, I know very well what the rule says, but this reference is only for the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. We have never sent Bills to that committee; to do so would be doing something without authority and establish-

ing a new principle. The clerk of the House draws my attention to the fact that the Bill must be sent back to the committee to which it was originally referred, which, in this case, would be the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would think that rule 114 would require the Bill to go to the same committee that considered it before.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to Private Bills Committee.

PEOPLE'S RAILWAY COMPANY.

Consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 110) respecting the People's Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Mr. NESBITT moved that the amendment be considered now. He said: The amendment is not material.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it?

Mr. NESBITT. In clause 16 the amendment strikes out all the lines after the word 'company' in line 23.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me to be pretty important.

Mr. NESBITT. The first part of the clause says that they shall not interfere with any provision of any agreement with a municipality, and the latter part that they have struck out is simply saying that they shall confirm any such agreement. I think the Senate are quite right and that there is no necessity of confirming it when the first part of the clause says that they shall not interfere with it.

SUPPLY — AMERICAN WARSHIPS ON GREAT LAKES.

The hour for private Bills having expired the House resumed discussion of the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding, that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion is adopted I would like to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister the lack of information with regard to warships or training ships of the United States upon the Great Lakes. On March 30, 1908, the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asked a series of questions one of which concerned the tonnage, horse-power, armament and crew of the 'Nashville.' An answer was given to that. The same day the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), made a motion for orders in council, papers, &c., from 1907 down to that date, and also for a statement of the numbers and armaments of ships then in commission by the United States upon the Great Lakes. This order was passed without discussion. The first part of this order was complied with but the last part of that order has never been complied with, no statement has ever been brought down although the order of the House passed three years ago.

On November 16, 1909, the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington), asked for certain information. His question is to be found at page 103 of 'Hansard' for that year. The Prime Minister declined to furnish the information at that time alleging that diplomatic action was pending. On November 16, 1909, the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), asked for some further information on the same subject. He asked to what departments the United States had made application for the purpose of enabling their ships to pass into the Great Lakes. The Prime Minister stated that application had been made to either the Minister of Railways and Canals or to the Secretary of State.

On November 17, 1909, the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), moved first for the orders in council from 1897 to 1907 and secondly, for orders in council from 1907 to that date. The Prime Minister agreed to the first part of the motion but refused the second part. He said the matter was then the subject of diplomatic action. The motion as amended passed and as far as I have been able to ascertain that order of the House has never been complied with.

On December 1, 1909, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), moved for certain papers relating to this matter, and in the course of his remarks he went into some detail with regard to the training ships of the United States upon the Great Lakes. There seems to be no difficulty in getting at the information from unofficial sources, but great difficulty indeed in obtaining any information from the government in regard to this very important question. In the end, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), having moved for correspondence and all papers, the Prime Minister said that some correspondence could be brought down, but that there was some correspondence that could not be brought down. From that time up to the present I cannot find that that order has ever been complied with.

It seems to me that the House and the country are entitled to be informed as to the exact condition with regard to American warships or training ships on the Great Lakes. We are entitled to know and to know from official sources how far the treaty of 1817 has been departed from and for what reason. I mention this matter to-night in the hope that the government will see fit to have these orders of the House complied with at the earliest possible date and take the House and the country frankly into their confidence with respect to this matter, as to which it seems to me, there has been altogether too much secrecy in the past.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will readily agree that upon a subject of this character it may be necessary to have a larger measure of secrecy than would be necessary in the case of matters of a different character. These questions, I need not tell my hon. friend, are of a delicate character, and it would not be always wise for the government to present to the House all the information they may possess. However, I quite agree that whatever information is properly available to the House should be brought down. I do not wish to express any opinion on the matter myself, but I shall at once call the attention of the Prime Minister to my hon. friend's remarks and I trust that whatever is available may be brought down at an early date.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is to be now and in the future a very considerable departure, not only from the spirit but from the letter of that treaty I think we ought frankly to understand it and consider what our own situation will be with respect to the maintenance of armed vessels upon the Great Lakes.

BOUNTIES ON STEEL WIRE, &c.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like the Minister of Finance to make some plain statement with regard to the renewal of the bounties on iron and steel wire, rods, &c. I listened with a great deal of interest to his utterance this afternoon upon that question. Rumour has it, and one cannot turn a deaf ear altogether to rumour, that the minister has under consideration the renewal of these bounties. I would ask him, as he did not make himself very plain upon that subject this afternoon, and did not even mention that he had under consideration the renewal of these bounties, if he would make a plain statement as to whether he is considering the renewal of the bounties on iron and steel and if so when he proposes to make a statement to the House upon that subject.

Mr. FIELDING. The bounties on a number of articles of iron and steel expired on the 31st of December last past. The bounties on iron rods will expire on the 1st of July ensuing. There is no intention on the part of the government of renewing them.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Fisheries—salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $227,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount is the same as last year except a small increase of $7,500. This amount is provided for the purpose of paying the salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, and this additional amount of $7,500 is to provide for paying increases of salaries to some of those officers.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Will the hon. minister give a full explanation of the new appointments of fishery overseers that he has made in the province of Ontario, with their names, salaries and duties?

Mr. BRODEUR. I laid a report before the House the other day, giving the names of these men. The officers for Ontario are the following:

District No. 1.—Inspector A. G. Duncan, Sault Ste. Marie.

Nominee.	Headquarters.	District.
.....	.....	Lake of the Woods
.....	.....	Rainy Lake.
.....	.....	Thunder Bay.
T. Jackman.....	Killarney.....	North Channel.
C. W. Hamilton	Blind River.....	North Channel.
L. Groom. . ..	Parry Sound....	Georgian Bay, off Parry Sound and Muskoka.
A. Desroche....	Penetanguishene	Georgian Bay, Simcoe.
William Ross...	Leith	Georgian Bay, Grey.
B. B. Miller....	Wiarton	Georgian Bay, Huron.
W. W. Morrison	Bracebridge	Muskoka (Inland).
John Murphy...	North Bay.....	Lake Nipissing.
J. J. Coley.....	New Liskeard...	Lake Timiskaming.

District No. 2.—Inspector O. B. Sheppard, Sarnia.

.....	Southampton....	Bruce County.
John Bruce....	Goderich.....	Huron.
J. K. Laird.....	Guild's.....	Kent.
J. P. Black.....	Kingsville	Essex.
W. L. Galbraith	Ridgetown.....	Kent (Lake Erie).
Harry O'Brien..	Port Stanley....	Elgin.
A. H. Smith....	Port Dover.....	Norfolk.
John A. Beck...	Dunnville.....	Haldimand.
L. V. Garner....	Welland.....	Welland.
Herbert E. Mihell.....	Strathroy.....	Middlesex, Oxford, Perth.
David Jolly, Jr.	Brantford	Brant, Waterloo.
A. W. Tyson...	Guelph	Wellington, Dufferin.
— Haynes.	Port Dalhousie..	Lincoln.
William Easterbrook.....	Hamilton.....	Wentworth.
Frank Lee... ..	Oakville.....	Halton & Peel.
John Sowerbys..	Toronto	York.
Tim O'Connor..	Whitby	Ontario.
John Miller.....	Cobourg.....	Durham & Northumberland.
A. M. Platt	Picton.....	Prince Edward.
W. R. Purdy...	Bath.....	Lennox & Addington.
Thos. Sullivan...	Kingston.....	Frontenac.
M. K. Connolly.	Brockville.....	Leeds & Grenville
E. Hamel..... ..	Cornwall.....	Dundas, Stormont, Glengarry.

District No. 2.—Inspector O. B. Sheppard, Sarnia.—*Con.*

Nominee.	Headquarters.	District.
E. Thiverge	Clarence Creek	Russell & Prescott.
C. McLean	Ottawa	Carleton.
T. Ellward	Smith's Falls	Lanark & Grenville (Inland).
Colin Craig	Sharbot Lake	Frontenac & Lennox (Inland).
F. P. McCaffrey	Westport	Leeds (Inland).
P. Lassman	Pembroke	Renfrew.
E. A. Kennedy	Bakefield	Peterborough.
Nicholas Brady	Lindsay	Victoria & Haliburton.
Donald McNiven	Barrie	Lake Simcoe.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What salaries do these overseers get each?

Mr. BRODEUR. $500.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What are their duties to be?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are to look after the carrying out of our fishery regulations. By the judgment rendered on the fishery question in 1897 or 1898, it was decided that the right of legislation concerning the fisheries belonged to the federal authorities.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). In so far as regulating the close seasons was concerned.

Mr. BRODEUR. The close season, the instruments used for carrying on fishing operations, and everything bearing on the preservation and regulation of the fisheries. At the same time, it was decided in view of the proprietary rights of the provinces, that they had a right to issue licenses. In Quebec that right has been exercised in one section of the province. The other section, the most important one, that is, the section below a line drawn through the St. Lawrence from Cap Chatte to Pointe des Monts, is to be under the federal authorities. In Ontario, the provincial government, took authority to issue licenses, and I understand appointed some officers to look after the carrying out of their regulations; but these officers have no specific authority with regard to our regulations. We had only three officers to carry out our regulations. As a result, a great many complaints were made that our regulations were not being properly observed. For example, in the fall of 1907 there were complaints that the close season for whitefish was being openly violated in the Georgian bay, which is one of the best fishing grounds in the province. The inspector of fisheries was directed to investigate the conditions and he found that a large quantity of whitefish were being taken in the close season. My hon. friend will find the same thing if he consults the report of the Georgian Bay Fishing Commission. The unanimous report of that commission indicated there is abundant evidence of illegal fishing. We have, however, no means, of giving instruction to those officers appointed by the local authorities because they are not under our control; and it seems to me that not only should we appoint officers to see to the carrying out of our own regulations, but also to inform us as to any changes which might be required in them. How could we get that information unless we appoint our own officers? We had none except the three inspectors, and we had no opportunity of being in touch with the different fishing districts. We thought, therefore, it was advisable to appoint inspectors and overseers who would see that our regulations were carried out.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The only real reason which the minister had for these appointments—45 in number in the province of Ontario—is that he wanted to give a salary of $500 per year each to 45 of his political friends for doing nothing. The only complaint to which he can point as a reason for these appointments is with regard to some illegal fishing having been done in the Georgian Bay in 1907, some four years ago. Since that time he knows that the Ontario government have purchased a boat and have had that district under inspection. He has simply appointed a number of officers to do the work which is now being well done by the provincial government. In my district the fisheries inspectors and officers under the Ontario government are doing efficient work. There was no necessity at all to appoint these 45 men, their appointment will only lead to trouble between them and the officers of the Ontario government, but the hon. minister was anxious to give a fat job to his political supporters.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Any one who is familiar with the way in which the present government of Ontario is administering the fishing laws must admit that it is high time something was done to protect the fishermen in that province. For the past few years the complaints of the fishermen have been of the strongest character, and rightly so. Until the administration of the fisheries was taken over by the present government, it was customary for the owners of land to get licenses for fishing in the waters adjoining their lands, but at present they are denied this privilege. The licenses have been taken away from practical fishermen and given to men who have no experience, but who are political friends of the party in power in Ontario, and these men make their profit by subletting their licenses to other fishermen. Another complaint was

with regard to the sorting out of small fish. Under the regulations of this parliament, fish of a certain size are subject to confiscation, and instances have arisen in which inspectors appointed by the province of Ontario have confiscated fish which were not under size, but should have been allowed to go on the market; and these inspectors have used these fish for their own private purposes. With such a state of things existing, it seems to me there was urgent need for some impartial administration of the fishery law. It is unfortunate that jurisdiction is divided. What I would like to have done would be to have the fishermen take out licenses from this government as well. If licenses were required subject to the supervision of the fishery officers appointed by this government, we could hope for something like an impartial administration of the law.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The Ontario government has the sole power to issue licenses.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I do not think it has.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That is the decision of the Privy Council.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I do not think my hon. friend will find any decision declaring that the whole power to grant licenses rests with the provincial authorities. True the beds of the rivers and lakes belong to the provincial government, but not the control of the fisheries as regards making regulations for the size of the nets, establishing a close season and such matters. These are in the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament. And when we make regulations governing these matters, we ought to have officers to see that they are observed.

Mr. BLAIN. I am very much surprised that if there were such a complaint against the Ontario government, as my hon. friend alleges, it should not have been ventilated in the local legislature. I never heard that this tremendous complaint against the Ontario government has ever been mentioned in the local legislature.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). If it has not been mentioned there, I have had several complaints from several fishermen along the line I have stated.

Mr. BLAIN. I am very much surprised that if the local government have been taking away the licenses from the fishermen and giving them to political friends of their own, no such charge was ever made in the local legislature. It cannot be such a very grave charge, but evidently is only one of these political charges, which my hon. friend wants to make use of. But what my hon. friend wants particularly is that this government should issue licenses. Does my hon. friend suggest for a moment that, if the license was issued by this government, it would be more free from partisanship than those issued by the province of Ontario?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I never heard any of these complaints from fishermen of either political party under the former administration of the province. I do not mean to say that this government alone could issue a license. I think it is conceded that the Ontario government has power to give licenses. What I say is that if a license is required from here also, then one would be a check upon the other and we should not be likely to hear the complaints that we hear now.

Mr. BLAIN. The point is that my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke, Essex), is anxious that this government should issue licenses to fishermen in the province of Ontario. The grievance he has in mind is that the Ontario government issues licenses. I do not think it would make much change if what he contends for were granted. The people would not have any more faith in this government than in the Conservative government headed by Sir James Whitney. In fact, I think they would have less faith.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Why do they come to me?

Mr. BLAIN. Because they think that my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke, Essex), has power with this government. He has taken up their case at once and says: I am not in favour of the Ontario government granting licenses; they do not know how to administer anything except in the interest of the Conservative party. But come to this Dominion government and we will give you equal rights. The hon. gentleman nods his head. He does not believe it, of course. But that is not the point, and I am not going to enter into a discussion of the fishing interests of Ontario. But what I do say is that this is a very alarming charge, and I think that on reconsideration my moderate friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) would not repeat it in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Dominion government issue licenses to fish in the Georgian bay? Does it propose to do so?

Mr. BRODEUR. The federal government is not issuing any licenses in the province of Ontario. We have the right to do so, but we have not exercised that right.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say with regard to the observations of my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke), that they are a surprise to me. I know something of the Georgian Bay fishery. For two or three years in succession I drew attention to the unfortunate condition of this industry; as between the two governments it was not

known exactly where the authority lay to control the fisheries. I always understood that a workable arrangement had been made between the two governments on the subject. Until the observations of the hon. gentleman, I have never heard a word of complaint of the administration of the laws in the Georgian bay by the government of Ontario. And I know that the same class of men are carrying on the industry in the Georgian bay that have carried it on for many years. That the licenses were given to Conservatives and farmed out to others who were not fishermen is certainly news to me. The other charge that the hon. gentleman made was that fish which were caught in conformity with the regulations were confiscated and used by the parties themselves. These charges should not be made unless there is evidence to back them up. If I had such information as the hon. member intimates he has—for he says complaints were made to him—I certainly would make the charge and press it; and if I did not make complaint and insist upon an investigation, I should never make mention of the matter in this House. I do not think a member of this House is doing his whole duty who contents himself with making a statement here when his own friends in the province are in a position to discuss it and debate it and bring it before the face of the very men who would be culpable if the charge were correct. The leader of the opposition in the Ontario House lives right on the Georgian bay where the fishing industry is carried on so extensively.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I did not refer to Georgian bay.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the hon. gentleman spoke of Georgian bay.

Mr. STRATTON. It was the minister.

Mr. SPROULE. The reference was made by some speaker on that side with regard to the law not being properly enforced in the Georgian bay. I have before now asked in this House if there were any complaints, and was told there were none. It would appear that the working understanding which I thought existed between the two governments has not yet been reached. I have always understood that it was the right of the provincial government to issue licenses, but that it was questionable whether the federal government had that right, but that it had the right to make regulations with regard to close seasons, the size of mesh and other things of that kind. I think an arrangement was made at one time under which the licenses were to be issued by the Ontario government, and the Dominion government would confine itself to such questions as the close season and the size of mesh of nets. I am sorry that that understanding does not seem to exist, and that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries thinks it necessary to appoint practically an army of inspectors to take charge and oversight of the fisheries in Ontario, because, undoubtedly, it will lead to conflict and trouble in the future, for the inspectors belonging to the province of Ontario will not lightly abandon their work, because federal overseers are appointed. This is an old question, and I am sorry that no arrangement has been reached between the two governments.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am rather surprised to hear the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) make the charges he has made. I am particularly surprised to hear such charges from that hon. gentleman, because we have regarded him as a man who is fair in his statements. But he is altogether wrong when he says that only Conservatives are given licenses at such places as Port Bruce, Port Burwell and Port Stanley, which are large fishing centres.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I did not make that statement.

Mr. MARSHALL. There are as many Liberals fishing in Port Stanley as there are Conservatives, old fishermen who have been fishing there for years. I must say, I think it a perfect waste of money to appoint these special inspectors. They are not needed at all. The gentleman who was appointed fishery inspector in East Elgin was a good worker for years for the Liberal party. I have never heard of a complaint in East Elgin by the fishery inspector. It is a shame to waste money in this way.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). They are just appointing them as political agents.

Mr. MARSHALL. Oh, yes, that is what the man in East Elgin is; that is what he has been doing for years and that is what he will do.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The same in Leeds.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not care what his politics are he is not needed. We have other government inspectors who are doing their duty, but this office is absolutely unnecessary and I object to this wasteful expenditure.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Clarke) is usually very fair when he speaks in this House, but I think his remarks are not justifiable in the present case. So far as the Georgian bay is concerned I do not believe the fishery laws have ever been administered so strictly and indeed so severely as since the Ontario government took hold of their administration. I know of three specific cases in my own town where the Ontario inspector seized the boats of the

fishermen irrespective of political considerations. In one case the action was so drastic that I had to complain on behalf of a client. Fish were found on the shore during the close season, and on the mere suspicion that this boat had placed them there, they seized the boat. They even refused to lay information against the owner and we had to press the government to lay the information and when it was tried the case was dismissed. The fisherman was out of his boat and consequently the means of earning his livelihood for six weeks, and the government had to pay a small amount in damages. In the other two cases the parties were convicted. Now, if the member for Essex (Mr. Clarke), knows that the overseer in his locality has been guilty of the offence he charged against him, why did the hon. member not give information to the Ontario Minister of Public Works. Before the hon. member made such a charge in this House he should at least have given the Ontario government an opportunity to rectify the grievance he complained of. If there is one thing more than another to the credit of the Whitney government it is that they have ordained an absolutely impartial and drastic enforcement of the laws of this province, so much so indeed that many of their own supporters are not quite as sympathetic towards Sir James Whitney as they otherwise would be. I think the people of Ontario will bear testimony to the fact that the Whitney government has shown absolute impartiality in administering the laws. There is absolutely no necessity for the Dominion government appointing these fishery officials. The Minister of Marine has been able only to mention a single instance on the Georgian bay where there has been an infringement of the fishery laws in four years.

Mr. BRODEUR. Several cases are mentioned in the notes before me. In 1907 the department was informed that there were several cases of violation of the regulations and we sent an inspector there. There were pound nets found at Black bay, and during the close season it was reported that fishing operations were carried on openly in the Georgian bay.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then it is three years since any complaint has been made to the department as to illegal fishing on the Georgian bay.

Mr. BRODEUR. Since then there is the report of the Georgian Bay Fishery Commission in which such allegations are made.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The minister admits that no specific complaint as to violation of the fishery law has come to his department in three years, and yet he justifies himself for appointing forty-five fishery inspectors on the ground that the laws are violated.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Does the hon. gentleman think it a proper thing for the Ontario government to have fishery inspectors who go around stumping the country for the provincial candidates in the elections, and acting in every way as partisans?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is what they do.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not believe in such a practice, and if there is anybody in the hon. member's riding who does that and if he complains to the Ontario government that official will receive his just punishment.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It is a very well known fact.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Here we have forty-five Dominion officers doing exactly the same work as the provincial officers, and the only reason that can be urged for the appointment of these Dominion officials is that the Ontario government cannot do the work properly. The inference is that because a man is a Conservative he will not do his work properly and because he is a Reformer he will, and upon that inference alone the Minister of Marine and Fisheries pays 45 men $500 a year each and has with them an understanding that their salary shall be increased $50 a year until it reaches $700. Is not that so?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. And in addition, are they not entitled to their travelling expenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. And the travelling expenses will be paid for the use of their own horse or their own boat as the case may be?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the practice.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then, in a couple of years each one of these officials will be drawing a salary and expenses in the neighbourhood of $1,000 a year, which means $45,000 a year thrown away for no other purpose than that these officials will be useful to the government at election times. Why did not the minister go to the Ontario government and make an arrangement with them so that the one set of officials would do this work. If a fisherman violates the law the Ontario government forfeits his license for the next year, but if one of these fishermen is convicted by a Dominion officer how is the provincial govern-

ment to know that he is not entitled to his license for the ensuing year? The Minister of Marine is going to mix up the whole thing from beginning to end, and the result will be that with this dual administration of the law there is bound to be defective enforcement. So far as the Georgian bay is concerned I may tell the minister that the provincial government has justly and honestly enforced the fishery laws, and there is no necessity in the world for the Dominion government paying these useless officials of theirs. At Wiarton the Ontario government appointed a man by the name of German to enforce the fishery regulations, and I see that another man is being appointed by this department for the same town. These two men go over the same route and do exactly the same work. Is the man appointed by this government going to do any better work because he is a Grit or the man appointed by the Ontario government because he is a Conservative? There seems to be no excuse whatever for making this appointment.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am exceedingly sorry to find that this question is treated as a party question.

Mr. SPROULE. You have made it such.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is absolutely mistaken. The action which has been taken by my department in connection with this question had regard simply to the protection of the fisheries, and the preservation of this national asset. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) has stated that there would be some inconveniences in having two sets of officials performing the same duties. But, the duties which have to be performed by the officials of the provincial government and those which have to be performed by the officials of the federal government are not at all the same, and I will try to explain to my hon. friend the reasons why I consider they are not the same. We have our own laws and regulations. Our laws and regulations cover a very wide field—the seasons of fishing, the gears and instruments with which fishing is to be carried on. The Ontario officials are called upon to see that the laws of Ontario are carried out. The laws of Ontario cover the issuing of licenses. On the one side there is the licensing authority, and on the other the regulative authority.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the Ontario government do that as well?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they could not do that because in order to carry out those regulations the officials have to receive instructions from this government.

Mr. CROSBY. Give them instructions.

Mr. BRODEUR. We cannot give instructions to officers who are not our own. They are the officers of the Ontario government obliged to carry out the laws and regulations passed by the legislature of Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. If the regulations are carried out between the two authorities ought there to be any conflict between them and why could not the minister clothe the Ontario officials with the same authority that he clothes the officials appointed by himself?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a different proposition altogether, but we will take the situation as it is to-day. It is very unfortunate that this question of jurisdiction with regard to the fisheries in Ontario has not been settled. It was to be expected that some settlement would be reached by which the authority with regard to the fisheries should be exercised only by one government. So long as there is divided jurisdiction, so long as we have the right to regulate the fisheries, and the provincial authorities have the right to issue the licenses, there will be conflict and inconvenience. I have made some effort with the view of obtaining a settlement of this question, but unfortunately I have not been successful.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the hon. gentleman had any communication with the government of Ontario with the view of settling this question amicably?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I had the question brought up two years ago. I invited the minister who has charge of the fisheries to come to Ottawa on two different occasions to consider the question of the fisheries of Ontario, and upon one occasion I broached the subject whether it would not be possible to settle the question of jurisdiction. My suggestion would have been that we should continue to exercise the powers which are given to us under the British North America Act to regulate the fisheries, and that we should also issue the licenses and account to the province for the money we collected.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I should like to ask the minister whether or not he ever asked the Ontario government if they would allow the Ontario officials to carry out the Dominion regulations?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I did not discuss that point with them. I approached the question on a higher plane in order to discover whether it would not be possible to get rid of the divided jurisdiction, which, I think, must have the worst possible effect upon the fisheries in that province. But, I have not been successful. We had this dual jurisdiction, and I thought a settlement could be reached by which we could

continue to exercise the powers which are given us by the British North America Act, and account to the province for the money which would be collected, of course, after having deducted the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Would that mean that all licenses would be issued by the Dominion authorities, and not by the province?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, what my hon. friend wanted the Ontario government to do was to give up the rights that they undoubtedly had.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I wanted to have some settlement. The same situation existed with regard to the province of British Columbia for many years. We have collected the license fees for them, and we accounted to them for the money which we collected. I may say that our relations with the government of British Columbia are good. The other day a question came up with regard to boat rating in the northern part of British Columbia. This arrangement was satisfactory to both governments.

Mr. FOSTER. And they are not issuing any licenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they have begun to issue licenses, since last year, pending the settlement of the question which is now being submitted to the court. One serious difficulty arises with regard to British Columbia, that is to ascertain whether the provincial or federal authority has the power to issue licenses within the three-mile limit. This question was not decided and has been submitted to the courts. Pending the decision of that case each government is now issuing licenses. We have reduced our fees, and they have adopted a fee equal to the amount of the reduction we made, so that practically the British Columbia fisherman is paying the same amount as before and is getting licenses from both the provincial and federal governments. That system is being carried out satisfactorily.

Coming to the province of Ontario, my suggestion would be that if it is not possible to settle the question in the way I am suggesting, that we should continue to make the regulations and issue the licenses ourselves, that at least the licenses should be issued by the provincial and the federal authorities so that the complaints which have been made by my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Wilcox), will be removed in that respect, because we will then be sure that the licenses will not be issued in a partisan way, but to bona fide fishermen. As to the carrying out of the regulations, the question arises whose duty is it to look after the carrying out of our own regulations, the provincial or federal authorities?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Have the Ontario government ever refused to carry out the federal regulations through their provincial officers? I understood that when the Minister of Public Works of Ontario was in Ottawa trying to arrange the matter, my hon. friend made the proposition he has suggested to the House, but the Minister of Public Works for Ontario said that they would enforce the regulations and would adopt the close season; my hon. friend was not willing to do that, but employs 45 men at a salary of $500 each and expenses, to enforce his regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am trying to explain the situation. Let us try to understand it and see whether there is not some means of settling this question of jurisdiction which now exists between the provincial and federal authorities. We have all one end in view, the preservation of the fisheries, and so long as this dual jurisdiction exists there will always be trouble and difficulty. My hon. friend asks if the provincial government have refused to carry out our regulations. That is not the question.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That is the question.

Mr. BRODEUR. The question is, can the department here be sure that their regulations are properly observed when they have not their own officers whom they can instruct as to the interpretation and carrying out of those regulations? They cannot give any instructions to the officials of the provincial government and in order to administer the regulations they must have officials who are under their control. There is another point far more serious: How are we going to be informed as to the wants and requirements of different localities? These matters have to be studied and if we have officers on the spot they can give us the necessary information as to what is to be done. That is the object we have in view. My hon. friend does not seem to accept with favour the statements I am making, but I assure him it is absolutely impossible to frame and carry out regulations without having our own officers to enforce them and at the same time advise us as to changes which have to be made. Some day, perhaps, these fisheries will be depleted and then they will come to the federal government and say: Why did you not see to the carrying out of your regulations. We might say that we expected the provincial authorities to do that, but the provincial authorities would say: We have no jurisdiction on that question, we have to look after our own regulations with regard to licenses, but it is your duty to see to the preservation of the fisheries. The argument would stand against the federal au-

thorities. So long as we have our own officers we are going to be responsible for the preservation of the fisheries. There would then be no question of jurisdiction, or throwing responsibility one on the other, the federal department would be absolutely responsible for the preservation of the fisheries. That duty was imposed on the federal authorities by confederation. We should put this question above party and should consider the general interest of the fisheries.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has the minister appointed overseers for Ontario only, or for the other provinces as well?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have them in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, the prairie provinces and in British Columbia.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). These are old appointees.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood there was a different situation in the maritime provinces, that the decision of the Privy Council left the responsibility for looking after the fisheries on the Atlantic coast with the federal authorities.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. That was my understanding of the decision, but in regard to the inland fisheries it was different.

Mr. BRODEUR. The situation in the maritime provinces is exactly the same as in the other provinces, and any of them might take the same position as Ontario has done to-day, and say that they were going to take over the issuing of licenses for fisheries. They could do that but they have not done it, because they think it is better that it should be centred in the hands of the federal authorities. It is not a party question. I have been in the department for several years now, but I have yet to receive a single complaint to the effect that we are not issuing licenses to bona fide fishermen in any of these provinces. Not one complaint has reached the department with regard to that, in fact the issuing of licenses never comes before the minister the minister has nothing to do with it; the licenses are issued by the officials to the fishermen.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not want that statement to go uncontradicted. There has been a complaint from Nova Scotia about the issuing of licenses for lobster factories.

Mr. BRODEUR. On party lines?

Mr. CROSBY. I do not know what lines, but you have refused to issue licenses in Nova Scotia except to a few people.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a matter of general policy; we have refused to issue new licenses to packers. It is a well known policy.

Mr. CROSBY. You said you had not refused any one a license in any part of any province.

Mr. BRODEUR. The statement has been made here that the issuing of licenses was a matter of party politics. I said that nothing of the kind has entered into the administration of the department. With respect to the lobster packers, the department decided some years ago not to issue any new licenses; but we changed that policy a couple of years ago, and decided that where a certain number of fishermen applied for a license, the license should issue. Lately some other changes have been made in the regulations. I believe the present policy is needed for the carrying out of our own regulations and is absolutely necessary for the preservation of the fisheries.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says this action was taken purely for the protection of the fisheries. Who would have the greatest interest in the protection of the fisheries—the people who live in the locality, who use the fisheries and who benefit by their protection, or those who have never been there at all, and could not in any way benefit from the fisheries? It seems to me that the former would be more likely to have the greater interest in protecting the fisheries. If there is one thing more than another for which the Ontario government is noted, it is for enforcing its own laws, whether it is the license law, the fishery law, or any other.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the provincial authorities have enforced the fishery laws, how is it that during the last five years we have never received from them any money in pursuance of the provision of the Act that the penalties imposed under it shall be handed over to the federal authorities? The inference I draw from that fact is that the provincial authorities have never prosecuted.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there would be two very good reasons for that. They were not charged with the duty of enforcing the federal law, and the penalties collected under the provincial law would naturally go to the province. Then, the provincial officers were never clothed with authority to see that the federal law was enforced. It seems to me that this whole difficulty could have been easily and amicably arranged if the federal government had clothed the provincial inspectors with authority to see that the federal regulations were carried out. I have no doubt that they would have enforced the law and made regular returns to the federal authorities. But I am afraid that the temptation was too strong to get

appointed a number of the hon. gentlemen's own political friends who would be useful at election time, and to pay them a respectable salary to keep them going from year to year. I have yet to hear any one in my part of the country say that the laws are not strictly enforced in the province of Ontario by the provincial authorities, I think much more so than the laws enacted by the federal parliament, which are too often a dead letter.

Mr. BEATTIE. With two sets of fishery inspectors, I think clashing is inevitable. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) said that the fishery overseers of the Ontario government were appointed for party purposes. I do not think he was justified in making that statement. Only four years ago Col. Leys, the local member for the city of London, resigned his seat, because the minister in the late Ross government neglected to enforce the law. In fact, the government allowed their partisans to put a net across the River Thames, so that the fish coming from Lake St. Clair could not get up the river. They were caught in a trap and were shipped to Buffalo. In several instances the inspector of the Whitney government has stopped the package at London and has found them packed with fish caught in the close season. I think the law is administered today by the Ontario government as well as it ever has been. I am a pretty good party man, and yet I have tried to get a license for a friend of mine, but without success. All old friends of the Ross government were allowed to retain their licenses, but I could not get a license for my friend. I do not think the Whitney government can be accused with any show of partisanship, because certainly if that government had been partisan in this matter, they would have granted my friend a license.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was very much surprised to hear my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke) charge the Ontario government with partisanship in the granting of licenses. Why, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries at Toronto is the same man who occupied that position under the Ross government, and he is, I am told, a very strong Liberal.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). What is his name?

Mr. HENDERSON. It is Tinsley. That same gentleman has given a good deal of trouble in my county by interfering in matters in which he had no right to interfere, and annoying the inspector and fishermen. That is the only complaint I have against him. On one occasion when the regulations called for a mesh of two and three-eighths inches for small herring or cisco, he was going to insist on a three-inch mesh. I called on him and remonstrated. I have often wondered why Dr. Rheaume did not dismiss him. That is what he should have done. I agree with the minister that if you want your laws properly administered, you must have officers in sympathy with you. The Whitney government have not such an officer in Mr. Tinsley. He seemed rather disposed to annoy people instead of assisting his government in getting a proper administration of the law. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if, in the event of two licenses being issued, one by the Ontario government and one by this government, the fishermen would have to pay two license fees. I would also ask him to define what are the rights and privileges of the inspectors appointed by the Ontario government.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, if the federal authority should exact a license, the fishermen would have to pay two licenses, unless the Ontario government and this government came to an agreement to issue only one.

Mr. HENDERSON. But you have no authority under the judgment of the Privy Council to issue a license.

Mr. BRODEUR. That judgment never decided that we had no authority to issue licenses. What the Privy Council decided was that the Ontario authorities, in view of their proprietary rights, could issue licenses, and they also formally stated that the right to issue licenses still existed with the federal authority.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the intention of the hon. minister's department to issue licenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not yet considered that question. Of course if there were serious complaints that licenses were not being issued properly by the Ontario government, we might find it necessary to exercise the power vested in us and issue licenses, but that matter has not yet been considered.

Mr. BLAIN. Have there been any complaints that licenses have not been properly issued?

Mr. BRODEUR. I heard some complaints from members on behalf of fishermen that licenses were issued to persons who were not bona fide fishermen, but I have never ascertained whether that was the case or not.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any complaint to the department in writing? We hear plenty of rumours.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the second question raised by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), I would not like to define the duties of the Ontario officers; but speaking generally they would

have to see that whatever regulations regarding the issue of licenses were made by the Ontario government were observed by the fishermen.

Mr. BEATTIE. Suppose a fisherman has a federal license and a local license as well, and suppose the local officer tells him he is not doing right and the federal officer tells him that he is, which is he going to obey?

Mr. BRODEUR. I give the instance of British Columbia. There was some question of boat rating in that province. The British Columbia government sent their officer and we sent ours, and they determined how many licenses should be issued for boats, and we agreed.

Mr. BEATTIE. If a fisherman had a license from the local government and not from the federal government——?

Mr. BRODEUR. He could not fish.

Mr. BEATTIE. So, the province would have no rights. And, if both federal and local governments issued licenses, which inspector would the fisherman be supposed to obey?

Mr. BRODEUR. He would be obliged to obey the laws of Ontario and the Ontario officer so far as the provincial license is concerned, and, so far as our license is concerned, he would have to observe our regulations and obey the officer of the Dominion.

Mr. BARKER. I think the minister has just shown how absurd the whole situation is. Beyond question, there is an anomaly in the power and authority. But, why in the name of common sense cannot the minister here and the minister in Toronto get together and put a little commonsense into the matter by making proper working arrangements? I happen to know something of this subject: I am interested with other people in a very large property bordering on Lake St. Clair, and I know there are most absurd difficulties arising there simply because nobody knows who is master. It is not that there is no master, but there are too many masters. For the minister to say there is no politics in it is ridiculous. When the time for politics comes, there are no more active politicians than these gentlemen. If the minister here and the minister in Ontario were to get together, I believe they could settle this matter in five minutes. But when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) talks about 'our' regulations, there is no chance of an agreement. That is not the way business people go about such matters. A word has been said as to politics about the inspector at Toronto. I happen to know that man, Mr. Tinsley—have known him for twenty years. He was appointed by the Conservative government of Ontario, but at the request of both Liberals and Conservatives. He is a life-long Liberal, but he is above all a sportsman, and is probably the best man in the service in this connection in the whole of Ontario. Everybody respects him, and his whole heart is in the business. I think he has done more good than the two ministers put together—with all respect to the hon. gentlemen. He is a good man, an honest man, and cares more for his duty than he does for his politics, and there are very few in this country who do.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). I notice that this mania for creating new offices has extended into the district of Nipissing. I understand that a Dominion inspector has been appointed for Lake Nipissing and also one for Lake Timiskaming. What on earth is there an inspector required for on Lake Nipissing, where the catching of the principal fish has been prohibited for the last three years, and especially when the matter is being well looked after by the local government? These lakes are open for about only six months a year, and these new inspectorships will cost from $1,100 to $2,000 a year each,—for nothing. I had hoped that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was trying to get his department down to a business basis. I believe that if the minister will consider what he has proposed doing, he will drop it and save that much money from being actually thrown away.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think this money will be thrown away; I believe it will prove of great benefit to the country.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Did the hon. minister have any complaints from that section?

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say, offhand. The hon. member complains because we have appointed two officers there. It is a very large district, and we have appointed one for the south and one for the north. If they carry out their duties properly, as I have no doubt they will, there will be plenty for them to do.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). There are others there now.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but we have no authority over them. I do not wish to argue that point at such a length that I will incur the displeasure of members of this committee. But if my hon. friend (Mr. Gordon, Nipissing) were administering this department he would like to have officers to whom he could give instructions. We cannot give instruction to the provincial officers. And what is the result? The result is, according to me, that the fisheries are not pro-

perly preserved, and the time has come when action has to be taken for the purpose of protecting and preserving the fisheries.

Mr. SPROULE. One of the strong reasons the minister and his friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke) gave for this change is that licenses are issued by the provincial government to men who are not fishermen, and then these licenses are peddled out again. But what did this government do in the same line? Was Mr. McNee, the Windsor newspaperman, a fisherman? He got a license to fish in the Nelson river and Lesser Slave lake for a number of years for a merely nominal sum. If that argument was a sound one surely it would apply to the appointment by the federal authorities as well as to the others. Was Mr. Markey, a Montreal lawyer, a fisherman when he got a license for a large fishing area in that western country. I might mention many other cases to show that the law in this respect has been violated to a greater extent by the present federal government than by any provincial government that ever existed.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). They never got a license from this government.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly they did.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). They got concessions, not licenses.

Mr. SPROULE. That is only childish play upon words. The hon. member (Mr. Clarke) knows better. Let them be concessions if you will, but they amount to licenses for twenty years at $10 a year, and they cover immense areas of fishing territory, and they are given in one case to a newspaper man and in another case to a lawyer who farmed out the fishing privileges to others and sent the fish out of the country as well. The provincial law provides that if a fisherman violates his provincial license a second time he will be deprived of his license, but the federal law only provides for a fine no matter how many times he breaks the law, and this certainly leads to a conflict of jurisdiction.

Mr. BRODEUR. If a fisherman violates the law we do not issue a license to him. We have the same rule in that respect that they have in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite easy to see that this variation between the federal and provincial law may be the means of depriving some of these poor fishermen of their means of livelihood. I remember when there was a federal license as well as a provincial license required to sell liquor, that the liquor dealers were practically unable to carry on their business and vexations and annoyances arose and in the end the federal government had to obtain a vote from parliament to recoup those who paid federal license fees. I think the government would be well advised to stay their hand before appointing an army of men whose only mission will be to cause trouble and annoyance to honest fishermen who are endeavouring to earn their livelihood.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is there any revenue from the province of Ontario with respect to the fisheries, except from the payment of fines?

Mr. BRODEUR. None.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. And the minister has stated that one of the evidences that there were no infractions of the law in Ontario was that there were no fines received by the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. There were fines sent to us by the magistrate who convicted on the complaints of private individuals.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I see in the report of the Fishery Department that there were fines returned from Ontario to the amount of $1,520 which is evidence that there has been enforcement of the law.

Mr. BRODEUR. We did not receive any money from prosecutions taken by provincial officials.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister say of his own knowledge that this money is not the proceeds of prosecutions by provincial officers?

Mr. BRODEUR. So I am informed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I know of two prosecutions in my own town instituted by provincial officials.

Mr. BRODEUR. Who got the money?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. You must have got the money and that is where the fifteen hundred dollars come in.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no. The Fishery Act says that money should come to us, but the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) tells us of a fine being imposed on the prosecution of a provincial officer and we have not received the money. That is serious.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. You got the money all right.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the minister any evidence that the $1,520 referred to in his report was not received as the result of prosecutions by provincial officers?

Mr. BRODEUR. We could get that information.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I asked the minister whether there were any complaints from the province of Ontario to his government

with respect to mal-administration in the granting of licenses.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not quite understand the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. My question is based upon the statement made by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) who said, at the commencement of this discussion this evening, that in the province of Ontario licenses were taken away from good fishermen by the Conservative administration at Toronto and given to political heelers.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I never said 'heelers'; I never use that word.

Mr. BLAIN. I will correct it by saying, not 'heelers,' but political supporters. I ask if any such complaints have reached the government in writing.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we have received complaints from people in Ontario saying that licenses had been taken from men and handed over to men who were not even fishermen.

Mr. BLAIN. Has my hon. friend such complaints in writing?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend have them brought down?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, we will continue this item till they are brought down because it is very important.

Mr. TALBOT. May I ask the minister how long this dual authority is going to last? There are lots of complaints from the province of Quebec about this dual legislation. The authorities appointed by the federal government are in conflict with the authorities appointed by the local government. You have inspectors who have to go over the ground covered by the local inspectors and they do not make reports. You cannot follow what is going on upon the St. Lawrence river. I have called the attention of the government and the department to this several times. It is a very important point and I think it is time that this dual authority and dual legislation should cease. It seems to me that the different provincial and federal governments could come to some understanding about it. You have to bear a heavy expense and you are getting no revenue. The local governments are getting all the benefit from the issue of licenses. You have your men who are instructed to go and follow the various fishermen along the St. Lawrence, this involves a great deal of expense and the revenue goes to another point. It is high time that some understanding was arrived at. I do not know what is going on in Ontario or the other provinces but I know that this dual authority is almost a curse in our province.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is very hard for me to state how long it is going to last. This is a question which should be settled by the two governments.

Mr. TALBOT. Why not do it?

Mr. BRODEUR. But it does not seem possible for us to reach a settlement. I have tried to bring the question to an issue, but it has been impossible to reach any settlement.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understand from the minister that the government have not yet made up their minds whether they will authorize these inspectors or overseers to grant licenses. I assume that they have placed in the hands of these overseers or officers printed instructions as to their duty, and if they have done so these instructions would tell these officers whether or not they are to have the right to grant licenses. I fully agree with what has been said as to the likelihood of conflict between the two governments because of the dual authority over these fisheries. If the federal government permits its officers to grant licenses to fishermen there is this point to be considered: In many waters controlled by the provincial authorities they limit the number of licenses that they will grant with the view of protecting the fish. But if you have two different bodies granting licenses it is not going to be long before your waters in certain places will be fished out. Where the authority is under one government they will know from their officers how many licenses should be granted there, but where you have two different bodies granting licenses you are taking a course which is going to result in depleting the waters of fish. That is a very serious matter. I would like to ask the minister when the salaries of these officers commenced. I have been told that they have been drawing salary from the first of the year, is that correct?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the 11th of February, the date of the order in council.

Mr. EDWARDS. So that they will be drawing salaries for two or three months before they can possibly have anything to do?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they got their instructions immediately and they are going to carry out these regulations.

Mr. EDWARDS. The bulk of their work will be reading over their instructions because they will be unable to do anything until the ice goes out.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they paid monthly or by the quarter?

Mr. BRODEUR. They get a salary of $500 a year and are paid monthly.

Mr. BLAIN. Some salary has been paid some of these officers already. Out of what fund was it paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. Out of the money which was voted last year for this purpose.

Mr. GOODEVE. It seems that the courts have decided that the fish themselves belong to the various provinces, and therefore, the province issue the licenses to fishermen to take fish. At the same time the same courts have decided that the jurisdiction with respect to regulating the fisheries belongs to the Dominion government and therefore the Dominion government issue licenses in order that they may know that every fisherman complies with the Dominion regulations. They get no revenue because the fish themselves belong to the different provinces. Now then, the question naturally arises: Supposing an application is made by an individual to one of your Dominion inspectors and he issues a license allowing him to fish under the regulations of the Dominion government, the provincial government having already issued what they consider sufficient licenses in that particular territory and not desiring to have any more fish taken out of that particular water, what occurs? That man cannot get his license from the provincial government and therefore he cannot fish; or, vice versa, a provincial government issues a license allowing the licensee to take fish in a particular water and the Dominion government refuses to issue a license and therefore he cannot fish. What is the position in a case of that kind? I would like to know who is to have the final jurisdiction and say as to who shall ultimately regulate the right to fish.

Mr. BRODEUR. In such a case where the federal authorities had issued a license and the local authorities refused to issue a license for the same territory or to the same person that person could not fish. That is very clear to me and I think we have had cases of that kind where it was thought by the provincial authorities that it would not be in the interest of the fisheries that more licenses should be issued. In these cases no more licenses are issued.

Mr. GOODEVE. Then it seems to me that properly there should be absolutely no refusal by the Dominion government and for this reason. The courts have set forth that the fish belong to the provinces.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the courts have not decided that.

Mr. GOODEVE. And it is on that ground they have issued licenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Privy Council has declared that the provinces have the proprietary right in the fisheries, but they have not said that the fish belong to the provinces. There is a distinction between the proprietary right in the fisheries and the property in the fish.

Mr. GOODEVE. Taking the proprietary right of the provinces in the fisheries, they have issued licenses for that reason. That being the case, it seems to me the only way that would be fair to those applying for licenses would be that a Dominion license should issue at once upon the issue of a provincial license; otherwise it would be very unfair and a man would never know when he was within his right.

I absolutely agree with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), that the Dominion government need only go to the various provinces and make an arrangement with them whereby the provincial authorities will insert in every license issued, the Dominion regulations enacted from time to time and rely on the provinces to carry out those regulations. The provinces would no doubt do so and that would be a very easy and a very fair way of getting over the difficulty. It seems to me the government could trust the various provincial authorities to see that the regulations are carried out and do away with this large additional expense of which we complain and with the dual jurisdiction.

Mr. BRODEUR. Why not adopt the system which exists in the maritime provinces?

Mr. GOODEVE. What is that system? We have been trying to find out all evening whether the minister has a solution of this difficulty before passing the item. If he thinks the maritime regulations will answer all the requirements why not give the committee that information and, if possible, do away with the additional expense. The minister says he does not know what the final result will be and that they have already cases in which the provinces have refused to issue licenses and vice versa.

Mr. TALBOT. This is a very serious question, a national question, and the sooner it is settled the better. Let it be by federal legislation or provincial legislation, I do not care which, but let us have one legislation which we can follow. As it is, one is antagonistic to the other and we do not know where we are. It is a serious matter because it involves large amounts of money to the provinces, and many individuals are giving the best of their ability and investing a great deal of capital in the fisheries. It seems to me that some settlement could be arrived at.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I think most of the members will agree that the present position in regard to dual jurisdiction is not all that could be desired, but I think that it is a matter that cannot be settled by the Minister of Marine and the provincial authorities who have jurisdiction over fisheries. Take the case where the bed of a river is owned by the adjoining owners, such as the River Thames; I do not understand that under the decision of the Privy Council the Ontario government has any jurisdiction whatever over such a river. As I understand the decision, the reason that the provinces have jurisdiction is by virtue of their ownership of the soil at the bed of the river. If they do not own that soil, if the soil is owned by private persons as is the case in many rivers, then it seems to me that the Dominion alone has jurisdiction over such a river. So in cases of that sort no agreement made by the two governments——

Mr. BARKER. Why not agree as to those special cases?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). How could the two agree that the province should have jurisdiction?

Mr. BARKER. The two could agree that the one who has the real proprietary rights could exercise them.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). You would still have the division. It seems to me that what is necessary is an amendment to the British North America Act which will set all these matters at rest and give jurisdiction over fisheries to one authority or the other, no matter where these fisheries are.

Mr. LENNOX. Of course if we commence making amendments to the British North America Act we will have many and it is just as wise, I think, to avoid interfering with the British North America Act whenever we can. I have not followed very closely all that the minister said but I would like to know from him whether he has ever made any serious and systematic effort to bring about a conference of the different parties interested in this matter. It appears to me that that is what the minister should do. I recognize that as the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Clarke), says, probably the minister has not power to determine the whole matter but he has the power to make an effort and I think it is his duty to make an effort. The first move to bring about a friendly discussion has to be made by some person and probably it would come from a federal minister as well as from anybody else. The other different authorities all stand on about the same basis; the federal government stands in a position by itself. It is not at all unlikely that if the minister would invite the different provincial legislatures to appoint representatives to confer with him upon this matter, some adjustment of it might be brought about. The present situation is very unprofitable, very unseemly and absolutely unnecessary, and it would be in the public interest if the ministers would get together and endeavour to find a solution. We are different provinces, but we are all one people and it is a matter of comparative indifference in one sense which party exercises jurisdiction if jurisdiction is once definitely placed. I am confident that if the matter was left to the provinces, they would endeavour to administer it in the interests of all concerned. They would exercise that jurisdiction just as well as the federal authority would. I am opposed in principle to arrogating to the Dominion any jurisdiction that properly belongs to the provinces and I am opposed to the government treading upon doubtful ground in a matter of this kind. If there is any doubt I think it is in the best interest of the country as a whole that the provinces should be allowed to exercise jurisdiction. I think that anything that savours of the Dominion parliament usurping jurisdiction is liable in the end to create friction and dissatisfaction and probably worse. The minister, if he has not already done so, should endeavour to bring about a friendly conference, and by some means terminate this dual jurisdiction. There is a waste of money in it, and there are even more serious interests at stake than a waste of money. I would like the minister to tell us what he has done in the way of bringing about a conference of the parties interested, and what he intends to do to that end.

Mr. BRODEUR. Steps have been taken by the government with a view of bringing about a settlement of this question of jurisdiction between the provinces and the federal authorities. It was taken up with the maritime provinces, and we have reached a settlement which is satisfactory to all. Some time ago there was a difficulty with regard to the oyster beds in the maritime provinces. These are within the three-mile limit, and it was a question whether they should be under the control of the federal or the provincial authorities. I had an opportunity of discussing the question with one of the members of the New Brunswick government who came here, and also with Mr. Hazen, the premier. We had conferences also with a representative of the Nova Scotia government, and with the Premier of Prince Edward Island, and we have reached a settlement of the question of oyster beds, which was pending for several years. It has been agreed that we shall issue the licenses in those provinces, and of course we regulate the fisheries, and provide the

neccessary guardians and overseers for the purpose of carrying out the regulations and preserving the fisheries. In Quebec, the question has been settled with regard to that part of the province which lies north of Pointe des Monts and Cap Chatte. The provincial government does not issue any licenses or exercise any authority in that part of the province, leaving it entirely to the federal authorities. In the other parts of the province they issue the licenses and we make the regulations. In Ontario, immediately after the judgment of the Privy Council was rendered, the provincial authorities took power to issue licenses, and we have not been able to reach any modus vivendi with them. Some three years ago we appointed an officer for the purpose of conferring with the provincial authorities, but he has been promoted to another place. When the international regulations were under consideration, I invited the representative of the Ontario government to come here, and the Minister of Public Works of that province, who is also the Minister of Fisheries, came. One of the first questions that arose for discussion at the conference I had with him was as to who should issue the licenses in international waters. We have a treaty with the United States under which the regulations with regard to the fisheries in these boundary waters are to be made by two commissioners, and one article of the treaty provides for a system of registration. I thought the best means for carrying out this provision of the treaty would be the granting of licenses; but the representative of the Ontario government protested very strongly against any assumption of power or authority on the part of the federal government to issue any licenses even in these international waters, where we are obliged under the law to protect the fisheries. That showed the position taken by the Ontario government, or at least by its representative. In the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta there is no doubt that we have absolute jurisdiction over the rivers and lakes. In British Columbia, the provincial government did not take power to issue licenses until two years ago, when the question was raised as to whether we had the right to issue licenses within the three-mile limit. This question was made the subject of correspondence between the two governments, and it was at last agreed, after an interview with the attorney general of the province, that the question should be referred to the courts. A question was prepared, and was submitted to the Supreme Court, and we expect a decision at the next sitting of the court, perhaps this month.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not want the details of what was done with the various provinces. That is a kind of huckstering which I do not think will bring about a very satisfactory result. What I would urge the minister to do, as something statesmanlike and in the general interest of the whole country, would be to ask the various provinces to get together as portions of the Dominion of Canada, and consider this matter from a broad national point of view. It is an entirely different proposition to get a representative of one province and try to make the best bargain you can with him, and then proceed with another, and so on. That may be very wise from the standpoint of trying to get as much power for the Dominion government as possible.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may inform my hon. friend that during the late Hon. Mr. Sutherland's time a general conference of the provinces was called for the purpose of discussing this question, and they were not able to reach any settlement. That is the reason we took it up province by province.

Mr. LENNOX. Even if there was such a conference, I think that some concerted action should be taken again. It is absolutely a disgrace to this country that this kind of thing should go on, and I would endeavour to get a conference in the light of day, as a public national deliberation, with the eyes of the people of Canada upon the proceedings, so that if a settlement could not be brought about, we should know exactly with whom the fault rested. I would have a discussion in which perhaps a representative from New Brunswick would be pointing out to the representative of the Ontario government that something should be done by Ontario in the general public interest, and vice versa. You will not have this haggling and quibbling such as would be likely where an official from a provincial government confers with an officer of the Dominion government, but you would have a conference conducted with dignity and in which the representatives of each province would be interested in having the various questions adjusted in the general interests. The government should set to work to have such a conference brought about.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have before me Sessional Paper No. 165, containing questions put by Mr. Porter with reference to this item and the answers given. He asked for the number of fishery officers appointed, their names, rank, the limits territorially of the jurisdiction of each, the salary of each, their duties, &c. The last question he put was this:

Is any and what system followed in making appointments to this service as to efficiency.

The answer given to this question was as follows:

In all instances it was sought to procure the services of energetic, active men, having a

knowledge of the fisheries conditions in their respective districts.

Well, I am informed on good authority that among those appointed, one is a blacksmith, a couple are farmers, one is a farm labourer, another is a bar tender, another is a fish buyer for a big company, and still another is a gentleman who at one time was a member of the ministry in a congregation in Ontario. I am not going to read over the names, but surely we ought to have something more definite than the information given in this sessional paper. Surely we ought to have from the minister, with regard to every name on this list, information as to who recommended each and every one of them, why they were recommended, whether they were recommended by political friends; and I understand from good authority that every man on this list is a worker at election times for the Liberal party. I would like to know why they were engaged, what their duties are, and why they stay at home three-quarters of the year and only go around at election time. In looking over another part of this sessional paper, I find this question:

What is the total revenue derived during the years 1908 and 1909 from fisheries for the province of Ontario, and what was the total expenditure?

The answer given was that in 1908-9 the revenue was $770.78, and the expenditure $4,784.23, showing that the department spent $7 of the people's money to get one back. And this year we are asked to vote $50,000 more of the people's money for this purpose. What does the hon. minister expect to get back? I think it is absolutely ridiculous to ask this House to vote an item of this kind. At the same ratio between expenditure and income that prevailed two years ago, for that $50,000 of expenditure, the minister will put the people in the hole to the extent of $350,000. There is no sense in it. It is high time for some one to move that this item be struck out, and I beg to submit that motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion is that this item be struck out.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) decided to appoint these new inspectors, I presume it was his intention to improve the fisheries, and no doubt he looked about him to find the very best possible inspectors he could get. I would like, therefore, to ask him if he can tell me what experience in fish inspecting the two gentlemen have got whom he appointed in Nipissing. One of them is named John Murphy and the other Mr. Kill.

Mr. BRODEUR. The requirements are that they should be young men, active and energetic, but we did not require special qualifications because for the sum of $500 you are not likely to get such qualifications.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Does not the minister think that more than that would be necessary to fit these men to be inspectors?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that if he were of ordinary ability, and had the qualifications to which I have referred, he would be qualified for the position.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Does not the minister think he ought to know one kind of fish from another?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but every man living in a fishing district knows these things.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has shown the minister how impossible it has been to work out this dual system along the St. Lawrence. The hon. gentleman says that down there they do not know to whom to look for instruction. In the district of Nipissing, we have had a condition just the opposite to that. They have only the one authority to look to, the local government. And now the minister wants to inflict upon that district the same kind of trouble that they are up against on the St. Lawrence. If there was anything to gain on the part of this government, I would tell him to go ahead. They have nothing to gain in a financial way. And no person will insinuate that the provincial authorities have not as much interest in maintaining the local fisheries as the Dominion government have. If, then, there is nothing to gain, what is the sense of appointing two extra inspectors? And especially what is the sense of appointing these men, their salaries to begin on February 11, at a time when the lakes which it is their business to guard are covered with from three and a half to four feet of ice.

Mr. BRODEUR. This service must be organized, and that takes a little time. And the officers of the Ontario government, like these whom we are discussing, are appointed for the year round.

Mr. BLAIN. Looking over the list, I see that some of them get only $40 a year.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are guardians, but what do the overseers get?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the minister if he did not listen to a question I propounded? I have not heard any answer to it. Who nominated these men and stated what their qualifications were?

Mr. BRODEUR. They were appointed by order in council upon the recommendation of the minister.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But I am asking the minister who has this vote before the committee what reason he has to recommend these men. Who told him they were capable men? Who told him that a farm labourer was a capable man to act as overseer?

Mr. BRODEUR. Who is he?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister knows himself. Who told him that a farmer was capable——

Mr. GRAHAM. Why not? A farmer is capable of being a member of parliament; why should he not be capable of being a fishery overseer?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I acknowledge the corn, Mr. Chairman, and admit at once that a farmer is capable of doing anything. But as to these other people, this bartender, this ex-minister and others, I think we should have information about them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I say without hesitation that a farmer is absolutely capable of carrying on this business.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I accept that at once.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman has stated that a blacksmith is not capable of carrying on this work. I say that a blacksmith, a young, strong and active man, who is honest, is just as capable of being a fishery overseer as any of the others. The hon. gentleman has referred to a former minister. I think one who has been a minister of the church is capable of discharging these duties.

Mr. GRAHAM. Surely; he has been a fisher of men.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who recommended these men to the minister? I think the minister will tell you Mr. Chairman, that he does not know more than a very small percentage of these men personally. I think I have a right to ask who recommended them to him, especially as I felt called upon to take exception to certain appointments in my own section of the country. For three years I have been pointing out to the minister that he appointed the wrong man, a Grit heeler who was appointed to a similar position to this.

Mr. BRODEUR. Who is he?

Mr. CAMPBELL. A. J. Macpherson of Winnipegosis.

Mr. BRODEUR. He is not a fishery overseer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not want to contradict the minister flatly, but in reply to a question of mine, he said, and is reported in 'Hansard' as saying, that A. J. Macpherson was appointed to a higher position at a higher salary as chief of the hatchery at Snake island because of the experience he had, and it all has resulted as I warned the minister beforehand, that he was fired for incompetency within the last few months. It is only fair that I should ask what qualifications these men have?

Mr. BRODEUR. Before making these appointments I wrote to different persons in whom I have confidence.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who were they?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the list here, but I have no objection to supply it. I told them what work these men had to do, and I was informed that these were the best men available for the service and I appointed them.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. One of the reasons given by the minister for the appointment of these men is that they were young and active, and could go over their districts with celerity, but I would point out to him that in the Wiarton division which has a coast line of 150 miles to inspect, he has appointed a man about 75 years old who had been acting in the capacity of police magistrate in Wiarton. Does the minister think that a young and active man of 75 years of age can go out in all kinds of stormy weather for the purpose of detecting fishermen breaking the law. This is one more proof that the appointments were made because of political service and not of any service they were supposed to do in enforcing the law.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the name of that official?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. B. B. Miller.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember that name.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I know the man very well.

Mr. BRODEUR. I specially mentioned that the men recommended should be active and energetic. I believe there are one or two cases where those appointed were above the specified age of 40 years, but I was informed that they were fit to carry out their duties properly.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Seventy-five years of age is a good deal above forty.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would be surprised if that were true.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. There may be other surprises in store for the minister.

Mr. BOYCE. The minister must now have sufficient reasons to cause him to reflect before forcing through this item tonight. The minister, must realize that as he has been able so satisfactorily to settle conflicts of jurisdiction with other prov-

inces, he should not weary in well doing if he wants to arrange a modus vivendi with Ontario, or any other province in which there is dual inspection of fisheries. The facts admitted by the minister indicate that there is tremendous confusion in the administration of the fishery laws. Whatever rights the Dominion has, even in international waters, can be protected without making confusion worse confounded by appointing a Dominion inspector to see that the Ontario inspector who issues licenses does his duty and does not transgress the regulations of the Dominion. The whole thing is a farce. It brings us back to thirty years ago when the Ontario government and the Dominion government being of a different political complexion, played the same game at the town of Rat Portage and constables were appointed by the Dominion and constables were appointed by the province, and justices of the peace were appointed by the province and commissioners of police were appointed by the Dominion, and the farce wound up by the two sets of officials arresting one another. This thing is not as bad at the present time as it was then, but I submit to the minister in all reason that it is equally ridiculous. Did the minister appoint his officials to see that the provincial officials did their duty, or did he appoint them to enforce Dominion regulations, and if he did he knows that they do not discharge their duties. Apparently, the Dominion inspectors spend their time watching the Ontario officials, and in exhibiting vigilance and activity in the Liberal interest when election time comes. Granted that there is a Dominion license, and a provincial license, and a fisherman has paid both, then there is an inspector of the Ontario government and an inspector of the Dominion government to see that he observes the regulations of both governments. Are the duties of the Dominion inspector confined to enforcing the regulations under which the Dominion license is issued?

I do not think the minister will admit that his duties and functions consist in the carrying out of these regulations. If they do then there are two or three inspectors whose reports have been before him for three or four years and who ought or ought not to be continued in his department. I ask him which horn of the dilemna he will take. If that be the case, and if he answers in the affirmative that the duties of the Dominion inspectors are confined to Dominion licenses and that the duties of the Ontario inspectors are confined to Ontario licenses, the minister will see how easily an almost daily conflict would arise as between the regulations under which these fishermen are acting. Is there a fisherman acting illegally under an Ontario license? The Dominion inspector may see in that a reason for a complaint which is common to both licenses and there would be a conflict of jurisdiction. If under these conditions, a Dominion inspector interferes with a fisherman acting under an Ontario license, who proceeds, who prosecutes? There is the regulation; what does the minister say with regard to it, who gets the fine, where does the fisherman land in case the Ontario overseer prosecutes? Supposing a fisherman acting under both licenses is charged with violating the regulations again, who prosecutes and why should one inspector be entitled to prosecute more than another? I am simply quoting these hypothetical cases to the minister to show the possibilities of confusion that the situation presents. I am speaking of the Lake Superior division, and he knows these conflicts that are going on. I have no desire to comment upon this unduly, it has been very ably discussed from both sides of the House but I do suggest to the minister that it is time this difficulty was settled. I refuse to believe that it is a difficulty that cannot be settled, I refuse to believe that the minister cannot adjust these matters with the provincial governments, I decline to believe that men in this country, having the interests of Canada at heart and the protection of her resources, either having provincial or federal jurisdiction, are so stubborn that they cannot get together and arrange by themselves at any time a settlement of this whole difficulty. The minister must realize the confusion that arises and one would have supposed that he would have felt called upon years ago, as soon as the jurisdiction became separated, to make an effort to settle this very important question. When the difficulty arose it might have been settled by just a little painstaking, a little anxiety and a little earnest effort to get together in the interests of the fishery resources of Canada and I believe it would still be an easy matter. The complaints are not confined to the province of Ontario. We have heard complaints from the province of Quebec, and I must confess that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), who is a pretty strong supporter of the minister's, so strong that his difference from him on this question ought to satisfy the minister that there is merit in it, was a very excellent one. It may not be one that appealed actually to the minister but it was simple and cogent in its effect and I think the minister should hesitate and see if he cannot, before putting this item through, bring down to this committee some suggestion whereby the appointment of two inspectors will be rendered absolutely unnecessary, or some such simple and far reaching suggestion as that which has been made to the committee by one of his own ardent admirers. Under

such conditions you will have no conflict of jurisdiction, you will not have the acrimony, strife, uneasiness and unrest that result always from divided jurisdiction. With the possibility of the issuance of two licenses you have the fishermen paying two fees, you have the fisherman subject to two sets of regulations, whether expressed or implied, the regulations which go with each license and to which each license is subject. You have under certain imaginable conditions two penalties and you have a department compelled to serve two masters. I would recommend to the minister again the force of the scriptural saying with regard to a man who serves two masters, and if it has been impressed upon this department I feel satisfied that he will not seek to impress and force it upon some of these poor fishermen. I have here the report of the inspector for the Lake Superior division, Mr. A. G. Duncan, a gentleman who has occupied the position of fishery inspector for some years. Round about election time this gentleman is usually fishing for votes. He is very busy. There always seem to be fishery troubles to carry him at the expense of this government from place to place in the interest of getting out the fishermen's votes, and I venture to suggest to the minister in passing that the travelling expenses of the gentleman in question are very much inflated in consequence of his political activities. The report deals not only with the question of enforcement of the Dominion regulations but refers to some extent to the supervision which he exercises over provincial officers. He tells the minister: Now, I have watched the carrying out of the law by the provincial authorities, I have spied out how there was illegal fishing, I have spied out how the Ontario government did not prosecute in such cases, or, where they did prosecute, I have made it my business to find out that the offenders were not fined but that they were allowed to go on suspended sentence, I reported this matter to the Ontario fishery officer and I found out what his instructions were with regard to the fisheries and the things which he did in consequence of the information which I—A. G. Duncan—had given. Then he says, in substance: In consequence of my supervision the Ontario officials put on a patrol boat and they seized two tugs and a lot of gill nets. That all indicates to the minister the trouble that exists.

Where there are two inspectors there must necessarily be conflict, just the kind of conflict we see in the report of the inspector of the Lake Superior division. Inspectors are only human, an inspector has to make a pretense of earning his salary and this man's report is made up of statements showing how he has spied upon the inspectors of the Ontario government in the performance of their duties. As has been said this is a national question, one which should not be dealt with in a hurried manner and without serious consideration. I would ask the minister not to try to pass the item to-night, and to endeavour at the next meeting of the committee to suggest some rational, broad, national settlement of this conflict of jurisdiction, if not on the lines indicated by the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) whose suggestion is worth more consideration than the minister gave it, then along some other lines that may appeal to the hon. gentleman. I do not think the minister will find the Ontario officials quite as hardheaded and stubborn as he suggests, but that they would approach the subject with a disposition to deal with it in a fair spirit, having regard to the interests of the province in the protection of its fisheries.

In the appointing of inspectors the minister sometimes makes mistakes as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell). When he appoints as fishery inspectors men who go over the country endeavouring to patch up voters' lists in unorganized territories, and acting as campaigners, spending money in bars to treat electors at election times. I think he is not making a choice of fit and proper persons to carry out any regulation, and that the men who will do that sort of thing will not be very vigilant with regard to the infraction of any regulation around election times.

I commend this matter to the minister's earnest attention in order that we may have a solution of this serious and complicated state of affairs.

Mr. BRODEUR: There is no man more anxious than I to see this matter settled. Since I have been in charge of the despartment I have endeavoured by all means possible to reach an agreement with all the provinces, and I believe that the settlement which has been arrived at with the maritime provinces should commend itself to the other provinces and to the province of Ontario. Unfortunately I did not get from the Ontario government the same consideration as I received from the other provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. What about Quebec?

Mr. BRODEUR. Quebec, as I said, is divided into two parts.

Mr. BOYCE. Is the matter settled as to Quebec?

Mr. BRODEUR. Settled as to one part but not as to the other, so there are only those two, one part of the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario are not settled. The situation in Quebec is not as difficult as it is in Ontario. I mentioned a few moments ago the fact

that when we came to settle the regulations concerning the fresh boundary waters, I thought in that case it would have been possible to reach a settlement but even in fact in that case the Minister of Public Works in the Ontario government said they would insist upon all licenses being issued by the Ontario government. That is their right, no one can dispute that right, and if no settlement has been reached it is not necessarily my fault. Nor is it the fault of my predecessors. When the late Mr. Sutherland was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he called a convention of representatives of the different provinces, but it was then impossible to reach an agreement. I called a conference which was attended by representatives of New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, but we could not reach a settlement. We have our regulations. My hon. friend quoted from a report and he will find in that report that the regulations were not observed. For instance, 'the Thessalon fishermen,' 'says the inspector, 'were fishing without licenses and shipping the fish. That is a serious offence against the law. When I reported that to the Ontario fishery authorities, the inspectors were ordered to seize all their nets and fish and were instructed by the Ontario government to remove the article seized, but later the inspector was told to take bonds and all the fishermen were allowed to go on bonds. In the matter of two tugs seized in Lake Erie, they were allowed to go on bonds and I have not heard of a fine being imposed.' The report goes on that the Ontario fishery inspectors have been instructed by the department to notify the fishermen that they could fish away until they could get their licenses. This is absoluetly contrary to the law.

Mr. BOYCE. Which law?

Mr. BRODEUR. The federal legislation, that no one can fish without a license. It is very unfortunate that these regulations are not enforced.

Mr. BOYCE. The report is somewhat vague about that. As I understand there was some technical difficulty about the licenses, they had been paid for, all the preliminaries with regard to the licenses had been observed and it was only with regard to the actual issuance of the license itself, as a ministerial matter, that these instructions or any suggestions of that kind were given out. As a matter of fact the licenses were in the departement at Ottawa, they were not in the hands of the fishermen. That is all that amounted to, but there is another instance of your interfering.

Mr. BRODEUR. I take the report as it is here, perhaps my hon. friend has better information, but I see by the report here that it was stated that the fishing was carried out without any license.

Mr. BOYCE. That is subject to that explanation.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course if my hon. friend has some particular information as to that I am very willing to accept his word, but it looks to me as if that justified the government in taking the necessary steps to see that our regulations are enforced. I do not want to restrict in any way, shape or form the rights of the provinces. They have certain rights, let them enjoy them, but it is our duty to see that these laws are enforced and that is the reason those appointments have been made. This is not a new policy, it has been in force for more than a year, the money was voted last year for that purpose. The member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) has suggested to strike out this item. That would cancel the appointment of all our fishery officers in the country. Is the committee ready to vote for that? It is a matter to be decided by the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this matter is so important that the minister should not press this item to-night. This matter is one that should receive a good deal of consideration by this committee. It looks like a conflict of great importance between this government and the provincial government of Ontario. I asked my hon. friend if he had under consideration the question of issuing licenses from his department, and from his answer it looks as if he intended in the near future to issue licenses. If he does, these licenses will certainly come into conflict with the licenses issued by the government of Ontario. We have had conflicts before between the government of Ontario and the government of the Dominion, and these have been very costly to the people of both the province and the Dominion, and I am very much surprised that my hon. friend, who represents the party that has always claimed to stand for provincial rights, should so willingly press in this committee a matter that might lead almost to a war between this government and the Ontario government. We have asked for information which my hon. friend is not able to give. I asked him if there had been any recent complaints made to his department of abuses of the fishing interests from those asking for licenses from the provincial government. The minister was unable to produce those written complaints, if there were any, and I think we should have them before the committee, to show whether there have been any general complaints of this kind, and, if so, how important they are. I think we should have all the correspondence between my hon. friend's department and the Ontario govern-

ment with respect to this matter. Coming from the province of Ontario myself, I cannot understand why we should have two sets of officials to protect the fishing interests of that province. I am not going to say who is right. It looks at the moment as if the Ontario government had the right to issue licenses, because they have been doing so. I would like to know just how far my hon. friend has gone in this matter in order that a settlement might be brought about. We should have a more lucid explanation from the minister in respect of this matter. I think he should let the item stand until all this and other information can be brought, so that the House may understand who is responsible for a settlement not being brought about. I am of opinion that the provincial government is quite willing that this matter shall be settled amicably, and the best time to settle it is not after my hon. friend has an army of officers appointed to look after his interests in the province. The better time is before these officers get on far in the work. I regret that officers have been appointed at all. Was my hon. friend in the House last year when his estimates appropriating the portion of the money to pay inspectors was voted?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so.

Mr. BLAIN. I think not. I looked up 'Hansard', and found that the matter was in the hands of another minister, and there was no explanation at all beyond the statement that a portion of this money was to pay inspectors. We were entitled at that time to a fuller explanation, when there was going to be a change of policy entailing a conflict with the Ontario government. I am not complaining of my hon. friend, who was at the time in ill health ant not able to give us a fuller explanation. Now for the first time we have the hon. minister in his place when this matter is up for consideration, and he should be the first to suggest that it should be left over until he is able to present such information as he has in his department to satisfy the committee that an expenditure of this kind is required.

Mr. EDWARDS. A reason has been given by the hon. minister himself why a portion, at least, of this amount should not be voted. He has stated to the committee that the salaries of these appointees began on the 11th of February. That means that for about three months they will have nothing to do, so that at least one-fourth of the year's salary will not be earned by anything in the shape of practical work. Therefore the minister has condemned at least one-fourth of the amount which he is asking for as payment to these men. The hon. minister says that the officers of the Ontario government are appointed for the whole year. These men have been appointed, and their services go on from year to year. These are new appointees, and it seems to me that if the minister were inclined to be economical, he would have the salaries of these men start when their duties begin, and not two or three months before their duties could begin. This amount will not cover the expenditure, because I think the hon. minister will admit that many of these officers will have to be provided with gasolene launches, in order properly to do their duty. It is strange to me that from 1896 down to the time the Whitney government took office, the hon. minister did not seem to think any such regulation as this was necessary, although it was well known from one end of the province to the other that the fishery overseers appointed by the Dominion government for the province of Ontario were making use of their offices for political purposes—that they were allowing men belonging to the Liberal party to violate the law without bringing them to time. All of this passed without any comment on the part of the gentlemen opposite. They did not consider it necessary, when the Liberal government was in power at Toronto, to appoint any fishery officials from Ottawa. But now when they find that the reins of power have been taken out of their hands in Ontario, and they dread lest they be taken out of their hands in the Dominion, they find it necessary to appoint a horde of fishery inspectors and overseers solely for political purposes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the Dominion government assert their right to issue licenses concurrently with the Ontario government?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not asserted that right.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Do you intend to?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then the number of fishermen will entirely depend on the Ontario government?

Mr. BRODEUR. As regards fishing licenses, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. As there is evidently a conflict here which ought to be straightened out before we dispose of this item, I would suggest that my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) should withdraw the motion he has put, and that the hon. minister should let this vote stand until we get the information which he says is in his department. In the meantime I think that if he communicated with the Ontario government, both governments might agree on a conference which would result in an

amicable settlement of this question—a question which will undoubtedly lead to considerable trouble if not amicably settled.

Mr. CAMPBELL. After listening to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I am quite willing to withdraw my motion on the understanding that this matter is to be held over. In any case I intended to ask permission to amend my motion so as to word it somewhat differently. I understood that this was an itemized vote, or I would not have moved that the whole vote be struck off. I would ask, therefore, to be allowed to amend my motion so as to move that '$26,500 be struck off the amount we are asked to vote,' that $22,500 being the sum required to pay these 45 employees. If the hon. minister is willing to take the suggestion of my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule), I am quite ready to withdraw my motion; but if he is not willing to let this item stand until the information asked for from this side be submitted to the committee, I would ask to have my motion put as I have amended it. I leave it to the hon. minister, whose good sense is always evident in times of stress, whether he should not come to the conclusion that we are only asking for what is very reasonable.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that I would have said anything had not my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) spoken so enthusiastically for every man in the province of Ontario. He said he was sure that there was not a man in that province who would stand for such a proposition as this. Well, I am quite sure of the contrary. I happen to know something about this question. When the decision of the Privy Council was given, the transfer of the right to issue these licenses from the Dominion to the provinces was not made at once. Some time elapsed after that decision was given before it was carried into effect and the transfer made from the federal to the provincial authorities. That transfer was absolutely experimental as every one knows who has had anything to do with it. I am not a lawyer, but to me the decision of the Privy Council was as clear as mud. I had quite enough to do at that time trying to work it out in the province. I saw there was going to be a conflict which could not be avoided between the two authorities under that decision. There is no question among the men who were taking a deep interest in the matter at that time that the arrangement made, in so far as regards this federal authority not taking such an active part was concerned, was altogether experimental. When on the government side in the Ontario House I discussed it, as I also did when on the opposition side. I took the ground which my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has taken, that if there was any way of getting rid of one jurisdiction or the other, and leaving the question entirely to one of them, that would remove the difficulty, but that did not seem possible. Neither side in the Ontario House is willing to concede anything of what they think they got by the judgment of the Privy Council. That being the case the question of negotiation only resolves itself into this. Let the federal authority hand over its jurisdiction to the provinces. Well, I am not sure that we would be performing our duty if we should do that. It is all very well for us to say that we must not interfere with provincial jurisdiction; but that cannot rid us of our own responsibility one iota. There is a responsibility resting on this government for the preservation of fish, and this government cannot shirk that responsibility. There is another statement which I make advisely, and in making it I am not speaking more of the provincial inspectors and overseers of to-day than of those under the late government. So far as the regulations of the Dominion are concerned, the provincial officers have never tried to enforce them with a heart and will as if these regulations were their own.

And they are not so particular. They will come—and this has come within my own knowledge—to a fisherman, and, being tender hearted men, when the fisherman says: 'That is a very stringent regulation,' they will say: We do not want to put it into force, if it were not that this is a Dominion regulation we would not put it in force this way. The fisherman knows that he does not have to observe that regulation strictly, because the authority that is supposed to enforce it has not it at heart. I admit all the difficulties and clashing of jurisdiction. But we shall never come to an arrangement, I believe, until this federal authority takes advantage of its powers under the decision of the Privy Council. Then it may dawn on some people that the situation is such that there must be only one power. But, so long as the regulations are not enforced by the Dominion authority, it is not enforced and everybody knows it. I am not blaming the provincial authority very much; they look upon these regulations as something that are a superfluous duty, something for which they are not paid, and they have no heart in the work. That is not as it should be. And, until the federal authority and provincial authorities can come to an agreement—and it is not a small question or one that can be settled offhand—it is the duty of this government to have their own officials, not to be over officious or to attend to matters outside their duty, but to see that the regulations which the Privy Council says the federal authority has power to make are enforced. One hon. member re-

ferred to the salaries, and said that some guardians received $40 a year. I say that the payment of that amount is merely a gift, the man who gets it does nothing for it, and is not expected to.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). That is what I said.

Mr. GRAHAM. And I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Gordon, Nipissing) thoroughly. If a man is going to do anything he must get some pay for it. I had some experience with these payments of $25 a year to officers. What can you ask a man to do for $25 or $40? You do not expect him to do anything, and he generally earns his money at that. I hope the time will come when this question will be straightened out. But you cannot straighten it out in a few months. In the meantime, it is the duty of this government to assume the responsibility and manifest the courage necessary to the carrying out of its own regulations.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Does the hon. minister know the Dominion regulations have not been observed by the fishermen in Lake Nipissing?

Mr. GRAHAM. If I were the member for Nipissing, I should like to be consulted on that point.

Mr. LENNOX. Are they not enforced on Lake Simcoe?

Mr. GRAHAM. Even Lake Nipissing and Lake Simcoe are not the whole of Ontario.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have been asked by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) to bring down certain correspondence with regard to the issuing of licenses. I said I would comply with that request, but, of course, I have not the papers with me. I understand that, in the meantime, the hon. gentleman will let the item go. He is within his right to ask for the papers, and they will be brought down. We might proceed with the next item.

Mr. CAMPBELL. After listening to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) I am sure that this committee sees the question exactly as he sees it, and to us all it must appear as clear as mud. Let me refer the minister to page 5480 of 'Hansard' of 1905, where he will find a question of my hon. friend from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) and its answer:

1. Were any requests made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries last year for the appointment of a commission to investigate the conditions of the fisheries on the Georgian bay, Lake Huron, or Lake Superior?
2. If so, by whom were such requests made, and when?
3. What action was taken upon such requests?

And this was replied to by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself as follows:

1. Yes.
2. The fishermen of Georgian bay by a memorial, dated February 22, 1904.
3. All the preparatory steps were taken for the appointment of a commission; but owing to differences of opinion as to the most suitable season of the year for the sittings of such commission, the matter was held over until the present year. It is proposed to arrange for sittings during the present year.

I would like to ask whether these things were settled and what came of them?

Mr. BRODEUR. The commission was appointed, and the hon. member will find that in its report was a statement to the effect that the regulations were not properly carried out.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This commission was appointed six years ago, and made certain suggestions. Was one of those suggestions that forty or fifty men should be appointed to go over the ground already covered by the appointees of the Ontario government?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the report stated that the federal regulations were not carried out, and so we thought it advisable to take this step for their enforcement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This matter has been discussed at some length and it is now twelve o'clock. There is much information still to be brought out, and I think the remainder of the discussion might be postponed.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is understood that we are going to take the other items.

Mr. JAMESON. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) says that when an officer is given a salary of $40 a year, he is not expected to do any work for it, and does not. I ask the minister whether in his department any salaries of $40 a year or less are now being paid to officials?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sorry to say that in some parts of the maritime provinces small salaries of that kind are being paid. When we came to appoint overseers for Ontario we thought it better to appoint a smaller number of men and pay them larger salaries, and hence, we have appointed forty-five officials for the whole province, while in Nova Scotia there are that number in some counties alone.

Mr. DANIEL. What county in Nova Scotia has forty-five fishery overseers?

Mr. BRODEUR. I know there are some, but I cannot mention them offhand.

Mr. BOYCE. How many are you appointing to the Lake Superior division?

Mr. BRODEUR. Two overseers.

Mr. LENNOX. There is a want of harmony amongst the departments in regard to the payment of small salaries. The Minister of Railways told us that a man who only gets $40 a year should not be expected to do anything, but in the Post Office Department there are thousands of postmasters and postmistresses who, the Postmaster General seems to think, should supply part of their houses as a post office, and devote all their time to the service, and live on the princely salary of $34.50 per annum net.

Mr. TALBOT. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman; is this discussion in order?

Mr. LENNOX. It is quite in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As an illustration it is in order.

Mr. LENNOX. It is given as an illustration of the different views taken by the different departments on this question and my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) may rest easy. It is a bad policy to cut people down to salaries so low that they are not expected to do any work, and I hope the Postmaster General will take note of the announcement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with reference to paying his officials large salaries, and that he will do something to increase the pay given to postmasters and postmistresses.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) withdrawn.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the minister intend to put in force in the maritime provinces the system he has given effect to in Ontario, namely, appointing a smaller number of officials and giving them larger salaries. Will the Minister of Marine displace these officials in Nova Scotia who are receiving small salaries, and who, according to the Minister of Railways, are not expected to do any work?

Mr. BRODEUR. If I thought that system would be satisfactory in Nova Scotia I would gladly put it in effect. The matter is engaging the consideration of the department.

Building fishways and clearing rivers, $10,000.

Mr. JAMESON. To-day I received a complaint from a resident of Digby county with regard to the dumping of sawdust in a stream. I can read the letter, or if the minister prefers, I will transmit it to his department, so that it may be dealt with. I presume the intention of the department is that the streams shall be kept free from sawdust and debris injurious to fish life, and that a complaint of this kind will be inquired into and a remedy provided if a remedy is necessary.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. member would be kind enough to send the correspondence to the department I will see that the necessary steps are taken.

Mr. CROSBY. Is it the intention of the minister to clear the riverway at the head of Ketch harbour in the county of Halifax?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will have the matter investigated.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is provision made for fishways at St. Andrew's dam and locks on the Red river?

Mr. BRODEUR. The present condition of that matter is well understood by the hon. members for Selkirk and Lisgar, and negotiations are pending as to a fishway at Pembina river and at St. Andrew's locks.

Mr. DANIEL. I always understood that the department compelled those who built dams to provide fishways.

Mr. BRODEUR. When new dams are built the owners are, generally speaking, called upon to put in the necessary fishways. The Act authorizes the minister to pay a share of the cost and in the case of old dams where fishways are being provided, the government sometimes pays a share of the expense.

Mr. DANIEL. Was any part of this appropriation used last year for this purpose?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, during the last fiscal year we paid $1,475.91.

Mr. DANIEL. Where was that expended?

Mr. BRODEUR. All over Canada.

Mr. JAMESON. Who is in charge of this work? I see that the Auditor General under the heading of 'Building fishways and clearing rivers' has the following entry:

R. M. S. Mignault, St. Michel d'Yamaska, salary, 12 m. to Mar. 31, 1910, $1,200.

Is there an officer permanently employed in charge of this work?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, he is the officer in charge. The man who is looking after this work in the maritime provinces is the inspector of the district there.

Mr. JAMESON. Are we to understand that it is necessary to have a salaried officer drawing $1,200 to look after an expenditure of $1,400?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not so much the amount of money that is expended, but it is necessary to look after the construction of dams, and to see that fishways are provided. We have provided that all dams shall be built with fishways, and I think it shows that that work is being carried out.

Mr. JAMESON. I do not think it does. We have not had any statement of what has been done in this connection beyond the few items which refer to it in the Auditor General's Report. I would like the minister to inform the committee as to the extent of this gentleman's work.

Mr. BRODEUR. He is the inspector of fisheries, and he is called upon to see that fishways are built in the dams which are being constructed.

Legal and incidental expenses, $4,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is this for?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to meet the legal expenses which are incurred during the year in connection with the fisheries.

Mr. LENNOX. How much was expended last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1,430.28.

Mr. BLAIN. To whom was it paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Justice Department selects the lawyers and we pay them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does this cover the amount that will be paid with regard to the cancellation of the leases in the northwest?

Mr. BRODEUR. It would come out of this.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As long as these leases are cancelled it would be cheap at the money.

Canadian fisheries exhibit, $16,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the usual vote?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Oyster culture, $10,000.

Mr. JAMESON. We want some statement as to what has been done.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to oyster culture the question of jurisdiction is still pending as between the government and the different provinces. The provinces claimed that they had the right to issue leases for oyster beds within the three-mile limit. The federal authorities contended that this power was vested in the federal authority. However, the question is going to be submitted to the courts. In the meantime we have reached a modus vivendi with the maritime provinces by which leases may be given for oyster beds in the barren places. The matter is almost concluded. There are still some negotiations going on, but the principle has been adopted and I expect that in a few days the order in council will be passed to give effect to the settlement.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the term of the lease the department will grant?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is likely to be twenty years, and the amount will likely be $3 per acre.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to ask the minister where Captain Kemp is prosecuting his inquiries and making his experiments.

Mr. BRODEUR. He made some experiments last year in Richmond bay. He started a bed there and it is our intention to have him do the same thing in the two other provinces.

Mr. JAMESON. Some years ago Captain Kemp planted some oysters in the Annapolis basin, off Goat island, and there was a brief reference to his work when he was before the committee with respect to the matter. At that time he stated that he had not made any examination of the bed since, that a light keeper had been placed in charge of it, that no report had been received at the department since then, and he was not in a position to say in what state it was, or whether the oysters had grown or not. I would like to ask whether any report has been received since that time, whether the minister is in a position to state what the condition of the bed is and what the result of Captain Kemp's work is.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the oysters were planted at Annapolis at the place which my hon. friend has named and after a couple of years when he went there he could not find much trace of the oysters.

Mr. JAMESON. He did not go back in a couple of years.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. He stated in his evidence before the committee that he did not go back.

Mr. BRODEUR. He went back last year.

Mr. JAMESON. That is seven years after the bed was planted.

Mr. BRODEUR. He was there two years after it was planted. That is the information I received just now. It was found that unfortunately there was not much left. However, he believes that it would be a suitable place for oysters to be planted.

Mr. JAMESON. I understand that there was a suggestion made—I do not know whether by Captain Kemp himself, or some one else—in conversation with some person who was interested in this question, that the oysters had been taken by local persons and used in the usual way. If the department would instruct Captain Kemp to see that another bed was planted there and would look after it we might have some results from his work. I am told that there

is a very good ground along there and also in St. Mary's bay, and a part of the Bay of Fundy, for the growth of oysters, and I hope the minister will see that this person does a fair share of his work in various parts of the maritime provinces and does not confine his operations to Prince Edward Island where, I understand, he has been working of late.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the intention to plant another oyster bed this year in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. Last year it was in Prince Edward Island, but it is the intention to have it in other provinces.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.17 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 5, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

QUEBEC BRIDGE, SERVICES OF MR. COOPER.

*Mr. LENNOX:

1. How often, before construction was actually commenced, at what dates, and for how long on each occasion, did Mr. Cooper visit and remain at the site of the Quebec bridge?
2. The same information is asked in regard to the period when construction began and the collapse of the bridge?
3. What was the nature of the service performed by Mr. Cooper on each of these occasions?
4. Was Mr. Cooper at any time retained to act for or on behalf of the government or the Railway Department, in connection with the Quebec bridge? If so, when, how, for how long, and at what remuneration?
5. Did the government or department understand during the time the bridge was in course of erection that Mr. Cooper was inspecting engineer and having oversight of the work, and did the government or department during this period take any, and if so, what steps to ascertain whether Mr. Cooper was actually and regularly inspecting the work?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1, 2 and 3. Mr. Cooper was at the bridge site on several occasions during the summer of 1903, 1904 and 1905. He examined the site, south pier and other works and the plans and specifications.

4. He was appointed by the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company on May 6, 1900, with the approval of the government. He had no remuneration from the government.

5. He was not inspecting engineer, but consulting engineer, and most of his duties were performed in his office in New York and not in Quebec. Mr. Norman McClure was appointed inspecting engineer by Mr. Cooper some time before April, 1905, and he made weekly reports to Mr. Cooper as to the progress and condition of the work and an additional special report when something would occur requiring more prompt attention.

Mr. LENNOX. The expression 'inspecting engineer,' is a phrase which I got from the minister's statement the other night, in the House.

WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron):

Has the Department of Public Works expended the money voted during the last session of parliament for the construction of a clock in the tower of the government public building at Wingham? If not, why not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, on account of pressure of work during the past fiscal year, the tower clock for Wingham post office was not reached, but will be attended to as early as possible during the present fiscal year.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MR. J. W. GASKIN.

Mr. TAYLOR:

1. Was John W. Gaskin, foreman in the electrical department of the Intercolonial railway, Moncton, during the year charged with appropriating goods belonging to the Intercolonial railway?
2. If so, what quantity and what was the nature of the goods he was charged with appropriating?
3. Was an investigation held in connection therewith? If so, what was the outcome of the investigation?
4. What was the date of his dismissal, if he was dismissed as a result of the above charge?
5. Was any restitution ever made by Gaskin of property said to have been stolen by him?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No charge was made against John W. Gaskin of appropriating goods belonging to the Intercolonial railway.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. No investigation was held.
4. He was not dismissed from the service.
5. He was held responsible for having permitted the loading of a greater weight of scrap than was purchased and paid for by Harvey Gaskin, and he was punished by being compelled to pay $290.89, the value of this excess weight of scrap.

Mr. TAYLOR:

1. What amounts of scrap brass was purchased by one John W. Gaskin, foreman in

the electrical department of the Intercolonial railway, Moncton, while he was in government employ?

2. What prices did he pay for the same during the years 1906, 1907 and 1908?

3. Is the said Gaskin now in the employ of the government in the electrical department of the Intercolonial railway at Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No scrap brass was sold to John W. Gaskin, foreman in the electrical department of the Intercolonial railway.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. He is still in the employ of the electrical department of the Intercolonial railway at Moncton.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MR. JOHN T. HAWKE.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Has Mr. John T. Hawke, proprietor of the Moncton 'Transcript,' any special right or privilege to make use of the freight sheds of the Intercolonial railway at Moncton for the storage of his newsprint rolls?

2. Is the government aware that Mr. Hawke has been, as alleged, making use of the said freight sheds for years without paying one cent of demurrage for the above purpose?

3. Why is the said Mr. Hawke forced from time to time to pay demurrage on small parcels of light weight, when at the same time he is said to be continuously blocking the Intercolonial railway freight shed with bulk newsprint rolls that weigh from 700 to 900 pounds each, in quantities sometimes that would constitute an entire carload?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Mr. Hawke has no special right to make use of the Intercolonial Railway freight shed. He receives about nine carloads of paper per annum, which he unloads immediately on arrival taking a part to his newspaper office. The balance is left for a short time before being removed.

2. As stated in answer to No. 1 space has been occupied but it did not in any way inconvenience the public or the railway.

3. He is treated exactly the same way that all other patrons are treated in regard to small consignments. The freight shed has never been continuously blocked or even any inconvenience caused by the paper being held.

G. W. BELL AND PASS INVESTIGATION.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Did the linesmen of the New Brunswick Fence Company travel on the Intercolonial railway from point to point, while doing construction work, on passes, with the consent of the railway officials?

2. Is it true that Mr. G. W. Bell, who reported on the pass investigation to the Honourable the Minister of Railways, obtained the greater part of his information from Dr. Chas. A. Murray, of Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.

2. No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—DISMISSAL OF BLAIR MAGEE.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

Was Blair Magee of the electrical department of the Intercolonial railway dismissed? If so, for what reason?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Blair Magee of the electrical department of the Intercolonial railway, was suspended in April, 1909, for neglecting his duties. He was not formally dismissed, but he does not appear to have asked to be reinstated.

SUSSEX STREET DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

Mr. THORNTON:

1. From whom are the properties bought on Sussex street on which it is proposed to erect the new government buildings, and how much was paid to each of the persons from whom the properties were bought?

2. What was the total cost of the site?

3. Did the government buy the buildings with land? If so, have the building been sold, and what total sum was obtained for them?

4. What did the site for the new Museum building at the foot of Metcalfe street cost?

5. What was the total cost of the new Museum building?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1.

Estate R. R. Dobell	$10,000 00
W. M. Dobell	19,000 00
R. C. Episcopal Corporation	19,000 00
W. P. Renaud	8,000 00
Mrs. L. de St. Just-Dion	11,000 00
F. X. Lemieux	5,600 00
F. McDougall	46,500 00
V. Olivier	6,100 00
J. Olivier	10,000 00
John Cuzner	17,000 00
The Caldwell Estate	18,000 00
Toronto General Trust Company	45,000 00
Rideau Lumber Company	6,000 00
Chancellor, Diocese of Ottawa	80,000 00
Thomas Egleson	13,750 00
Marie Elizabeth Laviolette	5,250 00
Rev. Canon Campeau and Mrs. Lapointe	6,700 00
Margaret Hayes	20,000 00
Sabina Murphy	20,000 00
C. and F. Proderick	19,000 00
J. G. Warnock	33,000 00
W. C. Wills for Estate Wills	18,000 00
E. G. Laverdure	40,000 00
D. V. Ranger	17,000 00
Uldéric Léger	3,000 00
Rodolphe Léger	3,000 00
Rosina and Harry Condon (Award)	17,500 00
W. R. Goulden	10,600 00
Egleson, Mrs.	9,200 00
Inglis property	60,000 00

2. $608,915.87.

3. (a) In almost all cases, (b) the work of tearing down buildings and selling materials is now in progress; (c) proceeds of sale to date $2,147.15.

4. $75,000.

2. $597,200.

OVERCROWDING IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. SPROULE:

What branch of the Postmaster General's Department is located in the basement of the Langevin Block, how many employees occupy offices there, how long have they occupied these offices, what are the sizes of the offices, and how many employees are in each room?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. (a) The Postal Stores Branch, and the Stamp Branch.

(b) 47 in the Postal Stores Branch and 3 in the Stamp Branch.

(c) Since the year 1889.

(d) See statements below.

(e) See statements below.

Size of rooms occupied by Postal Stores Branch in basement of Langevin block and number of employees in each room:

No. of Room.	No. of Men.	Size of Room.	Occupied by stores, cupboards, &c.	Free Air Space.
		cub. ft.	cub. ft.	cub. ft.
1	4	12,380	7,825	4,555
2	14	8,910	2,970	5,940
3	4	3,600	1,800	1,800
4	....	2,430	All stores.	
5	2	2,430	1,000	1,430
6	3	2,430	490	1,940
7	....	2,430	All stores.	
9	....	2,430	"	
10	3	2,430	650	1,780
11	....	2,430	All stores.	
12	....	2,430	"	
14	3	3,825	1,000	2,825
19	....	2,430	All stores.	
21	2	2,430	700	1,730
27	12	10,710	2,690	8,020

In addition to the above, one room in the basement (No. 13) is occupied by three employees of the Stamp Branch for the purpose of checking, racking and distributing therefrom the bulky items of the postage stamp issue, such as stamped envelopes, post cards, post bonds, &c. The size of the room in question is 19 feet 6 inches in length by 11 feet 6 inches in width and 8 feet 6 inches in height.

2. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY

3. The matter is engaging the attention of this department.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—DISTRICT C.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Why is it that only about 28 per cent of the work under contract No. 12, District C, Transcontinental, has been executed, and when will it be completed?

2. The same inquiry is made as to contract 16 D, where less than 13 per cent has been done?

3. Why has the work not been commenced on contracts 13 C and 18 E, when will the work be commenced, and when will it presumably be completed?

4. Is there any other of the twenty-one upon which work has not been begun?

Mr. GRAHAM: 1, 2 and 3. The reason why only about 28 per cent of the work on contract No. 12 has been executed is because all supplies, material and plant necessary for the prosecution of the work have to be taken in from the east, and until contract No. 11 was far enough advanced to admit of this the work could not be started on No. 12.

Contract No. 13 is in the same position, and until work is further advanced on No. 12 work on No. 13 cannot be commenced.

Contract No. 16 is in the same position which is dependent on work done on contract No. 15, so as to admit of transportation. As to contract No. 18, work has been commenced and up to February 28, 1911, 69·40 per cent of the contract had been done.

It is impossible to state exactly when any of these contracts will be completed, but it is estimated that they will all be completed in 1912.

4. No.

AGRICULTURAL EXPENDITURES IN ONTARIO.

Mr. BLAIN:

1. What amount of money has been expended by the Department of Agriculture within the province of Ontario during the last fiscal year?

2. What amount was paid in salaries and wages?

Mr. FISHER :

1. Expenditure, $605,527.53.

2. Salaries and wages, $445,503.11.

RECIPROCITY—ADMISSION OF OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. BLAIN:

Will oleomargarine be admitted free into Canada under the proposed tariff agreement between the United States and Canada?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask the Minister of Agriculture when a return with regard to methods of taking the census in various countries will probably be brought down.

Mr. FISHER. I could at once lay on the table a return giving the information for England, the United States, France and Belgium, but the officials are trying to obtain information with regard to Germany and one or two other countries. If my hon. friend likes, I will bring down the partial return to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A partial return of that kind would be desirable, and it could be supplemented by the further return to which the minister alludes.

QUEBEC BRIDGE—CONTRACT FOR SUPERSTRUCTURE LET.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House that the contract for the construction and erection of the superstructure of the bridge to span the St. Lawrence river, near the city of Quebec, was to-day duly signed and executed.

The straightening out of the difficulties surrounding this undertaking has been a work fraught with much anxiety, and not a little industry. The undertaking was such a vast one that the engineers engaged on the board fully realized that every step should be made only after the fullest investigation. Differences of opinion arose between these able men which were altogether of a technical nature, and could only be understood by men with a theoretical knowledge and practical experience in bridge building.

The original intention, and in fact the scheme contemplated until very recently, provided for roadways, street railway traffic, as well as steam railway tracks. The majority of the board, after full consideration, recommended the acceptance of the tender of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, upon a design of their own, which included provision for street railway and driveways. In doing so they called attention to the fact that another design had been submitted by the same company for a purely railway bridge. By the adoption of the latter proposition, it was pointed out that a very material saving could be made.

The government fully considered this suggestion and, as a result, the contract has been signed with the St. Lawrence Bridge Company for a railway bridge which will also have two four-foot sidewalks. The cost of this will be, at the estimated quantities, $8,650,000.

There has been deposited with the government, as security for the carrying out of this project $1,297,500, or 15 per cent of the contract price.

The stock-holders in the Dominion Bridge Company of Montreal, and the Canadian Bridge Company of Walkerville, Ontario, organized the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, but in addition to the last named company signing the contract, the two parent companies, the Dominion Bridge Company, and the Canadian Bridge Company, have guaranteed the carrying out of the work.

Considering the very many difficulties that have surrounded this entire project I am of the opinion that the very best possible contract has been made, and fully believe that these purely Canadian companies are competent to accomplish the task they have undertaken, and that the result will be a credit not only to Canada, but to the ability of the men at the head of these great industries.

As the province of Quebec contributed $250,000, and the city of Quebec $300,000, to the original bridge scheme, as subsidy for the construction of the roadways, it is but fair that these amounts should be returned.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister inform the House as to the time for completion mentioned in the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall lay a copy of the contract on the table in a couple of days with all the particulars.

RECIPROCITY—CONTINUED PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTIES

Mr. JAMESON. Does the government intend to continue the payment of fishing bounties to Canadian fishermen in the event of the reciprocity agreement going into effect?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have to pay them under the law now in existence.

Mr. JAMESON. Would the payment be continued as heretofore in the event of the reciprocity agreement going into effect?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not see why it should be discontinued.

Mr. JAMESON. Will it be possible for the United States authorities to pay a similar bounty to American fishermen if this agreement is ratified?

Mr. BRODEUR. That would be for the United States authorities to decide.

Mr. JAMESON. Was this subject of bounties to Canadian or American fishermen discussed by the commissioners of Canada and the commissioners of the United States at the time this agreement was being prepared, and was it understood

that a corresponding bounty or any bounty was to be paid to the United States fishermen, or that no such bounty would be paid to United States fishermen by the United States in view of payment of our bounty?

Mr. FIELDING. I have already stated in answer to the question of another hon. gentleman that nothing was understood; there are understandings in this matter, there is nothing but what is to be found in the agreement itself, and that which cannot be found in the agreement has no existence.

Mr. JAMESON. If the United States choose to pay a bounty to its fishermen after the ratification of this agreement it can do so, so far as any agreement is concerned?

Mr. FIELDING. I can only say that there has been no understanding or agreement on the subject. All these matters would have to be discussed if they arose, but there has been no understanding on the matter at all.

WATER-CARRIED FREIGHT.

Mr. LENNOX. In his annual statement on the railway situation on March 10 last, the Minister of Railways and Canals pointed out the increased value of water carried freight. He was asked if he could distinguish between freight which originated in Canada, and that which was of American production, and the minister intimated that some subsequent time he would endeavour to give that information. When are we likely to get it?

Mr. GRAHAM. So far as possible that division is made either in the report of the railway board or the statistical branch.

Mr. LENNOX. It might be possible, by the exercise of a great deal of labour and ingenuity, to ascertain it, but I understood from the minister that, by means of the staff at his disposal, he would furnish the House with that information. Does he say now that he will endeavour to do so?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. LENNOX. The other night the hon. minister said he would furnish information as to the actual supervision over the Quebec bridge and the amount that had been paid for such supervision. Will he also bear that in mind?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I gave the information at the time that only one man was employed at $75 or $70 a month.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not understand my hon. friend to give that as a final answer. There was just this one man which he mentioned that night, and apparently that is the only supervision which the government have over the Quebec bridge.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is not warranted in drawing that conclusion. He asked me what men were the department paying for, who were employed on the Quebec bridge, and I thought he was endeavouring to get at the amount which has been paid out on account of that undertaking. But there is other supervision, every detail as to which I gave the other night. These others are regular departmental officers who are not paid specially for their services in connection with the Quebec bridge.

Mr. LENNOX. But these have no actual supervision or inspection of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. I explained the details the other night and every word will be found in 'Hansard.'

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When does the minister expect the bridge will be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. In reply to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), I said a few moments ago that I would lay a copy of the contract on the table in a few days.

FISHERY OFFICERS—VICTORIA, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries what progress is being made with a return ordered nearly two months ago for a list of the fishery officers in the county of Victoria, N.S.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was brought down a few days ago.

Mr. MADDIN. An hon. member tells me that he has a record of its having been brought down the 24th of March, but I have been unable to get possession of it, although I called at the office where these reports are kept and asked for it on one or two occasions.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course I am not responsible for that. As soon as returns are brought down they are in the possession of the officers of the House and not in our control.

Mr. MADDIN. One or two instances which have come under my personal observation emphasize the importance of giving notice to the one who moved for the return when that return is brought down. There would then be no such confusion as has arisen on several occasions this session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax), The best way to accomplish that would be this. Let there be in the distribution office a number of printed forms which would require only a word or two to be filled in. Then,

as soon as a return comes in, let the officer in charge send out one of these forms to the member who moved for it.

ANGLO-JAPANESE COMMERCIAL TREATY.

Mr. FOSTER. I saw an announcement in the paper this morning that the Anglo-Japanese commercial treaty has been signed. Has the right hon. the Prime Minister any information as to where Canada stands in relation to that treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. Canada is for the present not included in that treaty, but the question is under consideration as to whether we may desire to be included in it or have a separate arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. When may we expect a copy of that treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. As soon as received, I shall be happy to lay it on the table. Whether we should adhere to the English treaty or have a treaty of our own is under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the government makes up its mind, does it intend to advise the House as to the nature of the treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. So soon as the British treaty becomes public property I shall lay it on the table. As to what action will be taken by the government, that is another matter.

Mr. FOSTER. But before laying it on the table, the government might decide whether to adhere to that treaty or not, and my question is whether the government will take that position before consulting the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to lay it down as a principle that the government should not do anything in these matters without first coming to the House. At present I have no objection but would not like to lay down the rule that the government should submit such matters to the House in advance.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply asking for my hon. friend's opinion in this matter which is of special interest.

Mr. FIELDING. Inasmuch as a special case might make a precedent for a general rule, it would be well that I should speak under reserve.

THE RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the attention of the Finance Minister been called to the fact that the United States government has recently established a publicity bureau and that this bureau is under the control of Mr. Champ Clarke and two other gentlemen and at present is especially dealing with the question of reciprocity. Some of the issues of this publication which have already come out have dealt with important phases of that question. I would ask the minister if he would be good enough to obtain copies of that publication while this reciprocity matter is being discussed so that we may have the advantage of using it.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to promise to open up any negotiations with Mr. Champ Clarke.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not necessary that the minister should enter into negotiations with Mr. Champ Clarke or any official of the United States government. All that is necessary is that he should apply to the publishers for a sufficient number of copies to supply the members of this House.

Mr. FIELDING. I have reason to believe that all the public documents of the United States are received in our library and are open to every hon. member.

Mr. LENNOX. I have inquired at the library, and this publication has not yet arrived there but I presume that ultimately it will. One copy in the library however, is not sufficient for all the members of this House. We have a right to this document and it is our duty to study it in order to arrive at a proper conclusion, and let the people know that we are speaking by the book. I assume it would not be unreasonable to request that the government should take steps to supply the House with a sufficient number of copies, but of course if the government refuse to do so, I shall endeavour to procure a copy for myself.

Mr. FIELDING. Any intimation given the librarian that additional copies of any public document are required would no doubt be received by him and he would endeavour to meet it. If the hon. gentleman will mention the matter to the librarian, I am sure he will get the copy he desires. If it would suit him better that I should convey his message, I have no objection to do so.

THE BANK ACT.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to ask the government what they propose to do about the Bank Act, which has been mentioned many times in the House? I ask because I observe that the Bill has been on government orders since the 15th of December last, without any steps whatever having been taken, so far as I am aware. That is a period of nearly four months; and during that time this Bill might have been under consideration by the Committee

on Banking and Commerce, to which it is usual to refer such a measure. I would like to inquire whether it is the intention to proceed with the Bill this session or not. If it is the intention, I would ask what is the reason of this delay of four months?

Mr. FIELDING. I assume that the hon gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax), was not present on the occasion, a few days ago, when precisely the same question was asked by another hon. member. I made a statement on the subject which will be found in 'Hansard,' and I think the hon. gentleman will find that I dealt with the exact point he has mentioned.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. PERLEY. On Monday last we had some discussion about statistics, showing the comparative prices of certain commodities in the United States and Canada which are absolutely necessary to a due discussion of the reciprocity agreement. The Prime Minister said that he would ask for some information on the subject. I desire to ask if the right hon. gentleman has secured that information?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I made some inquiries from Sir Richard Cartwright, but have not had an answer from him yet.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 155) to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: My object in moving the second reading is not to discuss the Bill. But representations have been made by several hon. members concerning the Bill, and it is understood that the measure should be referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries with a view to hearing interested parties. Immediately on the second reading, should it be agreed to, I will move that the Bill be so referred.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. BRODEUR moved that the said Bill be referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPROULE. This committee and some others were extra committees established a few years ago, but under our rules, no provision is made for sending Bills to them. I do not rise to say that I think it wrong to send Bills to this committee, but to call attention to the fact that we have standing committees to which Bills are sent. Bills relating to railways or canals go to the Railway Committee, those relating to banking or commerce go to the Banking and Commerce Committee, and miscellaneous private Bills go to the Private Bills Committee. If the rules were amended so as to provide that Bills relating to marine or fisheries could be sent to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, it would be regular.

Mr. BRODEUR. The rule that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) refers to, if I remember well, applies to private Bills, and indicates to which committee Bills of different character are to be sent. But, the House may send a public Bill to Committee of the Whole, or may refer it to a special committee or to a standing committee. I think that in this case it would be better to refer the measure to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, as it pertains to a marine matter.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—ACCIDENTS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. E. N. RHODES (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to a matter of serious importance as affecting a large number of people in Canada, those who have to travel by the Intercolonial railway. I refer to the large number of accidents which have happened on that road of late, accidents which have occurred with most disquieting frequency during the last few weeks. As a matter of fact, the condition has become more or less notorious. I do not think I can bring the matter to the attention of the minister and the House better than by reading two articles in a paper published in the province of Nova Scotia which has not been unfriendly to this government, and whose editor announces himself as being a supporter of this government. I quote from the Amherst 'Daily News,' of April 3, 1911:

> Only a few days ago, the 'News' chronicled two railway disasters on the Intercolonial railway, a collision at Evans' Siding and a run off at Londonderry Station. The accidents referred to tied up the traffic on the Intercolonial for several hours, endangered lives and destroyed much valuable property.
>
> Between last Saturday afternoon and Sunday evening there were no less than three more accidents on the Intercolonial. Kennedys's special jumped the track at Westchester Station. Ten freight cars were either totally or partially wrecked. the Maritime express bound west and the Canadian Pacific railway bound east had to proceed to their destination via the short line and Truro. The track remained blocked until yesterday morn-

ing, and No. 10 train, that is the Boston and Halifax express bound east, had also to reach Halifax via Oxford Junction, Pictou, New Glasgow, Truro. The wreck was of so serious a character that auxiliary trains were sent from Moncton, Truro and Stellarton to relieve the situation.

Yesterday, too, at Memramcook, Smith's special jumped the track and traffic would have been delayed if there were any trains running.

The chapter of accidents does not end here, however, another Intercolonial special ran off the track at West Bay, Cape Breton, on Saturday night and considerable damage to the track and rolling stock is reported.

These railway accidents are recurring week after week with monotonous frequency. Life is being threatened and public property is being destroyed. There must be some underlying cause for all these accidents and no time should be neglected in placing the responsibility.

Is the road undermanned? Are new rails and sleepers wanted? Is the rolling stock old and defective? Are the men careless or is the job of managing the Intercolonial too big for the Railway Commission? This can be said of a truth that in no time of the history of the Intercolonial were accidents so frequent as at the present time.

We cannot urge too strongly for our Maritime province members to bring this matter up in the House of Commons and to place the facts before the Minister of Railways and Canals and his deputy, Mr. Campbell. There is something rotten in the management of the Intercolonial.

It is very well to have a surplus, but down here by the sea we are not worried so much over having a balance on the right side of the books as we are in conserving lives and property. It is up to the Minister of Railways as the responsible head of the Intercolonial to order an investigation of the many and varied accidents that have recently occurred on the Intercolonial, and the heads of the men who are responsible for the same should be handed to him on a charger whether they occupy high or low positions. Numerous accidents mean inefficiency and inefficiency should be followed by immediate reform.

I find also in the same issue, the following editorial article:

Three more railway accidents occurred on the Intercolonial on Saturday and Sunday.

The accident record which the Intercolonial is establishing is simply damnable and should not be allowed to continue.

Is it possible that with a view of making a good financial showing necessary repairs on the road have been neglected? Is it possible that the number of operators have been so reduced that it is hardly safe to run trains from one station to another? Are the men on the Railway Board competent to fill their positions? Are the engines and cars tested and kept in such a condition as to warrant their use in active service? It is time that Honourable Mr. Graham and Deputy Minister Campbell should step in and order an investigation. The discharge of a brakeman or the suspension of an engineer will not satisfy the public. Our own opinion is that the Intercolonial railway is undermanned, that the roadbed has become impaired, and that rolling stock is sent out that should be in the repair shop. We may be wrong, but of this there can be no doubt, that there is a radical cause for the multiplication of accidents, and the cause should be found and the remedy vigorously applied.

It is rather peculiar that this should be the result, in view of the fact that it was a matter of more or less notoriety a few weeks ago, that there was a dispute between the traffic manager of the Intercolonial and the superintendent, which, according to the rumour at least, involved the resignation of one of these gentlemen, pending the settlement of the dispute. The subject at issue was as to whether the traffic manager had sufficient men to maintain the rolling stock of the Intercolonial railway in repair. The Intercolonial railway has in times past been the subject of much criticism, because it was felt that it did not meet the traffic requirements of the country which it serves. There may be some question as to that; but we must all agree upon this point, that it is the duty of the Minister of Railways and his department to have a thorough investigation into the conditions which at present exist on that line, and that a remedy should be applied, so that people who travel upon what is called 'the people's railway,' will not do so with misgivings as they do at present.

Mr. GRAHAM. I had not heard anything at all about the difficulty with the traffic manager; it is news to me, and is probably merely a rumour. I suppose there is no railway in the world that is run so much by rumour as the state-owned railways in this country. I do not admit that there is a greater number of accidents on the Intercolonial than any other railway. If the records are looked into, I think my hon. friend will find that that is so. As to the undermaning of the line, it will be found, I believe, that a greater number of men have been employed on the road this year than for some years past. It is true that we are handling much traffic at the present time, and the liability to accident increases with the volume of traffic. As to the rails and sleepers, nearly 700,000 new ties were placed on the Intercolonial this year, and a greater sum than for some years past was spent on the maintenance of the road. This much must be borne in mind—I am not saying it complainingly at all—it has always been the case, ever since I was old enough to read about the Intercolonial, that an accident on a state-owned railway gets a scare line heading in the newspapers, while an accident on a company railway gets two lines down in a corner, unless there is loss of life on the railway. On railways where the

company owns the telegraph lines, there are thousands of accidents that are never heard of; but when an accident occurs on the Intercolonial it is given great prominence. I am not complaining about that; it is accounted for by the fact that it is a state-owned railway. I venture to say that on the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific railways, outside of accidents where loss of life occurs, there have been scores of accidents within the last few weeks about which the newspapers have not had a syllable, and they are just as great as accidents occurring on the Intercolonial that have prominent headings in the newspapers. No one can deplore an accident as much as the man in charge, and the head of the railway department feels more anxiety about these than any single individual can. As a matter of fact, before this article was written, and before my hon. friend had made his speech, I discussed this question of accidents with the chairman, and it was immediately taken up by the board, who are making full inquiry to see if there is not some way by which the number of accidents can be reduced. But after saying that, I still adhere to the statement that there is no greater number of accidents on the Intercolonial, that it is not undermanned, and that it is not in bad condition. There is one point I wish to mention, and when hon. gentlemen are discussing the subject I would like them to bear it in mind, that when complaint is made about purchasing goods on the Intercolonial by tender, probably that applies to axles, wheels and tires, and as my predecessor before me, so I myself, have refused to abide by the rule which says that he must accept the lowest tender for those goods. Great complaint has been found with the department by members of this House whose friends had appealed to them complaining that when they wished to sell some of these goods to the Intercolonial they were passed over, and a better grade of goods was bought. Several of the accidents this year, I am told, have been caused by broken axles, a broken tire or wheel. I do not say that they were of that cheap quality; but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that it is false economy to buy a cheap article of that kind. When we are discussing these matters in supply, hon. gentlemen will find that we have adopted a policy of buying the best article we can find for that department, though costing considerably more money, for a broken wheel or a broken axle in an accident, to say nothing of the loss of life, can destroy more property than ten times the difference betwen a cheap axle and a good one. I may say to my hon. friend that we are making the fullest inquiry, and are very anxious to have the minimum number of accidents. I still maintain that we do not have any greater number of accidents on the Intercolonial than occur on any other railway doing the same amount of business on the same mileage, although ten times as much publicity is given to accidents on the Intercolonial than is given to those on any other railway on the continent of America.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is there an official record of all the accidents on all the railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then cannot the minister give us the figures to establish the statement he has made?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are in the report of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). Mr. Chairman, on rising to address the House at this late hour of this very important debate, I can assure you that I do so with considerable diffidence, occasioned largely by the fact that the matter has been so thoroughly discussed on both sides of the House, and especially by the fact that the speech delivered by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), and the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), make it almost impossible for me to add anything new in behalf of the position I intend to support. However, on account of the great importance of this question to the country, I cannot allow this debate to close without expressing my opinion, and giving a reason to the House and to my constituents for the vote I intend to cast on this matter. From the broad standpoint of what is best for Canada as a whole, and I believe that is the proper standpoint from which to discuss this question, I hold that this pact is bad, and well calculated to destroy very much that we have accomplished during the last thirty or forty years in building up this magnificent Dominion of which we are so proud. The class of people that this pact purports to benefit, namely, the farmers, I believe are the very men that will be the worst hit of any class in Canada.

I believe this pact is bound to work injuriously to the farming classes of this country. The agreement creates free trade in nearly everything that the farmer produces and admits the United States farmers and the farmers of some fourteen other countries into the markets of Canada, while the same privileges are denied to the farmers of Canada in these other countries excepting the United States.

Therefore, our farmers are practically put up against the competition of the world. Everything they produce is open to world-wide competition, while on everything that the farmer buys, such as farm implements, wagons, wearing apparel, everything that he consumes that is imported, even the tea he drinks and the sugar that he sweetens it with, he is still compelled to pay a high duty. That is what the government asks and expects the members of this House to accept and support, and that is what the government calls a good thing for the farmers of Canada. It is a gold brick that the government is handing out to the farmers, as great a gold brick as that which the government handed out to the farmers, and which the farmers, unfortunately for themselves, accepted in 1896 when the Liberal party seeking office, pledged the farmers to eliminate every vestige of protection from the tariff if it were returned to power, and promised the farmers free implements and a reduction in the expenditure. Everybody knows how the government never implemented its pledges. I think the present proposition will prove a more serious drawback to the farmers than even the ignoring of the pledges it gave to them in 1896.

This is a jug-handled arrangement with the jug full of Canadian possibilities placed in the hands of the natural competitors of the farmers of this country. I have failed to see any reason why the government is asking this House to accept a proposal of this kind at this time. Reciprocity between the United States and Canada was a dead issue for many years. In 1891 the Conservative party declared against any further attempts to secure a reciprocal arrangement with the United States. In 1897 and 1898 the right hon. gentleman who leads the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took the very same position, and declared against any further advances to secure reciprocity. Speaking in 1898 the right hon. gentleman made this statement:

Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself would have given many things to obtain the American market, but thank heaven these days are past and over.

Ten years afterwards, at the Imperial Conference in London, he made this statement:

There was a time when we were wanting, reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negatived. We have said good-bye to that trade, and we now put all our hopes on the British trade.

Later on, in 1909, in this House, the right hon. gentleman said:

Canada has opened her doors to Great Britain in the hope that she would ultimately receive similar preferential treatment from the mother country.

We have had three general elections since these hon. gentlemen came into power. In 1900 the question of reciprocity never was mentioned during all that long campaign. In the campaign of 1904 reciprocity never was mentioned, never was heard of. The people of Canada took it for granted that it was a dead issue, and that both parties had come to the conclusion that they were to turn their backs on any reciprocal arrangement with the United States. In 1908 we had another general election, and reciprocity was not mentioned. So, it is safe to say that for fourteen years it was taken for granted that the question was a dead issue in Canada. It has not been mentioned by any public man in any public way, and the people of Canada naturally took it for granted that the question was dead. Therefore, I think I have a right to say that the government had no mandate from the people to enter into this pact. The government, on account of that fact, have no right to ask this House to accept this proposed agreement until they give the people of the country an opportunity of declaring for or against it. Those favourable to this arrangement never tire of telling us that Sir John A. Macdonald favoured reciprocity. They do not tell us, as I said a moment ago, that the Conservative party under the leadership of Sir John A. Macdonald, declared against any further advances to secure reciprocity. Nor do they tell us that the right hon. gentleman who leads the government took the very same position. However, Mr. Speaker, these references to the past efforts of statesmen, some of them dead and gone, and to the past efforts of the right hon. gentleman, I hold, have no real bearing upon the matter before the country.

What was desired twenty-five or thirty years ago, and what might have been beneficial at that time might easily, under the changed conditions we find in Canada to-day, prove disastrous and ruinous to the country. In those days we were simply feeling our way, a few scattered provinces along the boundary line of the great Republic. We had no great transcontinental line binding the Atlantic and Pacific provinces together, we had no great interprovincial trade, ten times greater than our foreign trade, we had no great west as we have to-day, we had no great home market which consumes fully eighty per cent of nearly everthing which the farmer produces, we had not developed our foreign trade, we had no steamship lines plying to the Orient, Australia, New Zealand, South America, and the West Indies all carrying the products of Canadian industry. Reciprocity might have been of some benefit before these great strides forward had been taken by Canada. But, under the present conditions, I hold that the proposed pact is not

in the best interests of Canada, that it is calculated to undo much that we have accomplished during the last thirty or forty years.

The proposed pact, to my mind, is inopportune. We occupy a very different position from that which we occupied twenty-five or thirty years ago. We are not concerned so much about the past; it is the present and the future that we are elected to legislate for, and in view of the bright future looming upon the horizon of this young country, I have no hesitation in saying that if this pact is adopted it will prove disastrous to the hopes and aspirations of the people of Canada. Let us for a few moments look at what we have accomplished during the last 30 or 40 years which makes this pact undesirable to Canadians to-day. In looking over the trade statistics, I find the following figures showing the immense growth of our trade from 1868 to 1910:

	1868. $	1910. $	Increase. $	Per Cent.
Total trade	116,000,000	649,000,000	533,000,000	459
Exports	49,000,000	279,000,000	230,000,000	470
Imports	67,000,000	370,000,000	303,000,000	450

Between 1868 and 1910 our exports increased as follows:

	1868. From	1910. To
Produce of mine	$ 1,225,000	$ 40,000,000
Produce of fisheries	3,000,000	15,000,000
Produce of forest	19,000,000	47,000,000
Animals and their products	7,000,000	54,000,000
Agricultural products	13,000,000	90,000,000
Manufactures	2,000,000	31,000,000
Value total field crops last year		533,000,000
Value total manufactures (estimated) last year		1,000,000,000

The figures, Mr. Speaker, demonstrate clearly the wonderful progress Canada has made, and the wonderful prosperity Canada enjoys to-day. Then why ask us to leave the well-beaten path that was blazed out by the Conservative party in 1878 and travelled on by that party up to 1896, in which the foundations of Canada's greatness were laid deep and strong, on which has been built the magnificent Dominion as we have it to-day. In view of the prosperity of our country, in view of the position we occupy in the eyes of the world, why come before this House with a proposition of this kind which is not thoroughly digested, and on which the people of this country have not been consulted? I say that it is the duty of the government, before asking this House to agree to this reciprocity arrangement with the United States, to give the electors of this country an opportunity of declaring whether they are in favour of it or not.

Mr. BRADBURY.

Now, just for a moment let me direct your attention to a few facts regarding the transportation phase of this question, which will emphasize the undesirableness of this proposed agreement:

	1867.	1910.
Miles of railway	2,240	24,731
Railway earnings	$12,000,000	$174,000,000
	1879.	
Tons of freight carried	8,000,000	74,000,000
Passengers carried	6,500,000	36,000,000

The growth of our banks is shown by the following figures:

	1868.	1910.
Bank capital, including reserve fund	$30,000,000	$184,000,000
Bank deposits	33,000,000	925,000,000

In face of these facts, can any fair minded man say that we have not reason to be proud and well satisfied with the wonderful progress made, and the great prosperity enjoyed by the people of Canada to-day? We have developed a great interprovincial trade and a great home market that consumes fully 80 per cent of everything our farmers produce. This great and ever increasing home market was made possible by the operation of the National Policy of 1878 which the present government have been wise enough to adopt, in practice at least, which accounts largely for the prosperous condition Canada is in to-day.

Now, I want to refer for a moment to what Canada has spent on railways and canals, to show that this pact, if entered into, threatens the destruction of much that we have accomplished during the last 30 or 40 years. The Dominion government has spent in cash on railways and canals $440,000,000, the provincial governments $38,000,000, and the municipalities $18,000,000, or a total of nearly $500,000,000 in cash which the people of this country have provided for the building of our canal and railway systems. In addition to this the provincial governments have guaranteed $130,000,000 of railway bonds, and the Dominion government has given something like 55,000,000 acres of land for railway construction. And, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to provide nearly $100,000,000 for the completion of the Transcontinental railway; we are pledged to build the Hudson Bay railway at a cost of $20,000,000 or $30,000,000; and the construction of the Georgian Bay canal will cost at least another $100,000,000. All these great undertakings are absolutely necessary for the carrying trade of this growing country, provided that that trade is not diverted to the south, as this proposed pact threatens to divert it. Now, why have the people of Canada spent all these hundreds of millions of dollars if not for the purpose of developing our independent routes of transportation on our own soil and through our own waters, and thereby building up on this northern half of this

continent a British-Canadian nation independent of the great republic to the south of us, and for the further purpose of encouraging and developing our interprovincial trade between the east and the west? This has been done at enormous cost and sacrifice to the people of Canada. And now, when the sun of our success is almost at the meridian, and we have developed a nation independent of the great republic to the south of us, who have not always been as friendly disposed to Canada as they would make us believe they are to-day, our government is preparing by means of this pact to hand over to that country the control of a great part of our traffic from the west. The government proposes an agreement which, if adopted, will, I believe, make nugatory our years of labour and sacrifice in developing the greatest system of inland waterways in the world, and in building our Transcontinental railways and the feeders to them in the different provinces, like a vast network from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

And now at one blow this government threatens to divert the great trade of the west, south over American railroads to American cities to help to build up Americen centres, to assist in building up great American milling centres, to the destruction of our own milling centres, to the detriment of our own railways, and of our own country. If this compact is implemented I am satisfied that it means the diversion of over one-half the trade from the Pacific and western provinces south over American railroads. This means giving employment to hundreds of thousands of American citizens who ought to be employed in Canada; it means giving the carrying trade to American railroads after the large expenditure we have made to build our own railroads. It means that our wheat and the products of the west will reach Liverpool, the market of the world, in American instead of in Canadian or British bottoms. This surely was not the intention of the right hon. gentleman when he came before this House in 1903, and proposed the construction of the National Transcontinental railway. He was then in such haste that he could not wait for an investigation; time would not wait. Surely there must be some greater reason than we know at the present time for the change that has come over the hon. gentleman's dream. I find that the right hon. gentleman in proposing the construction of the Transcontinental railway used this language in this House:

> Such is our duty, it is immediate and imperative. It is not for to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late; heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels, and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land. Upon this question we feel that our position is absolutely safe and secure; we feel that it corresponds to the beating of every Canadian heart. Now, sir, we lay it down as a principle, upon which we are to be judged by friend and foe, that we are to have a transcontinental railway, that its terminus must be in Canadian waters, and that the whole line, every inch of it, must be in Canadian territory. We say further that such a line is a necessity of our commercial independence.

If the question was so urgent in 1903 is it not more urgent to-day? Was the right hon. gentleman in earnest when he made that speech? Did he himself believe in the warning he was giving to this country that if this road were not built trade might be diverted to American channels, to this very vigilant foe who was looking for our trade? Does the hon. gentleman imagine that that competitor is not as vigilant to-day as in 1903? If the right hon. gentleman did believe that statement at that time and was in earnest, what has changed his mind? The great undertaking he was then introducing is yet incomplete, and will not be completed for some years. Its completion will involve the expenditure of another hundred million dollars. Yet in the face of all these facts the right hon. gentleman, and his government propose a policy that every school boy familiar with the geographical position of the west knows means the diversion of a large amount of our trade over southern routes. What has caused that change of policy? I would say to the great men in front of me, as has been said to other great men: consistency, thou art a jewel. But it is a jewel very seldom worn by the right hon. gentleman opposite. This proposition means great and far-reaching injury to our national transportation system, and stamps this government, to my mind, as incompetent to deal with great national affairs that require experience and diplomacy and good judgment.

This compact strikes a deadly blow at some of our interests in this country. It strikes a cowardly blow at our market gardeners and fruit-growers, many of whom, without one moment's notice have been wiped out of business. The right hon. gentleman, and the Minister of Finance last session, in answer to a petition which I had the honour of filing, from the market gardeners of Manitoba protesting against the removal of this duty, stated that nothing would be done until an investigation was made. Later on the right hon. gentleman during his tour in the west gave the same pledge to the farmers of the west that no change in the tariff would be made until a thorough investigation was made, and in this House the right hon. gentleman made this statement in the early part of last session:

I stated that we would have a commission of investigation before we undertook a revision of the tariff. Does any member on the other side of the House take issue with the promise I make. Would any of them advocate rushing into a revision of the tariff without previous investigation. Honourable members laugh at that but they will not dare to say they would favour such a course.

In the face of all these promises, and without one word of warning to the market gardening interests of this country, I think I am within the mark when I say that the right hon. gentleman with one stroke of his pen has wiped out one-half the prospective profits of the market gardeners of this country, and destroyed entirely the other half of this great industry.

I have here a letter which I received yesterday from one of my constituents, a market gardener, which I wish to place on record. It reads :

Dear Mr. Bradbury,—I am writing you to find out what is the prospect of this reciprocity business being put through this session.

By the press there does not seem to be much doing in the matter at present; but the very prospect of the thing being put through has paralysed if not already killed out the market gardening business in this district. I hear of about 40 or 50 from Kildonan alone who are going out of the business at once this spring.

I can give my own personal experience of how the thing already is affecting business in this district. As you know, I have one of the best places for a market garden that is to be found between Winnipeg and Selkirk. It is now in the best condition possible; fall ploughed, with all necessary out-buildings, and with many additional conveniences, such as telephone, sidewalk from the main road, and splendid car service, which we had not last year.

A year ago or more, I merely hinted that I might rent it last season, and people from all over the country were after it. I was bored to death by people who wished to get it, even although I had not decided to give up working it myself. Now, on account of some heart weakness, I am forbidden by my physician to carry on the work, and have decided on no account to work it myself.

For the past two months I have the place placarded with 'To Rent' notices, besides advertising in every other way. Now, I have so far failed to get a person to take hold of it, and the reason given in every case was that if this treaty business was put through they would be wasting time and money if they would rent a place.

This is signed by Robert Macbeth, one of the most prominent farmers and market gardeners living in Kildonan municipality. It speaks more loudly than anything I can say to show the effect this proposed pact is going to have on the great market gardening industry of Canada. The market gardeners and farmers of Canada are too intelligent a class to be fooled long; and once they grasp the true meaning of this dangerous agreement, they will wreak their vengeance on the government which negotiated it. This agreement makes free every thing the farmer produces while maintaining a high protective duty on everything he requires, such as implements and machinery of all kinds. There is no lack of protection to the manufacturers of this class of goods. The farmers of Canada, I am satisfied, cannot be hoodwinked very long with a proposition of this kind. They want no special favour. If it be good policy to have free trade in farm products and put the farmer up against the competition of the whole world, as this pact proposes to do, it ought to be at least a fair and equitable policy to have free trade in what the farmer requires and thus put the manufacturers in the same position as the farmers. I say that the present proposition is an unfair one. It places the farmers in an unfair and false position. It is class legislation. While purporting to legislate in the interests of the farmers, you are legislating entirely in the interests of the highly protected manufacturers to the detriment of the farmers. No one sided arrangement such as this can be imposed on the farmers when they get to understand its true meaning.

But the government had an opportunity of meeting the wishes of the farmers of this country. I find that the United States were willing to meet our government half way or more than half way, by including in this pact free farm implements and a number of other manufactured articles and in this way acceding to the request of the farmers' delegation which came to Ottawa. I find that the President of the United States, speaking at Atlanta, made use of the following language:

When we entered upon these negotiations, I asked the Secretary of State and his commissioners to offer free trade in everything, but this Canada could not grant us because she has a protective system and was afraid of competition with our better organized industries.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who said that?

Mr. BRADBURY. President Taft. This matter was brought before the House by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) and the Finance Minister replied as follows:

That statement may be entirely correct, and I have no doubt it is, as to the instructions which the President gave to his officials, but as to what actually occurred in the conference the matter did not advance to a position which would enable these gentlemen to make such a formal offer in that way. At the very earliest stage in the negotiations——

See how careful our Finance Minister was to take care of the manufacturing interests.

—we certainly gave them to understand that we could not undertake to have any free trade in manufactures, speaking generally. There are certain articles which are on the free list and which were not the subject of discussion, but speaking generally, we gave them to understand that we were not prepared to deal with them on the basis of free trade in manufactures. That circumstance was clearly expressed by us at the beginning and no formal offer such as that suggested was ever made.

Yet the statement is no doubt substantially correct as to the willingness of the President of the United States.

A few days afterwards the question was again brought to the attention of this House by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell). He drew the attention of the right hon. gentleman to a speech delivered by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). Speaking at a meeting composed largely of the manufacturing class the hon. gentleman is reported to have said:

With regard to reciprocity, he noted that very little had been heard about the consumers interest. He did not believe that the reciprocity agreement being negotiated would affect the prices to the consumer adversely. That might seem strange, as it was supposed the farmers would get better prices. He could not see that the manufacturers would be touched very much, as few articles manufactured in Canada were affected. He was sure the Bain and Woodstock wagon companies would compete in the world's market even with a 2½ per cent reduction in the tariff.

I think he is quite right.

He thought the manufacturers opposed reciprocity because of what might follow, the thin edge of the wedge, but he had been assured——

This is what I want to emphasize.

—by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding that nothing of the sort would follow. They had gone as far in the farmers' interests as they would.

I am not going to read all of this, but here is the right hon. gentleman's reply:

The statement made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was quite consistent with our policy. It was nothing new and he had perfect authority, not only he but every member on the Liberal side, to make that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance authorize the hon. member in question to make that statement?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have answered that already. It is perfectly true. The hon. member for North Oxford and every Liberal member had such authority, he was not kept in ignorance of our policy in this matter and knew it well. He only stated what is our general policy.

That is a fair, frank avowal of the position of the government. That is not the position they take before the farmers of this country.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is he, and is the Conservative party to which he belongs, in favour of free trade in agricultural implements?

Mr. BRADBURY. I can only say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller), that when the leader of the opposition is placed on the other side of the House and charged with the duty of directing the legislative policy of this country, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller), will find where we stand. There is no question about the position the government occupies. The government had an offer from the United States to give to the farmer that which they were asking for, that which brought them down in hundreds this year to wait upon the government in this chamber. They asked the government for reciprocity in natural products and in manufactured articles, they asked for free farming implements. But what does the government do? They do exactly as they did in 1896, they gold-brick the farmers of this country. They give the farmer reciprocity in natural products, putting him up against the competition of the world. They talk of extending the farmer's market and make a great deal of this ninety million market that is to be opened. But do not the government realize that for every farmer in this country there are twelve on the other side who are anxious to take our market from us? I do not believe, I cannot believe, that the government entered into this pact with their eyes open. I believe they were led into a trap. And I believe that the means used to drive them into that trap was the Payne-Aldrich maximum tariff. The President of the United States threatened to enforce that maximum tariff and induced the government to send down the Minister of Finance, and, I think, one other to Washington a year ago. When the American government got these gentlemen in Washington, everything was easy. These gentlemen were no match for the shrewd diplomats they met on that occasion. I am satisfied that when the president expressed such feelings of sympathy for Canada he allayed any feeling of doubt that might have been in the breasts of Canada's representatives and that they came back feeling that the American people were very friendly and that any proposition they made for reciprocal trade relations would redound to the benefit of this country. Now, this changed attitude on the part of the United States and of President Taft as compared with that of the American people during the last forty or fifty years, in discussing trade matters with Canada, is very significant. It is

following out the advice of Senator Sherman, who gave the following advice in 1888, when a very similar question was under discussion:

Now, Mr. President, taking a broader view of the question, I submit if the time has not come when the people of the United States and Canada should take a broader view of their relations to each other than has heretofore seemed practicable. Since the conquest of Canada by Great Britain in 1763, she has been a continuous warning that we cannot be at peace with each other except by political as well as commercial union. Canada should have followed the fortunes of the colonies in the American revolution. The way to union with Canada is not by hostile legislation, not by acts of retaliation, but by friendly overtures. This union is one of the events that must inevitably come in the future. The true policy of this government then is to tender freedom in trade and intercourse, and to make this tender in such a friendly way that it shall be an overture to the people of Canada to become a part of this Union.

This is the advice which President Taft has taken to heart, and to-day he comes to us with a smiling face and offers our government conditions that we could not secure ten or fifteen years ago when the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), sought it and received the rebuff he did when he went to Washington in 1897. Senator Sherman went on:

Instead of any such mad course as retaliation, the path really open to us is one that will quietly, peaceably and forcibly defeat the whole project of discrimination against our goods. Canadian reciprocity is, in our judgment, the only road of safety and profit now open to us.

Then, we find the President of the United States, speaking on this question a very short time ago, declaring as follows:

They are coming to the parting of the ways. They must soon decide whether their markets are to be isolated by a perpetual wall permanently, or are we to be commercial friends. Should we not now, therefore, before their policy is too crystallized, too fixed for change, meet them in a spirit of real concession, facilitate commerce between the two countries, and thus increase the natural resources available to our people.

Why does the President of the United States advise the government of his country to make conditions with Canada? Not for our good, but for the good of the American people; there is no question about that. President Taft is evidently following the advice given in his time by Senator Sherman. They realize that they cannot force Canada into commercial union or annexation by hostile methods such as they have tried time after time during the last fifty or sixty years. Now, they come to us with a sunny smile; they are to win us by concessions; they are to induce this government to enter into this pact which is simply the thin end of the wedge and, as Mr. Taft says, might well mean 'the parting of the ways.' I find that Mr. Beveridge, another very prominent man, whom we had the honour of seeing in this chamber only a few days ago, made use of the following language.

There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbour. That policy already has driven American manufacturers across the Canadian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workmen to supply trade. That capital should be kept at home to employ American workingmen to supply Canadian demands. We should admit Canadian wood pulp and Canadian paper free in return for Canada's admitting our agricultural implements, our engines, our pumps and other machinery free. We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada freely admitting other American manufacturing products to Canadian markets.

Then Mr. Henry Whitney, a very prominent gentleman in the United States, says:

If we were to admit Canadian grain free of tariff charges, much of it would stay with us for home consumption; a portion would go through our ports to foreign lands.

Then, a little further on:

New York and Boston and Portland are the natural outlets for the foreign trade of eastern Canada, St. John and Halifax are twice as far from Montreal as New York or Boston or Portland. The Canadian Atlantic ports are not to be mentioned in competition with the American Atlantic ports for passenger business . . . . The elevators for storing and handling Canadian grain should be located on this side of the line, and the steamers of the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Pacific should, in the winter time at least, find their home port in New York, or Boston, or Portland. And if, under a reciprocity arrangement or otherwise, the farm products of Canada were admitted free of duty, the Canadian government would be friendly, instead of hostile to the use of American ports for Canadian business.

Then he stated in another part of this article what might be the political effect of the establishment of freer trade and social relations between the United States and Canada, which, he said:

Is a problem that had best be left to work itself out in the years to come. It is quite possible, indeed I think it is quite likely, considering the number of questions of domestic and foreign policy which might arise under such a condition that the two nations would in the end become politically one. But, he says, that would be a long way in the future if it ever came to pass at all.

This shows clearly the tendency of the negotiations, and to my mind is proof of the fact that the hon. gentlemen who went

to Washington to negotiate this pact fell into a cleverly conceived trap, and that the Payne-Aldrich tariff was the instrument used for that purpose. Now, Sir, I need not refer to the public pronouncement of the great men on the other side of the line, what they really believe will be the result of this reciprocal trade policy, if it is adopted. Mr. Champ Clarke made that clear in the House of Representatives when he stated boldly that he believed this would lead ultimately to the flying of the stars and stripes over every foot of territory on the northern part of this continent. That was a bold statement to be made by a man so prominent in American politics as Mr. Clarke. It is common talk on the streets in the great American cities that if this reciprocity treaty becomes a fact it is only a question of time until we become part of the great American union. But, Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that the British sentiment in Canada is too strong ever to permit this government to lead Canada into any such trap as that.

Now I wish to refer for a moment to a phase of this question which affects the western provinces more than it does any other part of Canada, and that is the question of wheat. There has been a great deal said in this House and in the newspapers to the effect that to the farmers of the west this reciprocity agreement meant an increased price for the wheat products of Manitoba and other great western provinces. For thirty years or more the United States, especially Minnesota and Dakota, held first place in the markets of the world in the production of wheat, both in quality and quantity. But during the last fifteen or twenty years Manitoba and the other western provinces have been gradually but surely forging to the front, until to-day we occupy the proud position of producing the best hard wheat in the world; and we are no mean competitors in quantity with our neighbours to the south, and with the other great wheat exporting countries. Last year we produced something like 150 million bushels of wheat in Canada, of which we exported 53 million. The United States produced last year something like 725 million bushels of wheat of which amount only 125 million bushels was hard wheat, hardly enough to supply home consumption, even when mixed, as it is, with the softer grades. The United States exported over 60 million bushels of wheat, nearly all of which went to Liverpool in competition with our wheat. They also exported 55 million bushels made up into flour, which went to Liverpool to enter into competition with our western product. That is an answer to the arguments that have been used on the other side of this House that there is a market for our Canadian wheat on the other side of the line. They are our natural competitors, not our natural market. They are producing and exporting twice as much wheat as we are exporting to-day. Now I am satisfied that if this pact becomes law, and the duty of 25 cents per bushel is taken off wheat by the American government—and it would be taken off any way, as has well been said—a large amount of our hard wheat would go to Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth and other great American points. This wheat will be carried over American railroads employing thousands of American citizens, building up great American milling centres, all at the expense of the Canadian people, at the expense of our own railroads, on which we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, and at the expense of the great home market that Canadian farmers enjoy to-day. And, Sir, perhaps worse still, our wheat will find its way to Liverpool in American ships. Our shipping interests will suffer nearly as much as our railways. Every bushel of Canadian wheat that goes through American ports will go through American elevators, and it can be mixed, and will be mixed, with American soft wheat to raise the grade of their wheat; it will be ground into flour in that mixed condition, and will enter into direct competition with our western wheat, tending to lower its grade and lower its price in the Liverpool market. Now let us see what Sir Geo. Ross says on this question. This is a gentleman that our friends opposite used to swear by, and used to like to quote as one of the ablest and most eloquent men in Canada. I am proud to say that he is patriotic enough to cut himself loose from his party on this great question, which he realizes will affect adversely the best interests of Canada. Sir Geo. Ross says:

> We must not forget that the mere exchange of certain articles may involve a great deal more than appears on the surface. For example, to abolish the duty on wheat on both sides of the line looks fair, but to accept an offer of that kind pure and simple would, in my opinion, be a poor bargain for Canada. I believe that the longer the American tariff of 25 cents a bushel on Canadian wheat is maintained the better for us—Canadian wheat has now a distinct place in the British market; if the market of the United States were freely opened it would be impossible to maintain its identity in passing through American elevators, and Canada would be the loser to the extent of any reduction in price.

He goes on further:

> A similar observation will apply to flour. Manitoba flour with rare exception brings a higher price on Mark Lane than any American brand. Who could vouch for the genuineness of this brand if American wheat moved freely across the border. The poorer qualities on the south side of the line would be fortified by the products of Canadian mills, and the better qualities on the north side

would be deteriorated by mixture from the south. Such an interchange would be throwing away all the advantages we possess from the great wheat belt of Manitoba and the west.

There is no question that Sir George Ross sized up the situation in a nutshell when he made that statement. That is exactly what is going to happen. Any intelligent man who knows anything about the conditions in the west, who knows the close relationship with St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth, who knows the condition of the wheat trade on the other side of the line, must realize that the statement made by Sir George Ross is absolutely correct and that what he says will surely happen if this pact goes into force.

I have also a statement from the Hon. Philander C. Knox, one of the gentlemen who was clever enough to lead the hon. gentlemen who went from this side to the American side, into the trap that they have been led into, and to send them back home to lay this proposition before parliament, a proposition which, if implemented, in my mind, means the putting back of the hands of the clock, impeding of the wheels of progress that have been set in motion and making nugatory much that we have accomplished in the last forty or fifty years by enormous efforts and expenditures on our part. Mr. Knox is speaking to the farmers on his own side of the line and he says:

In providing for free wheat we also take into accounts the facilities which the United States possesses for handling a part of the surplus of Canadian crop and thus preventing the demoralization of prices which results through the dumping of large quantities upon the European markets, where the world's price is fixed.

Where the world's price is fixed! That is absolutely true, and I would like my hon. friends from the west to keep that in view in speaking in this House, and not hereafter to attempt to make the farmers believe that this pact means an increase in the price. The price is fixed at Liverpool:

The free admission of grain from Canada thus meets the present situation and provides against future contingencies when the Canadian surplus becomes greater by placing the control in the hands of our own grain growers.

That is the situation in a nutshell. It means the placing of the control of the wheat in the North American continent in the hands of the American trusts. He goes on to say:

They have no cause to fear a demoralizing influx under the conditions which will result from the reciprocity agreement.

Mr. BRADBURY

Now, to show the effect that the Americans themselves think this pact is going to have, let me quote a little from the 'Northwest Miller.' The 'Northwest Miller' says:

The disposition of Canada's surplus is a question upon the answer to which depends the future, not only of the milling interests of the (American) northwest, but indeed of the United States. Should this surplus be shipped abroad, it must inevitably mean the destruction of the American export trade, the shifting of the American milling centre, the gradual decline of the American milling interest to a purely domestic basis, and its ultimate retrogression . . .. The miller who is able to grind this enormous (Canadian) crop will be the miller of the future; and, where he is, there will be the great mills of the world.

Mr. Chairman, that is the position exactly. The miller that controls Canadian wheat is the miller of the future. The country that controls our wheat is the country where the large milling centres of the world are going to be placed. If this pact goes into force and our wheat crosses the line, which it is bound to do under this pact, the great milling centres of the world will be in the United States. There is no question about that, and the 'Northwest Miller' is candid enough to point that out to its own people. We have had in this House several quotations from statements made by Mr. J. J. Hill, a man who seems to know what he is talking about, one of the greatest business men in the western states, and I also want to give a quotation from Mr. Hill. He replies to the attack of a North Dakota farmer:

St. Paul, Minn., Feb. 23—Discussing an attack made upon him through a letter from a North Dakota farmer, read in the United States Senate, Tuesday, Jas. J. Hill, of the Great Northern Railway said: 'The pending reciprocity treaty before Congress is the most important this country has had before it since the civil war. If, after having Canada waiting for years, they turn her down again, our country will suffer, and one of the hardest hit of our industries will be that of wheat raising. England is waiting and watching for just that thing to happen. Within the fortnight Austen Chamberlain had called up for decision in the British parliament the measure providing an Imperial federation for England and her colonies. Suppose that Canada joins the imperial federation of English colonies, as is proposed. A reasonable differential that England must impose upon our wheat, would be 15 cents a bushel, and that would mean our wheat-growers would find their whole product lowered that much per bushel in value. Great Britain take over practically all of the $200,000,000 in round numbers that Canada now pays us for manufacturing articles, then add the six hundred and more millions we export to Great Britain, and we find that, if we fail to adopt a reciprocity agreement with Canada and drive it to an imperial federation we are cheapening our wheat crop annually, say, 15 cents

per bushel, and at the same time we are losing $800,000,000 of export business to England and Canada.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a candid confession that if this reciprocity arrangement is not put into force Mr. Hill sees the possibility, and, I hope, the probability of a British preference in favour of our wheat which would give the Canadian farmers absolute control of the British market. This is the policy that the right hon. gentleman and his government ought to have bent all their energies to secure—a preference in the British market for our wheat that would place our farmers of the west in a position superior not only to the American farmers, but to the farmers of any other part of the world outside of the empire. Mr. James J. Hill fears that if this pact is not implemented the British government may well see its way clear to give us a preference of 15 cents a bushel, which, as he points out, would reduce the value of American wheat in the British market and put the control of the wheat trade absolutely in the hands of the Canadian wheat-grower. Surely this means a great advantage to our Canadian and western wheat-growers. It is a matter that the wheat-growers of western Canada want to take into consideration while listening to the eloquent speeches which will be delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite to convince them that this pact is a good thing for them. They want to realize that they are closing the door to imperial preference as soon as they agree to implement the pact before the House. You are putting in the thin end of the wedge, dividing the east from the west, assisting in building up the trade of the American republic to the south of us, diverting the trade of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, to the western states, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Chicago, diverting the trade of Ontario to the state of New York, and diverting the trade of Quebec and the maritime provinces to the state of Maine and other states.

If this pact is implemented, our great interprovincial trade is going to be interfered with very materially, a trade that is eight or ten times greater than all our foreign trade, and that has been built up by the people of Canada by great sacrifices, and the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. Secretary Knox, speaking, not to the Canadian people, but to the American people, points out clearly that this pact means that the United States will control the whole situation by getting control of our wheat. This means that American mills, American railways, American steamship lines, and American cities will all reap the reward that belongs to Canada, and the Canadian people. Our grain is to go to create great milling centres which will employ hundreds of thousands of men in the United States, instead of going over our own railroads, and our own shipping lines, through our own canals, building up our own milling centres, and employing hundreds of thousands of Canadian citizens, and thus adding to our Canadian home market of which we are all so proud. Mr. James J. Hill points out clearly that this pact, if implemented will have no influence in increasing or diminishing the price of wheat to the Canadian farmer, or the American farmer. He says:

Now, wheat is a world-wide product. Wheat is produced in large quantities in many countries, and the price of wheat in the world is made by the surplus of all wheat-producing countries selling to those who have to buy in order to supply their people with bread. Liverpool is the great central market of the world. And I don't care where you go on any grain exchange, in every current report in your newspaper, you will find Liverpool a penny or a half-penny up, and in a few minutes it has advanced or fallen correspondingly in our market here. I don't care if the market over the shipping point, if the market itself, as it is frequently in Minneapolis, is higher than you could ship to any European country, still the market is affected actually and equally, instantly affected, by the reports of the market in Liverpool. And if we are shipping, as we are, 50,000,000 bushels—and it used to be 150,000,000 bushels—50,000,000 bushels a year of surplus that goes to Europe, tell me, in God's name, what a 25 cent a bushel protective tariff has to do with the price of that wheat when the price of your entire crop is made by the surplus that is sold to the other fellow? Bear that in mind all the time, and that's the main fact, that will decide who will be elected. Talk about the difference in price between Minneapolis and Winnipeg, and that it is going to ruin the farmer in Minnesota, what difference does it make to the man in Liverpool whether that wheat went out through Duluth, Minneapolis or Port Arthur when it goes to Liverpool. He does not care. It is the price in Liverpool that makes the price, not only on what we sell to Liverpool, but the price of our entire crop. That's a well established commercial law, that price of the surplus that is sold makes the price for all.

That is the position that is taken by every man on this side of the House, and by every man in the west who knows anything about the wheat question. The price of wheat is determined by the price in the Liverpool market. There are times when the price of wheat is eight or ten cents a bushel higher at one point in the United States than at another, simply because of the local demand; but that has nothing to do with regulating the price. This wheat question is one of the greatest questions that Canada has to deal with, and if we are going to allow our wheat to be diverted to the other side of the line, we are going to destroy our milling interests; we are going to prevent the building up of the

greatest milling centre in the world, which we should have in Canada, and which we will have if we retain the control of our wheat. The 'Northwest Miller', the chief organ of the American flour and milling trade, published at Minneapolis, says:

Bountiful nature has placed at the very threshold of this country a natural wheat field the like of which has never before been known since the world was made. This magnificent source of supply, a mighty empire in itself, produces glorious wheat of unrivalled quality. Its possibilities are difficult to over-estimate. The land was created for wheat raising. This area can and will produce sufficient wheat to keep American mills supplied to double their present capacity. The future of American milling with free Canadian wheat is a grand one. With this enormous and steadily increasing crop flowing into the mills and elevators of the States, a splendid tide of activity and prosperity would follow in its wake. Assured of their future supply of raw material, the mills of America would go forward on their developing course, continuing the march of progress which has brought them to the front. New mills would be built, and capacities enlarged. New markets abroad would be sought and conquered. The returns from this renewed and extended activity would be felt in increased commercial prosperity. American railroads carrying the flour from the mills would secure additional freights; American banks would obtain increased deposits and greatly enlarged exchange accounts; American mill operatives would be in demand, and pay-rolls would be increased; mill machinery, bags, barrels and other mill supplies would be required in larger quantities; more money would be in circulation; and the benefit would be felt in every artery of industrial life touched by milling. There would be an increase in grain firms, in elevators, and in every branch of the grain-handling and flour-making interests. This would be felt in the added value of (American) real estate and in the solid and substantial development of every undertaking and enterprise that makes a community prosperous.

This indicates that the American milling interests are looking forward to building up their cities, increasing the value of their real estate, increasing the value of their railroads, all at the expense of Canadian wheat growers, and the Canadian people. The 'Northwest Miller' states that the United States milling trade has reached a crisis, and if the effort to capture the Canadian supply of raw material free of duty now fails, the American mills will suffer severely, or else have to move to Canadian soil. It goes on to say:

The disposition of Canada's surplus is a question upon the answer to which depends the future, not only of the milling interests of the American northwest, but indeed of the United States. Should this surplus be shipped abroad, it must inevitably mean the destruction of the American export trade, the shifting of the American milling centre, the gradual decline of the American milling interest to a purely domestic basis, and its ultimate retrogression to a comparatively unimportant place in the list of large American industries.

This indicates exactly what the American millers expect. This seems to me to be a well laid scheme to get control of the wheat of our western country, and if this parliament, and the people of Canada are foolish enough to enter into a compact of this kind they are simply depriving themselves of a great source of wealth which they enjoy to-day. We are asked to agree to this pact, to agree to build up great milling centres on the other side of the line, to create trade for American machine shops, to increase the value of American real estate, to improve the condition in general of the United States, to improve their railways. Are the farmers of Canada ready for a change of this kind? I think not. I think that when the opportunity comes, if the government has the courage to take the plunge and give the farmers of Canada an opportunity to pronounce upon this subject, the farmers and the people of Canada will relieve the hon. gentlemen of all further responsibility.

A phase of this question which has not been dealt with to any extent is the competition to which this pact exposes the wheat growers of Canada. I find that the agreement includes not only the United States, but twelve or fourteen other great wheat exporting countries. I may say that the whole exporting world in natural products is included in this pact, and is given free access to our markets. For instance there is the Argentine, one of the most prosperous countries in the world. That country exported last year 106,000,000 bushels of wheat. Russia exported 70,000,000 bushels of wheat, Australia exported 32,000,000 bushels of wheat, the United States exported something like 124,000,000 bushels including flour; in all about 332,000,000 bushels of wheat is exported by our competitors, by the nations to which this pact opens the door of our home market. A large amount of this foreign wheat can be laid down in Montreal or Vancouver for one-half the freight rates charged on wheat from Regina to Montreal. The rate from the Argentine is about 5½ cents a bushel. Labour in the Argentine, according to the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Lemieux), is about 64 cents a day without board; our wheat raisers in the west pay their men all the way from $30 to $60 a month. So I have no hesitation in saying that if this pact goes into force the Canadian wheat grower will lose the home markets in the eastern provinces and even, in part, of Ontario. Ontario is not growing enough wheat to-day for its home comsumption. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island do not grow enough wheat, they have to get wheat, and flour from other

parts of Canada. British Columbia is in the same position. We are opening the doors of the home market of the farmers whom we have protected and encouraged during the last 20 or 30 years. You are opening the door to the nations that can come into the Canadian market, and undersell the Canadian wheat grower. When the wheat growers of the Northwest come to realize what this pact means they will have their eyes opened so wide that no man who dares to advocate the adoption of this reciprocal trade policy in the west will be able to get a hearing twelve months from to-day.

The question of barley also effects the west. On this question a great deal has been said in and out of the House, and no other phase of the pact has been so unfairly dealt with and so misrepresented. Some Winnipeg papers and farmers papers which are in favour of this pact tell the farmers of the west that barley is worth 90 cents in Minneapolis and 45 cents in Winnipeg. They do not tell the farmers that they are quoting high grade malting barley in Minneapolis and St. Paul and feed barley in Winnipeg, two different barleys altogether. I have here a comparative statement which gives the average price of barley across the line and in Winnipeg. The United States crop of 1909 was 170,284,000 bushels. The United States exported, in 1908, 6.580,000 bushels. The average price to the farmers of the United States was 55·2. It is only fair to assume that that average price includes all the malting barley with the feed barley. In 1909 Minnesota raised 31,600,000 bushels of barley. The average price obtained was 46·6 cents. North Dakota raised 20,272,000 bushels. The average price was 43 cents. South Dakota raised 19,910,400 bushels, and the average price was 45 cents. The average price in the United States since 1899 has been as follows:

	Per cent.
1899	40.3
1900	40.8
1901	45.2
1902	45.9
1903	45.6
1904	42.0
1905	40.3
1906	44.5
1907	66.7
1908	55.4
1909	55.2

Now the average price in the city of Winnipeg for October and November was 46⅔ cents per bushel for barley. I would like to know where the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite comes in. I heard the member for Provencher say that if this were the only thing that this pact proposed to do he would be justified in voting for it, to give the farmers of the West a larger market for their barley. Every hon. gentleman who knows anything about this question is aware that the Americans produce 170,000,000 bushels of barley, that they exported last year 8,000,000 bushels while we are exporting only something like 2,000,000 bushels. I would like any hon. gentleman to tell me how he can justify the statements that were made that this is the natural market for our barley, a great nation producing ten times the amount of barley that we produce and exporting a great deal more than we export. They are our natural competitors and not our natural market.

But there in another phase to this question which I would like to impress upon the western farmer. Our Ontario farmers understand this question and have taken advantage of experience. At first glance, one might easily be led to believe that those who raise barley would be greatly benefited by this proposed agreement. But we will remember that in 1890, when President McKinley endeavoured to force this country into commercial union by his famous McKinley Bill—which was a token of the esteem the average American has for the Canadian—he put a duty of thirty cents a bushel on barley which was prohibitive. Our Ontario farmers were hit hard for a short time, as they had been in the habit of exporting all their barley to the United States, but only for a short time. The McKinley Bill turned out to be a Godsend for Canada. It opened the eyes of the Canadian people. It forced our government to seek foreign markets, and develop our home market, and make Canada what it is to-day. The hostile legislation in the United States from year to year has done more to stimulate the people of this country and make them independent and self respecting than anything else that has happened. In 1889 we exported to the United States about 10,000,000 bushels of barley. Then the prohibitive duty was put on by the American government. In 1891, on account of this prohibitive duty of 30 cents per bushel, we exported only about 200,000 bushels. Did our farmers in Ontario give up growing barley? Not at all. Why did they not, when their market was taken from them by this unfair McKinley Bill? That Bill made it impossible for us to export barley to the United States, but under the protecting wing of the National Policy, which was in the hands of skilful men, who knew how to use it, a great hog industry was built up in this country and encouraged. Our farmers began to feed their barley to hogs, and what was the result? They grew more hogs and cattle and made more money than when they exported their barley to the United States. In 1890 we sent 10,000,000 bushels to the United States, in 1891, under the McKinley Bill, that export fell to 190,000 bushels. In 1909 we produced 60,000,000

bushels of barley and only exported something like 270,000 bushels, but our farmers fed six times more to their hogs and cattle than they had ever exported up to 1909, and by doing so, they got a steady market for their barley, steady prices, and established a great growing industry, very profitable to themselves and the country. The production of hogs in Ontario in 1909 was $21,000,000. The report of the Agricultural College at Guelph gives some figures which are very interesting and instructive. It points out that from 3½ pounds of barley we make one pound of pork. The average price of hogs during the last five years has been about $7 per 100 pounds. 3½ pounds of barley will give one pound of pork worth seven cents per pound. That means about 96 cents a bushel for barley, and the enrichment of your farm by home feeding. That is an answer to the argument that it will benefit our farmers to export barley to the other side. The true policy of Canadian farmers is to make the manufactured article and not export the raw material. Let them produce fat hogs and cattle. By so doing they will build up in Canada a great hog industry, a great packing industry, and give employment to thousands of men on our railways, and be a source of revenue to every man in Manitoba. That is the true policy of the farmer in the west to-day. He should go into the raising of cattle and hogs, and feed his barley to them insetad of shipping it to the United States.

The raising of barley is placed in the very same position as the wheat industry. The farmer who wants to export his barley has to meet the competition of the other barley raising nations of the world. I find that the United States—that great market which is held out to our western farmers—exported last year 8,000,000 bushels of barley; Russia exported 80,000,000; Argentina, 21,000,000; Austro-Hungary, 8,000,000; Australia, 2,000,000. These five nations exported 118,000,000 bushels, yet these are the markets that this government is opening up to Canadian farmers. Why, we are taking down the gates to allow these nations to flood our market. This barley can be laid down, just as wheat can, for a freight rate of less than 5½ cents per bushel in Montreal, Vancouver or Halifax, and come into direct competition with every man who produces a bushel of barley in this country.

Another phase of the question which affects Canada is the cattle trade. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make us believe that this agreement means a great increase of prices for our cattle. Why, according to the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvel), we exported something like $10,000,000 worth of cattle last year, whereas the United States exported $18,000,000 that same year. What market then can we expect in the United States for our $10,000,000 worth? The United States exported also $16,000,000 worth of beef, $15,000,000 worth of canned beef, or nearly $49,000,000 worth altogether, while we exported only $10,000,000, and yet we are told that the United States is a good home market for our farmers.

I am just going to place on record the exports of the different nations. Australia exported last year 71,142,000 lbs. of frozen beef. They exported also 23,000,000 lbs. of canned beef. New Zealand exported 54,000,000 lbs. of frozen beef. Argentina exported 461,590,000 lbs. of frozen beef, also 25,615,000 lbs. of jerked beef and 14,000,000 lbs. of pressed beef, making a total of 649,000,000 lbs. of frozen and pressed beef. As against this, where does the Canadian market come in?—the Canadian market we have been building up and protecting for our own farmers, and that has made our farmers happy and contented. We open the door to every pound of that beef. We reduce the figure from 3 cents per lb. to 1¼ cents per lb. Under the reduced duty, that beef can be laid down in Montreal, Halifax, or Vancouver, for less than 7 cents per lb. all ready for the butcher's stall. Why, Sir, I cannot understand any set of men who pretend to legislate for the farmers of this country bringing down a proposition and asking the farmers to accept it which involves such conditions as these. In addition to the figures given above, the United States exported 182,000,000 lbs. of beef, and, as I said, $18,000,000 worth of cattle.

Now, consider the exports of mutton and lamb from some of these favoured nation countries;—and this is another industry which our farmers have been trying to build up but which has not received much assistance from hon. gentlemen opposite, for they have left the farmers without protection on their wool. Argentina exported last year 147,000,000 lbs. of frozen mutton; Australia, 116,000,000 lbs.; New Zealand 222,000,000 lbs.;—a total for these four countries alone of 485,000,000 lbs. of lamb and mutton. This meat can be laid down in Canada under the proposed arrangement for less than 8 cents per lb. Every one knows that if you go into a butcher stall to buy lamb or mutton you will have to pay 15 cents, 16 cents or 18 cents per lb. Where, then, will our farmer come in under an arrangement which brings this meat into Canada at less than 8 cents per lb? The exports of eggs and butter tell the same story. The butter exports from Australia last year were 56,000,000 lbs., from New Zealand 37,000,000 lbs., Argentina 8,000,000 lbs., Russia 112,000,000 lbs., Denmark 196,000,000 lbs., from Sweden 40,000,000 lbs., from Norway 3,400,000 lbs., from the United States

6,000,000 lbs., or a total from these countries alone of 458,400,000 lbs. The present duty on butter is 4 cents per lb., and even in the face of that duty some of these countries have been exporting butter into Canada. What will happen when the duty is taken off? What will be the result to our dairy interests of bringing all these countries into direct competition with them? Then, the export of eggs we find include the following: From the United States 6,000,000 doz.; from Denmark 32,000,000 doz., from Russia 215,000,000 doz., and from Sweden 3,000,000 doz.; or a total from these four countries alone of 256,000,000 dozen of eggs. The present duty is 3 cents per dozen, and in the face of that there has been an import, I think, of one or two million dozen. If this duty is wiped out, it will mean that millions of dozens of these eggs will come into competition with our own. Then, take our hams and bacon. Last year the United States exported 472,000,000 lbs, Denmark 210,000,000 lbs., Sweden 6,000,000 lbs.; or a total of 688,000,000 lbs., for these three countries alone;—and they are the only ones of the favoured nations the figures of which I have had time to gather; the government should have had this information ready to our hand, but I have had to find it as best I could. The present duty on hams and bacon is 2 cents per lb., and under this reciprocity pact it is proposed to reduce it to 1¼ cents per lb. Now, I would like to read a quotation from one of the secretaries of the Minnesota Branch of the National Reciprocity League:

> Our farmers should understand that in opening up our markets to Canada's national products, we are also getting a big market there for our natural products. We hear very much about how the agreement is inimical to the interests of barley raisers, but our attention has not been called to the fact that last year we exported 164,000 bushels of barley and paid thereon a duty of 15 cents a bushel. Canada removes this duty under agreement. Last year, our farmers shipped 7,680 tons of hay to Canada—and somebody paid a duty of $15,360 on that hay. Last year Canada bought 215,000 bushels of potatoes from us, and a duty of $43,000 was paid thereon. Of other fresh vegetables Canada bought from us last year $652,000 worth, and had to pay on them tariff taxes of $195,000. Canada bought from us last year several thousand head of cattle, 121,000 horses, 104,000 sheep and 25,000 other live animals, and a vast quantity of poultry, the total duties levied on which amounted to $175,000. All of these now go on the free list, and the Canadian market for them is to be untrammelled as the market in any part of the United States.
>
> While meats are not placed on the free list, the reductions offered by Canada are so sweeping that there must inevitably be an immense increase in our exports of such products to Canada.

In competition with whom? In competition with the men to whom the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues are holding out this gold brick and telling them that it will mean untold wealth for them.

Now, what does this proposition mean? The population of the United States is about 90,000,000; that of Canada about 7,500,000. That means that we have twelve American farmers to one Canadian farmer to enjoy the markets we have spent so much money to build up—twelve American invaders to one Canadian defender. It means a protected territory three times the extent of Canada, much of it highly developed, let into our home markets free. It means foreign population—(exclusive of the United States)—forty times the population of Canada furnished with free trade passes into the Canadian market. And every one of these nations living behind high protective walls. Our farmers cannot invade their market,—they have taken good care of that; but our government have taken down our walls.

Mr. PATERSON. What will be the effect in Montreal?

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister ought to know. He was there the other night.

Mr. PATERSON. I see the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is cheering.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the Minister of Customs will give the people of Montreal an opportunity, they will show him what they think will be the effect. What does it mean? Including the United States, with twelve favoured nations, it means one acre in Canada to four acres outside of Canada; it means one Canadian farmer matched against forty foreign farmers. That is the position the present government has placed our farmers in. They have matched one of the farmers against forty foreign farmers, including the farmers of the United States. And still they ask the people of this country to believe that this is a good thing for our farmers. As I told the hon. gentleman a short time ago, if he will give the farmers of Canada an opportunity within the next twelve months, they will give their answer in no uncertain terms, and the hon. gentlemen who have gone to the trouble to place Canada in this humiliating position, will find that they will no more be bothered by this question. Now how is our home market going to be affected?

Field crops for Canada for 1909 ..	$532,000,000
Dairy products..	100,000,000
Hay products, estimated..	45,000,000
Animals, estimated..	125,000,000
Total..	$802,000,000

That I think would be a fair estimate of the value of the home markets of Canada. I tried to get that question answered on

the order paper to-day, but the government apparently did not have the information, or did not wish to bring it down; therefore I had to make my own estimate, which I think is very fair. Now our total exports of the farm in 1909 amounted to $114,000,000; subtract this from the $802,000,000, and we have $688,000,000, as the value of the home market afforded by our own consumers, or eighty per cent of the total production of the farms. The proposed part opens the door of the farmers of the United States and of the other great exporting countries of the world, to this great home market of our farmers. For the sake of the twenty per cent exports, this agreement will destroy the farmers' market for eighty per cent of his products, in an effort to improve his market for the twenty per cent. Until now the farmer has found a ready market in Canada at good prices for all he produces, no question about that. It is therefore hard to understand what has impelled this government to rush into this proposed agreement at the present time.

In conclusion, let me say that what the farmers of Canada want, and what they ought to have, is not a reciprocal arrangement such as our friends propose to give them. What we ought to have in western Canada especially, is a government assisted cold storage system that will take care of the meat products all the way from the Rocky mountains to the Liverpool market. This would stimulate the meat industry, the cattle industry, and it would help our farmers to produce the finished article in our own country, instead of shipping our grass-fed cattle over to the Americans and allowing them to feed and to ship in competition with our own. The farmers of the west ought to have the Hudson Bay railway, they ought to have it built by the government, controlled and operated by the government, not built by the government and handed over to a private company as they did the Grand Trunk Pacific. The people of the west want a government owned and a government operated Hudson Bay railway. There is work, to my mind, for the Railway Commission to do. The farmers of the west are entitled, if I am rightly informed, to reduced freight rates over our Canadian roads. Give the farmers of the west cheap transportation, and you will solve any difficulties that exist in that western country. My opinion is that your Railway Commission ought to make a thorough investigation into the freight rates charged on all the transcontinental lines, and all lines operating between western and eastern Canada. Sir, the farmers who came down from western Canada in such large numbers a few months ago, did not want the proposition that the government are offering them to-day. They asked the government to give them reciprocity in natural and manufactured articles. The government are handing out to the farmers a proposition that they do not understand, I am satisfied of that. The farmers will understand it, they will understand before long that the proposition the government are offering to them threatens the destruction of their home market, threatens the invasion of their home market by foreign countries, threatens serious injury to our great transcontinental railway lines on which we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, and threatens beyond any question any future possibility of a British preference that the people of Canada are looking for.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this pact—I hope I have made that clear to the House.:

1. Because we are enjoying unparalleled prosperity under our present fiscal system.

2. Because hundreds of millions of dollars and the best efforts of our citizens have been invested in building up Canada as a nation, developing our agriculture, commerce, industries and finance; and the proposed reciprocal arrangement would tend to destroy our integrity and drain our resources into the United States.

3. Because our wheat, cheese and other commodities would lose their identity in the United States, our natural products would be exported without manufacture, our national railways would be deprived of trade for which they were created, our ocean and inland marine would be seriously crippled, our canal system and our lake, river, and seaports would be robbed of their commerce, while British and foreign capital would not trust itself in a country so unstable in its fiscal policy.

4. Because it would be unfair to our farmers to place them in open competition with the cheap farm labour of such foreign countries as Japan, The Argentine, Russia, Denmark, Norway, Hungary, Spain, Switzerland, and others, from whom Canada would receive no reciprocal advantage whatever.

5. Because it is unfair to place our market gardeners in open competition with the cheap black labour of the southern States, as is proposed by the pact.

6. Because all classes in Canada would have to pay tribute to the trusts and combinations which rule the prices of food and other commodities in the United States.

7. Because in the building up of our country we have made too many sacrifices, have struggled too long, have stood staunch in the midst of too many adversities, to be willing now, when the victory is won, and Canada is at the dawn of her 'century' to see a foreign people reap the reward of our work, courage, patience and loyalty.

8. Because our ambition is for a strong united British Canada, and our country is too vast, and our population too small, to permit of any policy which will tend to weaken the ties that bind our provinces together.

9. Because the parliament of Canada has no mandate from the people to make so radical a change in our commercial policy.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) who has just taken his seat, has certainly depicted a very blue-ruin condition of things for this country if it should happen to agree to the proposals made by the government. He has covered every argument that has been presented from the opposition side of the House on this question from the time that the resolutions were introduced up to the present. He has contended that all the progress of forty years, the investments of capital, and the development that has been made by Canada as a nation, will be absolutely destroyed by this agreement which we propose to enter into with the United States. I desire to say, Sir, that when the hon. member for Selkirk casts a reflection upon the enterprise and character of the people of this country in assuming that they are going to be affected by fair conditions of competition, I do not think that he speaks for the people of Canada. When my hon. friend suggests that this agreement is not in the interest of the farmers we are reminded that he sits as a representative of farmers, and we are reminded in the second place that the strongest representation that was made by farmers in favour of this proposition came from the great west that my hon. friend represents in this House. He argued very strongly that the competition which would be given the farmers of this country would destroy their interests. He contended that whilst the farmers had requested the government to give them a condition of free trade in agricultural products they had also asked the government to give them free trade in manufactures. I would like to ask my hon friend, and any one else who takes that position on the other side, if the government had brought down a provision for absolute free trade, as my hon. friend suggested, what earthly reason have we for supposing, in view of the arguments presented by hon. gentlemen opposite, that they would have been at all likely to agree to a proposition of that kind. But the astounding thing is that hon. gentlemen who contended so strenuously against a very small measure of free trade find fault with the government because they did not bring down an absolute proposition of free trade. That is an argument that is intended to affect the man in the west that my hon. friend thinks he represents, but when a sensible farmer in the west gets a portion of what he asks, and finds that opposition to that portion is manifested by these hon. gentlemen, he is not likely to put his confidence in them for a larger measure of the same commodity. The only guarantee that my hon. friend can give the farmers that he is sincere when he requests a larger measure of free trade is to support the measure of free trade that is already before the House. The only evidence that the voters in Selkirk can have that my hon. friend is protecting their interests, and that if he had a call to do so he would be in favour of everything they asked for, is to lend his influence, and cast his vote for getting something that they have asked for, and not support the party which is entirely against the proposals of these farmers themselves.

But, my hon. friend drew a doleful picture of the statement of Champ Clarke with regard to annexation, and he read pages of quotations from American statesmen representing their views as to what they thought might be the political results of this association. Well, Champ Clarke has as much right to say that this agreement is going to bring about annexation as hon. gentlemen have. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who is giving me his attention, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and several representative leaders on the other side and, by the way, my good friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), all said the same thing that Champ Clarke said. He has as much right as an American to say that as these hon. gentlemen have, and we are far more likely to expect that from Champ Clarke than from loyal, British subjects in this country who ought to know better. I do not expect anything different from Champ Clarke; the wish is father to the thought. I do not blame him a little bit if he wants to have a close political attachment to a great country like Canada, but I do wonder at my hon. friend and those who attach importance to his statements, and those who repeat this same statement, because their British instincts are not strong enough to stand a simple trade agreement with the United States, or to prevent their British affections from being diverted to that country.

I say that all the history of trade in this country, all the evidence of close affiliation by trade, social association, and every kind of connection between Canada and the people of the United States, have demonstrated the very opposite of the proposition that these hon. gentlemen are contending for in this House. If trade would make affiliations with the United States, then, we have had an increasing trade with the United States since the days of confederation. Who creates this trade between Can-

ada and the United States? It is not done by any machinery of government, it is not done by any proposals of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), but it is done by the citizens of this country, and we are reminded that whilst the citizens of Canada have constantly increased their purchases from the United States since the days of confederation up to the present time, there never was a time in the history of this country when the sentiment in favour of British institutions was as strong as it is to-day. I have studied the history of this country closely, I studied it closely before I came to Canada, studied its trade connections before I came here, and particularly since I came to this country, and I repeat the statement which I think I can prove that there is nothing in its trade or social or political history, that demonstrates the conclusion arrived at by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the results of this trade pact as between Canada and the United States it is absolutely contrary to the facts.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Mr. Chairman, at six o'clock I was making reference to a fatal weakness in the speech of my hon. friend from Selkirk, a weakness which has characterized the argument of every hon. gentleman who has addressed the House against the proposals under consideration. The House will notice that no regard was paid, in anything my hon. friend said, to the consumers of this country. He described the effect that this agreement would have on the market gardeners outside of the city of Winnipeg, but he had nothing to say as to how it would affect the interests of the great mass of the consumers in the city of Winnipeg. The same weakness has characterized every speech that has been made against these proposals. When we consider that seventy-five per cent of the people of this country are wage-earners, and when we consider that the value of that wage depends entirely on how much it will purchase of natural agricultural products which are necessary to the lives of these people, then it becomes an important question how far these proposals affect the cost of living in this country.

I want to make some reference also to some of the arguments presented by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat, and by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). While I come from the province of British Columbia, I regard this question as a national question, affecting the interests of all the people of this country; and while I recognize that these proposals may not affect all the interests of Canada alike, and may even partially discourage certain industries in this country under certain conditions, yet it is legislation in the interest of the whole country, and in order to get a correct view of its effect, it is necessary to see just how it affects the interests of the people of Canada as a whole. The hon. member for Kootenay and the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo confined their argument chiefly to the question, how far this agreement would affect the interests of British Columbia; but they never once mentioned the interests of the consumers of British Columbia. As a matter of fact, they confined their attention not merely to British Columbia, but to the application of this agreement to one single industry in British Columbia, namely, the fruit industry. Now, fruit production we of course all recognize as an important industry, and I will discuss that later on, I hope in the presence of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo. For the time being I want to consider a few of the arguments of the hon. member for Kootenay. That hon. member criticised the speech of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), saying that he wanted to prick some of the free-trade bubbles of that hon. gentleman. Everybody knows that the hon. member for Red Deer is quite able to defend himself; but there is involved in the points referred to by the hon. member for Kootenay a principle which I strongly defend, and which materially affects the conclusion of the House on these proposals. The hon. member for Kootenay criticised the reference made by the hon. member for Red Deer to Lever Bros., the great soap manufacturers of England, and made the statement that Lever Bros. were compelled by the Canadian tariff to establish their works in this and other protected countries. My hon. friend from Kootenay neglected to follow his argument to its natural and reasonable conclusion. He said that that firm had established a branch in Canada, and had created a home market for the farmer by employing a certain number of men to erect their buildings and carry on their business. But while we might admit that the existence of this industry in Canada benefits a few people, and while we are pleased to have any industry established in this country, we have to consider what effect, beneficial or otherwise, the existence of this enterprise in Canada has upon the consumers of this country. If the hon. member for Kootenay had followed his argument, he would have arrived at three conclusions: he would have remembered, first, that the capital which was invested by Lever Bros. in the soap business in this

country, was capital that was made in a free-trade-country; he would have remembered, secondly, that whatever their success was, it was due to and paid for by the consumers of this country, because as a matter of fact what Lever Bros. charge six cents for in England they charge ten cents for in this country; he would have remembered further that while this company exact from the consumers of this country half as much again in price as they get in England for the same article, the profits they make here go back to a free-trade country and are utilized in the development of their business there, under conditions of trade that are contrary to the principles for which my hon. friend contends.

The hon. member for Kootenay also made reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer on intensive farming in England, citing figures in his attempt to prove the depreciation of agricultural lands in England, especially in connection with the production of certain agricultural products. It is true that certain lands in England that used to grow wheat produce today the finest and greatest beef and mutton in the world, and I suppose the agriculturalists of that country understand exactly how to do their business and what kind of business to do in order to make a reasonable profit. The figures which my hon. friend quoted to substantiate his position as to the decline of agricultural products in England were the figures made up by the tariff reformers of that country two or three years ago and hawked by them around England, and afterwards brought to the United States and then to Canada. They have been conducting a very extensive campaign against the principles of free trade in England. I have read these figures many times, and I think I could place my finger upon the man who tabulated them as a tariff-reform argument. One of the gentlemen sent out by the tariff reformers in England was in Ottawa at the time my hon. friend made his speech and quoted these figures. In England, where the people understand their business, these figures have been turned down by the electors on three different occasions as against the tariff reformers. The object of these figures is to depreciate the agricultural industry of England, and I contend that the greatest enemies of England are the men who are going through the length and breadth of the land depreciating the success and supremacy of the industries of that great country. On the one hand, they call themselves the great loyalist party, the only party true to British interests, and on the other hand they spend their money to disseminate principles throughout England, in the United States and in this country, tending to depreciate the importance and the trade methods of England. Why, Sir, the loyal party in this House in my opinion is the Liberal party, who are leading this country forward in British trade methods. These are the men who help to strengthen the empire. They are not depreciating conditions in the old land. They look to the old land for their ideals and for some of their principles. But the very men who are doing all they can to depreciate British interests, British agriculture and British trade methods, are the very men who are all the time boasting that they are the only loyal party in this country.

My hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) made some reference to the manner of the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs when they came back from Washington. He thus described very dramatically the entrance of the Minister of Finance: He walked into the House, laid his Pandora's box carefully on his desk, touched the spring in the midst of expectant silence and the Trojan horse sprang out.

The only thing that was dramatic about this was the member for Kootenay. That was the first time I had ever heard that Pandora's box contained the Trojan horse, and I fancy the illustration is not very beneficial to the argument of my hon. friend from Kootenay. He is a little mixed in his mythology. Pandora's box, according to the ancient myth was supposed to contain treasures. That is not a fortunate reference for the hon. member to make, because that is exactly what we thought this Pandora's box did contain. However, if we take the words of my hon. friend literally, it woud look as if this Trojan horse had got away, and was wandering over the face of the earth, the member for Kootenay after it, and there is no reason to suppose he has caught the animal yet.

My hon. friend argued that the future trade on the Pacific with Oriental countries, and with Australia would be diverted owing to this pact from Canadian channels through the United States. He made that statement, but did not advance any argument in support of it. I cannot understand just what my hon. friend meant by making a statement that Canadian shipping companies already existing, carrying trade from the Orient to Europe, will be deprived of that trade by American companies owing to this agreement. Canada enjoys natural and geographical advantages over the United States with regard to Oriental trade, and the Canadian Pacific railway to-day operates three magnificent Empresses on the Pacific, carrying Oriental goods to Vancouver where it places them on its own railway, carries them to the Atlantic sea-board and thence on its Atlantic steamers to European ports. How will this present agreement affect that trade? If the Americans will be able to secure that trade under this agreement they can do so to-day. I am sorry my hon. friend is

not in the House as I would like to have answers to those questions. The large bulk of the carrying of Oriental goods to Europe is to-day done by the Canadian Pacific railway steamers, while the Great Northern railway which formerly operated two or three large steamers between the orient and San Francisco and Seattle to-day operates only one. The oriental trade is carried by the Empress steamers of the Canadian Pacific railway, yet the member for Kootenay, without any argument or any evidence, said that this agreement would divert this trade to United States channels. In a few years the Grand Trunk Pacific will be catering for this same trade. Prince Rupert is thirty hours nearer the Orient by any steamship course than any other Canadian or United States port. How can this reciprocity agreement influence the Grand Trunk Pacific to transfer their European freight through the United States? They will have their own railway, they will be closer to their port than to any port in the United States, and yet the member for Kootenay says that the result of this agreement will be that this trade will be diverted entirely to the United States. The only possible way in which that could be done is as possible to-day as it would be under this agreement, that is for the American steamship lines to reduce their rates to a point at which we could not compete.

It is true that the United States has an advantage in distance to their ports for business done in Australia, but this reciprocity agreement will not bring Australia any nearer to San Francisco and Seattle than it is now. There is nothing in this agreement that will make any geographical change. I think it is important to call these matters to the attention of the House, as my hon. friend's speech has been sent out to the people of British Columbia, and I see absolutely nothing in the statement of my hon. friend to prove that this agreement will divert entirely the trade done on the Pacific by Canadian steamships to United States channels.

My hon. friend read a letter from Cecil Rhodes to Sir John A. Macdonald. Here again he grew very dramatic and read that letter with the assumption that it was entirely opposed to the reciprocity agreement which is about to be made between this government and the United States. Cecil Rhodes in 1891 wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald, and here again I think the hon. member for Kootenay was very unfortunate in his reference. The hon. member said:

> When I read the words of Cecil Rhodes a few months ago I never expected they would apply as they do on the present occasion; I never looked forward to the time, and I hoped I never should see it, when these words would have the bearing on our country's position that this pact gives to them. On the 8th of May, 1891, Mr. Rhodes wrote a letter to Sir John A. Macdonald, and in it he said:
>
> Dear Sir,—I wish to write and congratulate you on winning the elections in Canada. I read your manifesto, and I could understand the issue. If I might express a wish, it would be that we could meet before stern fate claims us. I might write pages, but I feel I know you and your politics as if we had been friends for years.
>
> The whole thing lies in the question: Can we invent some tie with our mother country that will prevent separation? It must be a practical one, for future generations will not be born in England. The curse is that English politicians cannot see the future.

This part of the letter I want the House to take notice of:

> They think they will always be the manufacturing market of the world but do not understand what protection coupled with reciprocal relations means. I have taken the liberty of writing to you, and if you honour me with an answer I will write again.

Well, that letter was read by my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) as opposed to the policy of this government on the question of reciprocity, but the letter itself compliments Sir John Macdonald on the very same policy which is being carried out by the government of to-day, and which my hon. friend is opposing. Just take these words:

> English statesmen do not understand what protection coupled with reciprocal relations means.

But what was the policy of Sir John Macdonald in 1891? Was it not the policy of protection, coupled with reciprocity? Had he not been endeavouring year after year to bring about reciprocal relations with the United States, yet the hon. member from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) with a dramatic gesture, read this letter to the House as entirely opposed to the present policy of the government. Then he went on to read some correspondence of Cecil Rhodes with his friend Mr. Stead. From that correspondence he quoted Mr. Rhodes as saying:

> The labour question is an important thing, but deeper than the labour question is that of the market for the products of labour, and as your local productions can only support about 6,000,000 of people, the balance depends upon the trade of the world.
>
> If you had had statesmen, you would at the present moment be commercially at war with the United States and would have boycotted their raw products until they came to their senses.

And my hon. friend asked the House, after reading that quotation, whether that was not a marvellous prophetic utterance. Again he went on to quote Cecil Rhodes:

> If you had had statesmen you would have boycotted their raw products until they came to their senses, and I say this because I am a free trader.

But why did Mr. Rhodes make that statement? He made it because he wanted England to use her influence to compel the United States to reduce their duties; and what he proposed to do by boycott, this government is doing by conciliation and persuasion. But the point I want to make is that these utterances of Cecil Rhodes, far from being in opposition to the policy of this government, is in support of that policy. Then my hon. friend might have gone a little further and have made some reference to the great constructive work of Mr. Rhodes—work exactly in line with the proposition now submitted to the House. Why, if we consider the life and work of that great man, there can be no mistake that his object was to conciliate and unite the English speaking races of the world. He used all his influence for that purpose; he set aside a considerable portion of his wealth for the purpose of instituting scholarships which would bring young men from all Anglo-Saxon countries into close application with the very heart of the empire. His purpose was to bring all English races together by sending out from England's great institution of learning, the picked youth of these various countries who would at all times contribute to the unity of the Anglo-Saxon race. Surely it cannot be argued that in this great purpose, Mr. Rhodes was in strong opposition to the proposal of the present government.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think that a fair reading of the speech of the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) would warrant the conclusion my hon. friend draws from it.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I listened to that speech and I am sorry my hon. friend from Kootenay is not present, but if he did not read these quotations from Mr. Rhodes in opposition to the policy now before the House, I do not know why he read them.

Mr. BLAIN. What he said was:

> It is the statement of a man who did more than any one man in the British Empire for the building up of that empire, a man who almost unaided and alone has brought an entire dominion under the Union Jack.

His point was that Mr. Rhodes was a man who used his influence to keep the empire together, and not to disrupt it.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I am not saying anything different.

Mr. BLAIN. But my hon. friend suggested that the hon. member for Kootenay quoted the letter of Cecil Rhodes as an attack upon this agreement.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). If not, why did he quote it at all. I, of course, am very happy to take the word of my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) quoted the letter in support of the agreement. I am quite willing to accept my hon. friend's statement and withdraw what I said, if he will take the responsibility of saying that the hon. member for Kootenay read that letter with that object.

Let me now go to another point. The hon. member for Kootenay referred to a great man in the United States, Mr. S. S. McClure, the editor of McClure's magazine. He referred to him as follows:

> I looked to-day for a quotation which I have mislaid from one of the great American magazine men, who spoke before the Canadian Club, Mr. S. S. McClure. I wish you would remember those words of patriotism and faith.

I would like the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) to listen to these words, as I look to him to take in charge the interests of the hon. member for Kootenay.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Kootenay can take care of himself.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) was looking after his interests in his absence. That hon. gentleman went on to quote Mr. McClure as having said:

> There has been nothing in the history of the world that has stood for the civilization and advancement of nations in religion, morality and freedom like the great Union Jack.

He, an American citizen, made use of these words.

Well, now, it is a compliment to us for S. S. McClure to hold opinions of that kind, and to be able to make statements of that kind in this country. But what I would like to know is, what harm the Union Jack is going to take at the hands of Americans like S. S. McClure? And what object could my hon. friend have in making reference to such a speech as that of Mr. McClure? Is not that speech in flat contradiction to the position of fearfulness that these gentlemen take with regard to Americans?

Now, getting away from the hon. member for Kootenay for a few minutes I wish to discuss the general question, and especially the question as it was presented to the House by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). Those who discuss the question before the House, I think may be clearly divided into two classes—those who protect special interests at the expense of the masses of the people, and those who protect the consuming public against the aggression of organized capital. Now, I am speaking for myself alone. I am not a minister, and am not speaking for the government. And I take the House into my confidence by declaring that during the whole

of my experience of eleven years in this House there has been no question discussed here upon which I have had the opportunity to speak and to vote on which it gives me greater pleasure to declare myself than on the present question. Of course, my training, my environment and everything else place me solidly on the free trade principle. I have not said very much about it in this country, because I felt like one kicking against the pricks all the time. Yet, whenever an opportunity has presented itself to say a word or cast a vote in favour of the reduction of duties, especially duties on the food supplies of the people, I have been delighted to say that word or cast that vote. The principle that I support in this discussion is that of a reduction in the taxes on the food supplies of the people and so to benefit the consuming public. And let me point out that not one hon. member on the other side who has made a contribution to this debate even mentioned the great consuming public. I believe in the greatest good to the greatest number. I respect the manufacturers; I want to help them to exist; I respect every interest in this country; I profess to be a broad-minded man, and am prepared to consider every interest, believing that the success of the country depends on every interest. But, after all, the main point with me is to show what the legislation of this House does for the masses of the people. That is the best government that makes the greatest contribution to the interest of the largest number of the people of the country. And one strong point in this agreement that has gained my support and makes me enthusiastic in favour of the proposition is that I believe that freeing agricultural food products between Canada and the United States will offer a tremendous check to the rising cost of living and ultimately bring about a reduction.

Mr. BLAIN. How will that help the farmer?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) should not forget that the farmer, if he does get the higher price for his product—and that is the point he is driving at——

Mr. BLAIN. No, but how would the hon. gentleman's logic reach to the point that this will be in the interest of the farmer and give him a better price, and at the same time lower the price to the consumer?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I know that is a difficulty in the mind of my hon. friend. It is due to the fact that he believes in the protectionist principle.

Mr. BLAIN. And a difficult task for my hon. friend from Nanaimo.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I am going to answer the question. It is the same question that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) put to the Postmaster General when he proposed to reduce the postal charges in the face of a deficit of $750,000 a year. The question was: How are you going to manage to reduce the prices of postage and yet meet the deficiency in our postal revenues? And the Postmaster General's answer was: We will see how the operation works out. So, they reduced the British postage from five cents to two cents and the domestic postage from three cents to two cents—a tremendous reduction in favour of the public. And what happened? The very first year after that reduction was made, the Postmaster General was able to announce a surplus. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) forgets that when prices are reduced the people consume more. The man who had written one letter at a cost of five cents wrote three letters at the cost of six cents. And the great machinery already established took care of the increased business at very little added cost, so that the increased use of the mails not only met that cost, but wiped out the deficit as well.

Mr. GOODEVE. Would the consumer eat three times as much if he got it cheaper?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I have no hesitation in giving an answer. I suspect that he would eat three times as much fruit as before. I can quite understand that many poor people have great difficulty in procuring the food supplies that they desire even in this country. They have stability of wage against rising prices in the articles they require. But if this agreement goes into effect, and the prices are reduced, I have no doubt whatever that the money thus saved would be spent for increased supplies of the necessary articles of consumption—some in fruit, some in beef, and so on. In any case consumption will materially increase. And the most successful business in the world is not the business that has a restricted production and a large cost but the business that follows the principle adopted by the leading businesses in England, that of maximum production at a reasonable profit. No doubt that principle will operate in this case. I have absolutely no fear that when the duties are taken off agricultural products between Canada and the United States, the consumers of these products are going to get them at lower prices than they pay to-day. The question of increased cost of living is one which should be taken into consideration. The principle that is at the bottom of the present agitation which has given rise to the question in the United States, that gave rise to the question in England and in Canada is the great increase in the cost of living on this continent and in England and in Germany. The people of Great Britain have three times declared against the policy of Mr. Cham-

plain, a policy of tariff reform, because they objected to have their food products taxed. And I certainly think that the very emphatic declaration by the British people of that principle had its influence in the United States. The masses in the United States have been suffering under the oppression of tremendous increase in the cost of living. This matter has been agitated, and suddenly it breaks out. The man at the head of the nation, who is also at the head of the high protective party in the United States, is compelled by the expression of opinion from the consumers to do something that will reduce the cost of living. And it says something for the wisdom of the Canadian statesmen that they took advantage of the first opportunity that came to bring about this grand result. Hon. members opposite, of course, dispute their mandate. My opinion is that a good government always has a mandate to do good things for the masses of the people. If, when the great consuming public of the United States had aroused the interest of the public men of that country to offer a proposition to Canada, our statesmen had refused that offer, I should have seriously suspected the wisdom of our statesmen. The basis of this whole movement is the rising cost of living, and this government has taken advantage of the first opportunity to offer a check to that rise. Let me quote a few figures that were quoted by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) —quoted by him, of course, with a very different object from that which I have. These figures are taken from the report on prices of the Labour Department.

I take meat, swine and sheep. Meat has risen sixty per cent in ten years, swine eighty-five per cent in ten years, sheep forty per cent in ten years, potatoes one hundred per cent, apples thirty per cent, pears thirty per cent, peaches thirty per cent, grapes thirty per cent, dairy produce, cheese, milk and eggs, thirty-seven per cent, fowls eighty-five per cent, fish of all kinds forty per cent. Food supplies under this list have increased to the consumers in ten years an average of forty per cent. It was therefore a very reasonable thing for this government to take the first opportunity to check the increase in the cost of living to consumers in this country. Now the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), as I have said, confined his attention entirely to British Columbia, and entirely to the fruit-growers of that province. He stated in his speech that he was dealing with the producers, and that later on he would deal with the consumers. My hon. friend is in his seat, and I want to remind him that he never mentioned the consumers at all, he gave them not the slightest consideration.

Mr. BURRELL. I beg leave to correct the hon. gentleman. He will find my remarks in reference to consumers in my speech.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Well, I read my hon. friend's speech twice, and while I am glad to take his correction, I want to remind him that whilst fruit-growers are a very important element in British Columbia, and an important element in the community, there are other than the fruit-growers; there are the men that eat fruit as well as the men that grow fruit; there are the people in the cities, there are the lumbermen, there are the miners, all of whom consume this fruit. When my hon. friend comes to consider the reasonableness of protecting the fruit-growers of British Columbia, he has to consider the interests of the consumers of fruit in British Columbia. Now in the province of British Columbia we have a consumption of agricultural food products of about $30,000,000 a year. The member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) referred to this matter in his speech. I hold in my hand a statement prepared by the Finance Minister of the government of British Columbia, and the figures indicate that the general consumption of food products in that province is equal to about $30,000,000 a year and of that sum the province has to import about $15,000,000. My hon. friend from Kootenay referred to this very statement, but with a different object. He pointed out that we should protect the producers of agricultural food supplies in this country for the purpose of assisting them to provide supplies for the home market. My position with regard to that is that if you consume $30,000,000 worth of agricultural food products, and you only produce $13,800,000 worth, if you do not want the people to starve, you have to bring in supplies from some quarter. That is an argument, not in favour of the producer, but an argument in favour of the consumers of that province. Now I read the speech of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo very carefully. Unfortunately I was not present when he made his speech, but I will do him the credit of saying that I read it twice, with some effort, and I divided his argument into three propositions. He said it was impossible for the fruit producers of British Columbia to compete against the American producers for three reasons. The first was on account of difference in the cost of labour; the second was the older settlement and better organization of the competing fruit-growers in the western states, while the British Columbian fruit-growers were simply an infant industry; the third was the inequality of the agreement in not providing for corresponding reductions in fruit-growers' supplies. Now, I want to ask my hon. friend a question. He recited a large number of things that enter into the consumption of the fruit-growers. He said, If I go and

buy a hat, if I go and buy clothes, if I go and buy a dozen things, I find I am charged higher on account of protection to these enterprises. I would like to ask my hon. friend this question: Supposing the Finance Minister, in bringing down this proposition, had provided for a reduction of duties on fruit-growers' supplies, would he have supported this agreement?

Mr. BURRELL. The difficulty is not mine, the difficulty is my hon. friend's, who is supporting a government that is partly protectionist and partly free trade, which wipes off all the protection of our industry, and compels us to buy the implements that we use at a protectionist charge. The difficulty is not ours. I believe in moderate protection for every Canadian industry, but my hon. friend is supporting a lop-sided arrangement that gives no protection.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). My hon. friend asks the Finance Minister to make a proposal that he would not support if he had an opportunity. What I am pointing out is the uselessness of complaining because the government does not do something that he would not support if it did do it. That is exactly the position of my hon. friend. Now if he will agree to assist us to have the duties taken off these articles that enter into this consumption, I can promise him at once that I will lend him my support. If I have any difficulty with regard to this agreement, it is that it does not go far enough. I can consistently say to the Premier or to the Finance Minister, why didn't you take the duty off hats, and clothes, and boots and shoes, or any other thing? But I do not understand how my hon. friend can complain about the duty not being taken off twenty things, when he complains that it has been taken off one thing. Now the policy of the government is to go step by step. Perhaps at some future time they will bring another little thing down—I am not speaking for the government of course.

Mr. BURRELL. Did not the Finance Minister state that they would not go one step further?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo. That is not a fair statement of what the Finance Minister said, what he meant to say was that he would not do that at the present time. It is extraordinary that my hon. friend should complain that they do not go fast enough for him on the one hand, and then complain that they go at all on the other hand. That is an inconsistency which appears in the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite. But my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo was very loyal. He said it was important that the tariff of this country should be maintained, and that we should buy everything in Canada. But I detected in his speech that after all the member for Yale-Cariboo sometimes goes to the United States and buys things. He told us that in his speech. He complained to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) that whilst they could go to the United States and buy a wagon, the Minister of Customs did not provide for a reduction of duty on this particular thing that my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo wants.

Now if my hon. friend—and I have quoted his own words—thinks it is in his interest to go to the United States to get a wagon, Jim Smith and Tom Brown and somebody else may think it is in their interest to go to the United States also, and if everybody in Canada thinks as does the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo, evidently, that he can suit his condition better in the United States then, my hon. friend will see just exactly where that will drive him to. If the fruit industry of British Columbia is injured—and I admit on the surface for the moment that, if there is anything that might be hit at all, it might be the youthful industry in the shape of fruit growing—what is the remedy that my hon. friend is suggesting to the government? The difficulty is that the remedy lies in the direction of free trade, and my hon. friend is a protectionist. All he could propose was that the duty should be maintained on fruit. I want the duty taken off fruit, I consume fruit, I do not grow it and there are tens of thousands of others in British Columbia who consume fruit, who do not grow it, and who want the duty taken off. But, I would say to my hon. friend that if he would make a suggestion at all to the government for the benefit of the fruit growers of British Columbia he would ask them to take the duty off sugar entering into the manufacture of jams and the canning of fruit in British Columbia. There are certain industries in British Columbia now engaged in that business. Why does not my hon. friend do that? Would I be unjust to him if I reminded him that he was not doing his duty in the interests of the fruit growers when he failed to ask the government to take the duty off sugar? I do not know whether my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), or my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) would take any notice of my pleadings, but I would like to recommend to them that they take the duty off sugar. Taking the duty off sugar would not only benefit the general consumer, but it would benefit the fruit growing industry.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. member what the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Gordon), sitting behind him, thinks of that?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Well, it does not matter very much to me what my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Gordon) thinks—just about as little on this question as what my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) thinks. Just now I am dealing with what I think myself. I want to repeat to my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo that he neglected his duty, that he was not looking after the fruit grower's interest in British Columbia or he would have impressed upon the government the necessity of taking the duty off sugar, which I am doing now, and in which I hope I will succeed in getting the support of my hon. friend.

Then, my hon. friend pointed out that the fruit growing industry of British Columbia was in an infant condition, whilst the American industry was better organized. The trouble is that protected interests are always in the infant stage. That is the old trouble that we always found in the arguments of protectionists in England. It is a strange thing, but they are like the ladies—they never grow older. But, here is the inconsistency of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo: whilst he wanted the protection maintained in favour of the infant of British Columbia, strange to say, he strenuously fought for the old man in Ontario, who has existed for fifty or sixty years. While arguing for the British Columbia infant, my hon. friend was contending for the strong, mature man in Ontario, thus destroying the reasonableness of his argument in favour of the infant industry in British Columbia. Here again I think the fruit grower and the supporter of my hon. friend would be entitled to complain. When arguing before the House in favour of the infant industry in British Columbia he ought to have confined himself to the infant industry in British Columbia and the British Columbia fruit grower has the very reasonable complaint to make against my hon. friend that he interested himself in another industry, and in doing so absolutely and entirely nullified the argument with which he could hope to accomplish anything in favour of his friends in British Columbia. These industries never grow old. But my hon. friend declares that the fruit growing industry in the state of Washington is so well organized as to make it impossible, under this agreement, for them to make any further progress in the fruit growing industry of British Columbia. My hon. friend is an expert and I am going to give him some expert evidence. I am not an expert, I do not know anything about fruit except the choice of it when I eat it, but he presented his views to the House as an expert, and I grant that he is an expert. I appreciate that my hon. friend has had a very large experience in the business. I propose, instead of giving him my own opinions, to which he might not attach very much importance, to give him some expert opinions of his own friends in British Columbia. First of all I want to remind him that the people of Washington and the representatives of Washington in Congress, are labouring under the same alarmed feeling about the competition of British Columbia against them as the people of British Columbia have with regard to the competition of the state of Washington. Endless petitions have gone from Washington and Oregon to the Congress of the United States against the bringing of this pact into existence. The fruit growers on the other side of the line expressed the fear that the cheaper fruit lands and superior quality of the British Columbia fruit will enter into competition with the fruits of Washington and Oregon. But as I have said, I am going to give my hon. friend the evidence. I am going to give him the reports of his own friends in British Columbia, what they say about the fruit, and what they say about the quality and cheapness of the land. I am not going to give him my opinion, and if he has anything to complain of, I will put him in the position that he must complain against his own friends. Before doing this, however, let me read a few lines from a statement of the Hon. Wm. E. Humphrey, representative of the state of Washington who, speaking in Congress, said that the price of farm land near the boundary line was worth from $75 to $300 per acre more than immediately north of the line, and added:

> But the difference in the quality of the land is not nearly so great as the difference in the price. It is just as certain that the price of land on either side of the international boundary will come to a common level if there are no barriers between them. The results must be to greatly increase the price of Canadian farm land, and largely decrease the price of American farm land.

These were the representations made by the representative of the state of Washington in Congress. Let me read next a letter from a gentleman who was in England when he wrote it, and who is the owner of farm land in East Kootenay. A friend sent me a copy of the 'Pall Mall Gazette.' This British Columbia land owner was in London at the time he wrote this letter. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to it because it is entirely opposed to his whole argument, and I take it that this gentleman is an expert. He says that he is the owner of fruit lands, that he has lived in British Columbia for years, that he understands the whole question and he wants to publish this letter before he leaves:

> I am returning to British Columbia within a few days, and as a resident and owner of

fruit land in east Kootenay familiar with the conditions in British Columbia, and also in the adjoining state of Washington and Oregon, I would like to make to your readers a plain statement of facts before I sail, and to correct some very erroneous statements that have appeared in various papers lately.

I can only assume that party bias and 'Imperialism' have led some of the writers to make the commercial aspects entirely subservient to political ones.

Before I am misunderstood, let me state that I am not about to express any opinion upon the proposed treaty as regards its general effect either upon Canada or upon the empire, but merely as regards the fruit-growers' interests.

Now to deal with some facts which are apparently unknown to most of the writers:

The apple production of the United States within the past fourteen years has decreased about two-thirds.

Within this period the population of the United States of America has increased about twenty millions, the apple has become more popular as an article of diet; and railway transportation has made its distribution more easy.

Notwithstanding tariff, Ontario, the province of Canada supposed to be most hardly hit by reciprocity in regard to fruit, last year shipped 16,000 barrels into the United States of America.

Concerning British Columbia. Apple-growers in the adjoining states of Washington and Oregon get equally good or better prices for their apples than the British Columbia growers, their lands are dearer to buy, and the apples consequently dearer to produce. The freight rates are by no means inconsiderable, and there is brisk home demand for apples. Consequently there is no inducement to invade British Columbia markets at cut prices.

The removal of tariffs by the United States of America on coal, timber, and wheat will immensely develop these industries in British Columbia and the prairies, and create populations of workers needing food, thus increasing the home markets for the British Columbit growers.

The present United States tariff against apples is 25 cents per bushel and the Canadian tariff (40 cents per barrel) approximately 15 cents per bushel.

At the prices obtained in Canada for first-grade Washington and Oregon apples the protection is only equal to from 7 per cent to 10 per cent on value, which, if the growers had any real over-production, would not prevent competition with British Columbia fruits, as there is ample margin of profits to cut prices 25 per cent, and still make profits greater than those of most businesses.

The tariff, therefore, has not been British Columbia's protection so far as apples are concerned, but the simple factors of supply and demand.

Further on he says:

I will quote an extract from a letter just received from Mr. W. T. Sterling, one of the most experienced fruit growers in British Columbia, who writes as follows:

Re reciprocity treaty.—I see no reason why this should depreciate the value of fruit land in British Columbia.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo).

That is from Mr. Sterling, a large fruit grower of my hon. friend's district. He also said, writing to this gentleman in London:

The greatest effect that could result from the throwing down of all artificial barriers to trade between British Columbia and the States would be that conditions in British Columbia would be assimilated to those in Washington and Oregon. Consequently, values would be similar, and first-class fruit land in the Okanagan would sell at the same price as equally good land does in the Willamette and Yakima valleys, &c. As you know, the price of fruit land in these valleys is higher than it is now in the Okanagan, while our lands enjoy equal natural advantages.

I do not know anything at all about this gentleman, but he says that he owns fruit lands in East Kootenay. I hold in my hand also a letter from a gentleman who says that he owns fruit lands in the Okanagan, H. P. Lee. I do not know him, but his letter is entirely in favour of the contention that there will not be any serious injury to fruit growing in British Columbia. Then, I want to read to the House a few sentences from the British Columbia agricultural report to show the opinion of the agricultural organizations of the province about fruit lands in British Columbia. His Excellency the Governor General, in opening the exhibition at New Westminster, made the following statement:

Fruit growing in your province has acquired the distinction of being a beautiful art as well as a most profitable industry. After a maximum wait of five years, I understand the settler may look forward with reasonable certainty to a net income of from $100 to $150 per acre, after all expenses of cultivation have been paid.

Gentlemen, here is a state of things——

Some hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point is raised that the views or expressions of His Excellency cannot be quoted in the House for the purpose of influencing the House.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I am glad to obey your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I expected my hon. friends oposite to take that point of order, because the reading of the opinion of His Excellency makes entirely against their argument. Let me read what is said by the writer of the agricultural report:

In 1906, 1907 and 1908 the same success was achieved. In the former year British Columbia fruit won eleven medals in Great Britain, and in the latter was awarded first prize over Ontario and Nova Scotia at the Royal Horticultural Society's Exhibition at London, the gold medal of the Royal Horticultural Society of Scotland, while individual exhibitors won several silver and bronze medals.

It goes on to indicate the quality of the fruit in British Columbia. Let me read this sentence:

Great as were the honours won in Great Britain, a more signal victory for British Columbia fruit was the winning of two first, one second, and three third prizes in competition with fruit from Oregon and Washington.

The very States which these hon. gentlemen complain that the chief competition comes from. Now, I hold in my hand the 'Fruit Growers' Magazine' for March, 1911, in which, at pages 368 and 369, my hon. friend may find an article written by the editor of the magazine, who is a fruit expert, arguing that considering the quality of the fruit in British Columbia and the price of land, there is every reason why the fruit growers of that province should not consider that they will be very seriously affected by the reduction of the duties.

Mr. BURRELL. I might call my hon. friend's attention to another article in that paper by a much greater expert, entirely repudiating that article.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I think I know whom my hon. friend means—Mr. Cunningham, an inspector of fruit in British Columbia, an official of the British Columbia government. In that article Mr. Cunningham expresses his political views against the Liberal government at Ottawa, and his belief that this government will be put out of office. It is very unfortunate that my hon. friend made that reference. Mr Cunningham's article is entirely a political argument; but the article I referred to is by an expert fruit grower, a man who has been in the business for years, who was employed as a Dominion inspector of fruit, and he gives an absolutely impartial view of the fruit growers of British Columbia. I hold in my hand another letter from a friend of mine in British Columbia, an old settler in my hon. friend's district. This gentleman is an old settler in my hon. friend's district. He settled there 50 or 60 years ago, he has a very respectable family who have been brought up in that province, he is in the fruit growing business. He attaches to the letter an article written by a Conservative paper in the Okanagan Valley contending against the arguments of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). Of course my hon. friend does not like those articles.

Mr. BURRELL. I do not mind them.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). He took the Minister of Customs very severely to task because he read some articles from Conservative newspapers in the fruit growing sections of British Columbia against his arguments. But there are two sides to this question. I am not contending that the fruit growers generally are going to support this agreement, but I say that some of them are, that there is a difference of opinion, that it is not all blue ruin as my hon. friend teaches, and that there are a few people growing fruit as my hon. friend is, who do not think the result will be as serious as my hon. friend fears. My correspondent says:

I herewith inclose you a clipping re reciprocity. This does not fit in very well with Martin Burrell's calamity howl. I was growing fruit here before Mr. Burrell ever gave British Columbia a thought and am still at it. In my humble opinion we should have had this treaty years ago.

Wishing you every success with it.

Yours truly,

JAS. B. LEIGHTON.

Mr. Leighton has been in that province for 50 or 60 years. He is in the fruit business and that is what he writes.

Mr. BURRELL. Is that Mr. Leighton, the general manager of the express company, a very strong Liberal of old standing?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I suppose my hon. friend knows who Mr. Leighton is, and he knows if he is a Liberal; but will my hon. friend say that because a man is a Liberal his views on fruit are not acceptable?

Mr. BURRELL. Not at all.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). My hon. friend is not placing himself in a very strong position, because by contending that Mr. Leighton, who is an expert in the business, is not entitled to support this pact because he is a Liberal——

Mr. BURRELL. I did not say that.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). That is what it implies. If that is the case, I would like to know what importance this House should attach to the arguments of my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) because he is a Conservative.

Mr. BURRELL. I did not object to Mr. Leighton being a Liberal, but I gathered from my hon. friend's remarks that he was quoting from an old fruit grower who had been in British Columbia before I went there, and I was asking if he was the same Mr. Leighton who had been manager of the British Columbia Express Company since 1896, and who is not regarded in British Columbia as an old fruit grower, but as manager of the express company.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Perhaps he is manager of the express company, but I have given his letter to the House, and I want the House to take it at its face value. Mr. Leighton has been in the country for 50 or 60 years, he is in the fruit business now, and that is what he says about the

agreement. It does not matter to the House whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative. Mr. Leighton gives an absolutely independent opinion according to his experience.

Mr. hon. friend's next argument was on the difference in the cost of labour. He said the day labourer received $1.50 to $1.75 in the western states against $2.50 in the Kootenays. My hon. friend of course, knows something about the interior, and I can only speak on this question with regard to the Pacific coast. The fruit growers on the coast of British Columbia have always utilized the largest possible amount of Oriental labour in that province for the growing and picking of fruit. I am not disputing my hon. friend's proposition. It is very difficult to get the difference in wages of employees in the fruit industry in the western states and in British Columbia, and to calculate what that difference amounts to, but so far as the coast is concerned, every kind of available cheap labour has been utilized; Orientals have been utilized by the coast fruit growers to the largest possible extent. I have a suspicion that if they have not Oriental labour in the Okanagan and in the Kootenays it is because they cannot get it. At the present time there is some difficulty in getting all of this class of labour that is necessary on account of the development of railway construction which is so extensive in that province. That is a question which will right itself. My hon. friend must admit that the superior value of fruit lands ought to stand for something. When the reports of the Agricultural Department of the province speak so strongly upon the difference, surely my hon. friend ought to admit that with superior fruit and superior advantages and superior lands the fruit growers of British Columbia ought to be able in their own market to compete with the fruit growers in the western states. As a matter of fact I was pleased to notice a day or two ago that my hon. friend himself was modifying his views about the serious disaster to the fruit growing of British Columbia. If the published reports are correct the hon. member in Toronto on Saturday night exhibited a little change of heart; he had come to the conclusion, evidently, that he had spoken a little too early, some kind of influence was impressing my hon. friend that after all this arrangement was not going to be so bad, and that we were going to be able to survive even the shock of removing the duties on fruit. I think that a year or two from now my hon. friend will find that this change has not been so disastrous to the interests of the fruit growers as he thinks.

A word with reference to other enterprises in British Columbia. I would remind the members from that province that there are other industries than fruit growing in British Columbia, and if the members of this House and the people of this country read the speeches of the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), and the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), especially that of the member for Kootenay, they would think there was nothing in British Columbia but fruit growing. It is the duty of representatives from British Columbia to find out just exactly how this agreement affects the general enterprise of British Columbia. It may press a little hard on fruit. But supposing it does, supposing it helps all the other enterprises, supposing it helps all the industries of that province, surely it ought to be supported, and I think I can demonstrate to the House that two or three of the industries of British Columbia are going to be materially benefited by this agreement.

Take first lumber in which the member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) is largely interested as well as in the question of coal and coke. I think I can demonstrate that if this agreement goes into effect it will be the best thing that could happen for these industries in British Columbia, and I submit that if these three large industries are benefited by this agreement it becomes the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to consider what they will do about it. A great scare was raised by the Conservative leaders in the province on this general question, very shortly after the Minister of Finance made his speech introducing this agreement.

Mr. McBride, the premier of the province, placed his views before the people, in great headlines, even before the leader of the opposition thought he had time to consider the question. He predicted the absolute ruin and destruction of these enterprises in British Columbia, and the men who were interested in that industry took Mr. McBride, as they had been accustomed to do for many years, at his word, and without waiting to get the schedules and a complete report of the proceedings, they jumped at the conclusion that their interests were seriously injured. But when they read the report, they came to a different conclusion. The moment they understood what was done, every one of them supported the agreement. The men at the head of the lumbering interest which is one of the largest in British Columbia, changed their minds. I have letters from them, which hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute, but which I cannot take the time to read. I might say that Mr. McRae, in the Kootenay district, and Mr. Cameron, in the district of Victoria, two of the strongest lumbermen in British Columbia, have declared emphatically that nothing has happened at Ottawa which will contribute to the success of the lumber business as much as this agreement.

My hon. friend from Kootenay made some slight reference to the question of lumber.

This government has done nothing, he said, for the lumber industry, but has left things exactly as they were before. But, Mr. Speaker, whatever reductions in duties have been made with regard to lumber were made entirely by hon. gentlemen opposite. Why did my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) not reflect on the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who was Finance Minister 17 years ago, and who took then the duties off rough lumber coming into the Canadian market. But my hon. friend from Kootenay is perfectly satisfied that that was a good government, and that the Conservative government had always done everything in the people's interests, and that when they took the duty off rough lumber 17 years ago, they did it in the interests of the people. Now, however, he wants it put on, and he wants it put on in the interests of the people, when there are 10,000 to-day to every 1,000 we had then. The hon. member for Toronto did a good thing 17 years ago, when he took the duty off rough lumber, and we are doing a bad thing when we are leaving rough lumber as it is.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). The hon. gentleman made the statement that our government is not taking anything off the duty on lumber coming in here, is that right?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I was speaking of rough lumber, and rough lumber is the principal article in this agreement, and the principal article which affects our interests.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). He did not include dressed lumber.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). No, but I would remind him that there is a considerable reduction in the duties on dressed lumber and shingles. In this connection if I were to be disposed to indulge in a little criticism, I would liked to have seen the duties taken off manufactured lumber and shingles. But the American duties have been reduced on manufactured lumber and on shingles from 50 to 30 cents per thousand.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). What is the reduction on dressed lumber coming into Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. What is the reduction?

Mr. GORDON. It is 25 per cent ad valorem now,and I understand that under this arrangement boards dressed on all sides can come in at $1.50 per 1,000 feet.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no reduction on lumber coming into Canada.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). The agreement says so.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken, as he will find if he will look into the agreement.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). I have just looked into the blue-book, and I know that the duty on boards was 25 per cent ad valorem; and under the proposed arrangement the duty on boards dressed on all sides will be $1.50 per 1,000 feet.

Mr. FIELDING. Not coming into Canada.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). It is quite evident that my hon. friend can afford to look up this schedule again, and he will find no doubt that he is entirely mistaken. I was referring to the question of rough lumber, and I was saying that if complaint is due to anybody it is due to the Conservative government which took that duty off 17 years ago, when they opened the markets of Canada to the competition of American lumber, while during all that period the duty was retained by the United States. So that, if there be any complaint about there being no duty on rough lumber coming into Canada, that is due entirely to the action of the Conservative government 17 years ago, and the position to-day is exactly what it was then. No concessions have been made to the United States, so that when the lumber interests of British Columbia got together and looked into the question, they decided that this was a magnificent arrangement in their interest.

Let me now draw the attention of my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) to the question of coke and coal. The American duty, which amounts to $1 per ton, is to be taken off. Now British Columbia has the largest deposits of coking coal in the world. My hon. friend from Kootenay represents the great Crowsnest Valley. Let him consider what is going to be the result of taking off this duty. It will mean an enormous increase in the development of mining enterprises in that valley, and an absolute monopoly of the United States market by Canadian coal.

Mr. GOODEVE. What becomes then of my hon. friend's pets the consumers? What will become of the smelters and those who consume the coal?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). My hon. friend's objection is due to the serious fallacy that protection will benefit the consumer. But let him consider that the development of these mines will mean the employment of thousands of men where there are now only hundreds, it will mean the increasing of the product, and increased production will tend to lower prices. In any case to the consumers of the United States the article must be reduced in price to the extent of the duty taken off, which amounts practi-

cally to $1 per ton. But what I would point out particularly is that this means an enormous development of the coal areas in the Crowsnest Pass, and enormous increase in the population of that valley, and a correspondingly improved market for the fruit my hon. friend is growing in the Kootenay district. These hon. gentlemen from British Columbia who are opposing this proposed agreement are neglecting the interests of their province. Nothing can affect the larger number of people more beneficially than the taking off this duty on coke which is $1 per ton at present. As a matter of fact in my district some half a million dollars was spent on coke kilns some 20 years ago that were never operated, but the moment this duty is taken off they will be developed and developed profitably.

Let me say a word on the question of fish, on which perhaps my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) will have some views. I cannot see that we have anything to lose but everything to gain by the United States taking the duty off fish. The Pacific coast has the largest fish area in the world. We have every reason to suppose that, now that there is a prospect of the duties being taken off fish in the United States creating an enormous market for our fish, and with the sheltered and suitable conditions on the Pacific for catching these deep-sea fish, English and Scotch capital will be invested here, and will develop a great industry. Take the question of fish oil alone. The American duty is eight cents per gallon. The removal of this will amount to a big thing for the Canadian whaler. Whale oil is sent to the United States in tanks from Victoria, and the limit of consumption is restricted to the supply. Several millions of Canadian capital are invested in this enterprise, and a gentleman interested states that the agreement would produce a betterment in this line alone of a quarter of a million a year. In fish oils, of which British Columbia is the largest producer in Canada, the direct gain will be very great. It seems to me that these are important matters for hon. members from British Columbia to take into consideration. And I think I may fairly conclude this part of my address by saying that the fact that two members from that province sitting on the other side of the House have discussed this question at such great length and have confined themselves absolutely to one industry, and have not said a word about these other great industries that I have mentioned, fish, lumber, coal and coke—larger industries by far than fruit—is a significant fact. I conclude that they did not speak of them because they saw it would be fatal to attempt it. I call upon them as loyal members from British Columbia to consider the great interests of their province and its future, and to support the agreement because of the general good it will bring to the country.

Now, I want to look at two arguments put up in this debate by hon. gentlemen opposite. The first is the question of a mandate. I notice that all over the country as in this House, the leaders of the opposition are gradually abandoning certain arguments that formerly they pressed very strongly. They are not so strong on the loyalty question as they were, and they are a little suspicious about the annexation cry, but they are still very strong on the mandate. They never make a speech but they declare that the government has no mandate to enter into this agreement. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) have all taken that position. It seems to me that the large number of wealthy, industrious farmers who came from the west to ask for reciprocity were a considerable mandate. I am certain that, under our representative institutions, the people of the country expect the government not to wait until they are told to do things, but to go ahead and do things which will result in benefit to the masses of the people. The government always has a mandate to do things which will result in the general interest. But I notice that my hon. friend from Brandon was particularly strong about this mandate. I am sorry he is not here that I might ask him a question directly; but I hope he will see it in 'Hansard'. What I was thinking while the hon. gentleman was saying that the government had no mandate was whether the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Sifton) had a mandate from Brandon to make the speech, and take the position he did. I was wondering if he had abandoned the mandate he considered he had in 1896, 1900, in 1904, and, representing in this House the very people who sent the strongest representations in support of this policy. He certainly did not take his mandate from the people of that district. But the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) put a special and peculiar interpretation upon this question of the mandate. His words are remarkable and worth reading. I quote from page 3778 of the 'Hansard' of this session:

> There is a great political combine in this matter. I have no doubt about that. Hands across the sea, say some people. Yes, and not only hands across the sea, but hands across the boundary line as well. This is a great political scheme, put up by my right hon. friend, concurred in by the government of Great Britain and promoted by President Taft and the government of the United States. . . . So, we have this great triangle, this great trinity, this political combination at work, and it is a little hard for the people of Can-

ada to assert themselves and get their rights under conditions such as those, but we are going to try.

My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) in speaking in this way mistakes effects for causes. Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, answered the demands of that country when he refused to bring about tariff reform. The people of England declared three times within three years that they would refuse to consent to their food supplies being taxed. In the United States the democracy rose on this question of the cost of living. Mr. Taft was not the cause of bringing that about, but simply the effect, or, at the most, the instrument. He tried to do what the people wanted him to do. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) with all due respect, are not the direct cause; they are the representatives of the people. These gentlemen say: We have a mandate; we understand public sentiments, and know what the people want, and we are going to try to accomplish it for them. Let me read a few words from Mr. Asquith from his speech delivered in the House of Commons, in answer to a statement made by Mr. Austen Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain had suggested that the relations to be established between Canada and the United States would bring about political union, and that the loyalty of the people of Canada depended upon the trade relations between Great Britain and Canada, and if trade relations were made more favourable between Canada and the United States political union would follow. This is Mr. Asquith's answer:

> What is the situation? Supposing we had consented to tax the food of the people of this country and thereby stopped the disastrous agreement, what would have happened? The Canadian farmer would have been getting less for his corn and paying more for his agricultural machinery, and the British consumer would have been paying more for the necessaries of life. Is that the way to cement the empire? Moreover, is it not obvious that the United States, without any reciprocity at all, could have toppled over the whole fabric of preference at any time by the simple expedient of lowering her own tariff wall along the Canadian border, and the very foundation of your imperial preference is undermined.

Now, Sir, on this question of mandate, so far as I am able to judge, I think the government are doing what the people will support them in doing. I intended to give some figures with reference to trade between this country and the United States, but I will content myself with making a statement. If trade between the United States and Canada has any tendency to alienate the people of Canada from the British Empire, then we might have been annexed many years ago. If you go over the trade records of this country from confederation to the present time you will find that trade with the United States has been gradually increasing during all those years; yet nothing has been said about political union or annexation with the United States, nobody has ever thought of it. Now, if we can do a business with the United States, as we did last year, to the extent of $375,000,000, without weakening the bonds or the spirit of empire in the minds of the Canadian people, can we not increase that trade a few million dollars and yet retain the same feeling of loyalty to the empire? What is there in the history of trade in this country that would indicate that, as it has increased with the people of the United States, there has been a disposition towards political union with that country? So I say there is nothing whatever in this contention of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and they can point to nothing in our past history to support it.

Let us look at the history of British Columbia in this respect. Let me call the attention of members of this House, and particularly of members from British Columbia, to the condition of that province previous to confederation, and previous to the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. British Columbia was a small province with 20,000 people, separated from the rest of Canada by a sea of mountains four or five hundred miles wide, whose people for a generation had been in contact with the people of the United States, commercially and socially. Separated from the rest of Canada, her people did business north and south with the people of the United States; and yet it has been stated, and it has been demonstrated, that there has been no more loyal province in the Dominion of Canada than British Columbia. After the Canadian Pacific railway was built what happened? Certain trade routes had grown up between British Columbia and the United States, did the Canadian Pacific railway destroy those trade routes, did it break off that intercourse with the United States? No, they immediately provided for carrying on trade between British Columbia and the United States, and to-day, after fifty or sixty years experience, trade between British Columbia and the western states is exactly in the same condition in every particular. That trade is increasing every day between British Columbia and the United States, yet at no period in the history of British Columbia has the spirit of loyalty towards the empire been stronger than it is to-day. So I say there is absolutely no evidence that will support the hon. gentlemen in their argument that closer trade relations with the United States will weaken the imperial bond or the imperial sympathy.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said the government was putting

the head of Canada in a noose. I was wondering when the hon. member for Brandon arrived at the conclusion that commercial association with the people of the United States was a dangerous thing to Canada's connection with the empire. I hold in my hand the results of the policy adopted by that same hon. gentleman, a policy which, I may say, has contributed more than any other single thing to the prosperity of this country, to the settlement of the land, to the increase in population, a policy which has been continued by my hon. friend the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). What has been the result of that policy with regard to bringing Americans into this country? I find by the records that from 1897 to 1910 we have brought into the Northwest 681,885 American citizens. Forty per cent of these arrivals have made homestead entries in the western provinces, and in the year 1907-8 they brought with them $52,000,000 in cash and settlers' effects. Now what has been the effect of American settlers coming into this country? One effect has been to provide methods of transportation and trade north and south between the people of Canada and the people of the United States. Yet nothing serious has happened. We find that these American immigrants are the most industrious citizens we have in the Northwest to-day; we find them loyal and true to the institutions of this country, and many of them are loyal and true to the British Empire. We find among these settlers large numbers of men who left this country years ago, and have taken the opportunity to return. Therefore I say there is absolutely nothing in the contention that closer trade relations with the United States will have a tendency to weaken the loyalty of Canadians to the British Empire. I am glad to lend my support to this agreement. In principle it means a reduction of duties on the food supplies of the people, and anything that does that will have my hearty support.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Before I proceed to deal with the main question, I wish to refer to some of the positions taken up by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Smith, Nanaimo). He had a difficult task before him to-night, because he had to take care of his free trade principles on the one hand, and of his friends on the other. That is a very unpleasant position for an hon. gentleman to be in. He says that it was hard to kick against the pricks. He had been sitting in this House for several years holding free trade principles, but he had never announced them. He simply rubbed his friends down the back when they were doing what he wanted them to do, and he was careful to support them in nearly every vote. Now I want to ask if there is any sense in any man talking in this House about the interest of this country being conserved along the lines of free trade as they have it in England. Will the hon. gentleman, while he is roaming among the sepulchres of the past to find material with which to defend his argument, prove to me the common sense of any people trying to meet a continuously changing condition outside by an unchanging condition within? That is the position of England to-day. No other country would undertake it, no other country could do it except England, because she has control of the carrying trade of the world. Will he refer to any protected country that has as many unemployed as England has to-day? What about that problem in free trade England? What about the agriculturist in free trade England? What is his position? Driven out of his business virtually, and what surprises me is that the hon. gentleman tries to make the consumer believe that he will get more food than he ever had before and get it cheaper while the producer of that food will get more for his produce.

Now what does the premier say? If there ever was a man found to be on all fours it is the right hon. gentleman himself. Let me see what he telegraphed to one of his friends in York the other day. Here is a telegram sent to Mr. Robinette by the right hon. gentleman and what does he say in it? It is found on the front page of the 'Globe' and dated the 21st March.

Mr. Robinette began by reading this message from Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

> We have not hurt the manufacturer, and we will not do so. We have benefited the farmer and the consumer. When the time comes we will sweep the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

If there ever was anything found on all fours it is this telegram. He is not hurting the manufacturer and he does not intend to. What is the use of my hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Nanaimo), talking free trade? He is helping the farmer and what is going to help the farmer and the consumer? He is going to give the consumer cheaper food and give the farmer more for his produce. This is the meaning of that telegram. I think it is time that we were candid with the people of Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Nanaimo), says that the Union Jack is safe in the hands of the American. Does he ever find it there? He finds the Stars and Stripes in his hands out in our western country and I think that should not be. I do not think for one moment that the people of the older settled part of Canada will be affected in so far as their loyalty is concerned by this proposal. The genius of our people in the older settled part of the country is too sturdy and too honest to be swerved

by any such thing as that, but, we are attacking this country in its very loin, in the west which is filling up with a foreign element who are not favourably disposed towards British institutions. That is where the danger lies.

My hon. friend had a good deal to say about the farmer and the man that must get cheaper food. I want to say that the farmers' labour has increased fifty per cent during the years when he says that his product has increased forty per cent. The labourer is getting fifty per cent more on the farms than he was getting twenty years ago. There is no man who has to work so long to feed the world cheaply as the farmer, and it is time that he was getting better wages. There is no man who has done so much to feed the world, and to stick at his job as the farmer. But, my hon. friend's heart goes out to the consumer whether he works or plays. I say that the man who is found in the furrow is the man who ought to be considered first, because you may send a man to the battlefield, you may send your statesmen wherever you wish, but if the farmer leaves the furrow and does not feed him he cannot stay in that place very long. I am not ashamed to say that I will stand up here and advocate the interest of the farmer because if his interest is looked after the country will prosper. What the consumer requires and what the country requires, as the history of the world proves, is that the soil shall be covered by people, and unless you improve the condition of the farmer you will never keep the people on the soil. Therefore, it is the interest of the consumer to improve the condition of the farmer and enable him to raise more products in this country which is so well fitted to produce them.

There is another thing that surprised me a little. Here is an hon. gentleman who is an avowed free trader. Well, he may look one, but he does not act like one. There are not many of them on the other side of the House, but there is one that we have heard from to-night, and that is the first in a long while.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark).

Mr. BRODER. Well, the hon. member for Red Deer has taken to the woods. I want to ask the hon. member for Nanaimo why he is so anxious to get into the most highly protected country to get his blessing? Why does he not go to some free trade country for his blessing? Why argue that a 25 per cent tariff is a curse to Canada, and then go for his blessing to the United States where they have a 40 per cent tariff? He is so anxious to fall into the arms of the United States to get his blessing that he will leave a country with a 25 per cent tariff for the sake of a country with a 40 per cent tariff. Is there any consistency in wanting to get into the United States? Oh, well, one man said to me the other day, don't you want that 90,000,000 market? I said: Let us look at that for a moment; how would you care to have 90,000,000 people in your woods carrying your timber off to the United States and making wood pulp worth $6 a ton into a product worth $35 or $40 a ton by American labour instead of Canadian labour? Why should we send our rough lumber to the United States, let them manufacture it into furniture and then send it back into Canada in its finished condition? What about my hon. friend's consumer? It is all very well to talk about these free trade principles. I think the government, notwithstanding all their free trade advocacy for years, deserve credit, because when they came into power and took the responsibilities of government, they did not think it wise to put into practice their pre-election pledges.

An hon. MEMBER. They were afraid to do it.

Mr. BRODER. We will give them credit for watching the interests of the country in that sense. My hon. friend from Nanaimo, although he did not agree with them, supported them right along. I venture to say that if the men on this side of the House had been in power, and had done exactly what his friends have done he would have been kicking high dudgeon. He talks about a mandate. He came into this House as an independent member. Where is his mandate? He was elected two or three times as an independent member; he ran on all fours with the government last time—I will give him credit for that—but up to that period he had no mandate to support this government, and yet he supported them. He came as an independent man, but he did not act as an independent man. He supported this government. Where was his mandate? He went on to show that there would be no difficulty about apples in the United States, as the apple product of that country had fallen away two-thirds. Now, here is the American Year-book of 1909, which ought to be an authority on the subject, and it states that the export of apples in barrels in 1905 was 1,409.942 barrels, in 1906 1,208.980 barrels, in 1907 1,539,267 barrels, in 1908 1,049,545 barrels, in 1909 896,729 barrels, a falling off only about 400,000 barrels.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). My correspondent was referring to the total production, not the exports.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman does not propose to say that 90,000,000 people eat less that 70,000,000. If so, that country is not giving the people more to

eat but giving them less. As their exports have kept up nearly, they must produce more, because with their increased population they naturally consume more. So the letter is not founded on fact.

Now, I want to refer to this treaty on its merits. I am not going to discuss the hon. ministers who went to Washington. If we were going to pick out from that government two gentlemen to send away from home, perhaps these are the two that we would wish to send. I am not saying that the Hon. Mr. Fielding and the Hon. Mr. Paterson did not make the best bargain they could in the interests of this country from their standpoint. When we send men to a foreign country to make a bargain, we ought to stand by them until they make the bargain, and then whip them if they do not make a good one. We ought to show any foreign country that the people are behind the men who in the meantime are representing the interests of Canada. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not present, because I want to say something that I would like him to hear.

What brought about the reciprocity treaty of 1854? The agitation of the western farmers, who wanted to get access to the navigation of the St. Lawrence river, and one of the articles of that treaty gave them that right. They wanted an outlet for their products. When the war came on the Mississippi river was blockaded, and they could not get their produce out that way, so they looked to the St. Lawrence river as an outlet. The same influence that led to the abrogation of that treaty may cause trouble with this treaty. When the Canadian government in 1857 proposed to increase the duties on articles not included in the treaty, the manufacturers of the United States protested. They said the Canadian people had no right to do that, as it was understood when the treaty was made that they would not interfere with their tariff while it existed; hence the agitation for its abrogation. Something of the same kind may occur again with respect to this treaty and disturb the financial conditions of the country.

Now, who brought about this treaty? My hon. friend said it was Taft. It was not Taft; it was the western farmers. They came down here, 500 of them, and demanded certain things. The government said they had a mandate, because these 500 gentlemen came from the west. If their demand was a mandate, they had also a mandate to take the duty off agricultural implements. Why did they not carry out that? The right hon. leader of the government and his friends said to the manufacturers: This is an assurance to you that we will not interfere with you; we have settled the western agitation by this proposed treaty; therefore, you need not be alarmed about your interest; you will be taken care of. The manufacturer is a more logical man than that, and he says: You cannot stop where you are; if you take the protection off farm products, you have to take it off what the farmer uses. When these men from the west came down here, they said to my right hon. friend: Give us a slice of that free trade loaf which you have had in the oven these 20 years. But he said: No, that is shewbread; that is in the holy of holies; you can not have that; that is for the wild westerner; that is for the high priests of my party. But the agitation was too strenuous, and in order to pacify it, he proposed to get this treaty. So the two ministers went to Washington, and they expected to have to use political dentistry and pull teeth to get anything. Instead of that, they got their laps full. It was not a question of getting, but a question of carrying home. They could have got more than they brought home. They got too much—they durst not bring it home. But my hon. friend is satisfied with what they got. If they had not got anything, he would have been satisfied.

What effect is this treaty to have on the interests of the farmers? After all, it is the cold question of business. There are localities in the country which it will no doubt help. It will help the country in spots. How is the farmer in Ontario to be affected? It will affect four large industries adversely—the hog market, the horse market, the egg market, and the apple market. These are four principal products of Ontario and Quebec. There are others, but these I will deal with. Why do I say that it will affect the hog market? There are in the United States 49,000,000 hogs, and there are something less than 3,000,000 in Canada. That is 16 to 1, and it is worse than Bryan's. I intend to make a comparison of the average price for five years in Montreal and Chicago. Some people take Buffalo, but it is not a centre compared with Chicago, which is the principal centre for hogs. Here are the yearly average prices of the hogs for five years in Montreal and Chicago:

Year.	Chicago.	Montreal.
1906	$6.20	$7.77
1907	6.10	7.43
1908	5.70	7.10
1909	7.35	8.64
1910	8.90	9.60
Average for the five years	$6.85	$8.10

I shall take the average in another way. They have 16 hogs to our one. Hogs in the slaughter houses in the United States and Canada average a little more than 200 pounds each, we will say 200 pounds, and they are 16 hogs ahead. Their 16 hogs at

$6.85 a hundredweight will each be worth $13.70, while our one at $8.10 will be worth $16.20. Striking an average for the 17 hogs you have a loss to the Canadian farmer of $1.18 per hundredweight. In other words a loss of $2.36 per hog taking a five years' average for these two places. No man will pretend to say that the Canadian one hog will control the market, that would not be reasonable. The 16 hogs will decide what the market price shall be.

What about horses? There are 21,000,000 horses in the United States. There are 12 states lying along either side of the Mississippi river which are adjacent to our western country, and in those 12 states, one-quarter of the whole United States in number, you find 11,600,000 horses. Does any one pretend to say that our western market, which is our best market for heavy horses, will not be supplied from those states? In the first place the horses are more easily got into that market, and with less risk to the buyer. What is the average price given by the American authority? $108.19 on the farm, old and young and all. Again the American authority gives the average of the Canadian horses on the farm at $133, almost $25 difference in favour of the Canadian price. Does any man pretend to say to me that these figures will not affect the interests of the Canadian farmer? What will be the effect of that competition? They will drive the heavy horses out of our market because the demand in the west will be supplied from these western states, and we will have to breed a lighter horse here to compete with the horses raised in Maine, New Hampshire, and other eastern states. Any horse-breeder knows that when you undertake to raise saddle or coach horses, you may raise 1,000 colts and not have one fit for the market; the heavy horse is raised with greater safety by the farmer; if he is blemished, he will still do for a work horse, and will pay for his raising, but that is not so of the coach or saddle horse, if he is not a success he is a loss. No logic or argument or high-faluting business will remove that fact.

Mr. PATERSON. Are the figures the hon. gentleman has given taken from the census?

Mr. BRODER. The price of American horses is taken from the American yearbook; the Canadian price is given in the message of the President of the United States to Congress.

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose the only definite information we can get on these matters is to be obtained from the decennial census.

Mr. BRODER. I do not know how they arrive at the conclusion, they simply give the facts. I think they must have means of gathering statistics outside the census, because they give them every year.

Mr. TAYLOR. You had no facts or figures over there, but they had them all.

Mr. PATERSON. We had all that they had.

Mr. McCOLL (Northumberland). In averaging the price of horses, are you taking inthe western rangy scrubby mustangs with the well-bred horses?

Mr. BRODER. I do not know that, I am simply giving the American authorities.

Mr. McCOLL (Northumberland). Does it include that class of horses?

Mr. BRODER. Of course if the Americans take in our scrubby mustangs our price would not be $133 the price would be still higher if you threw them out. I hope he has taken them in, because the argument is still stronger.

Reverting to the hog industry previous to 1891, we had only four packers in this country, excepting some small ones who bought hogs in the fall from the farmers, and for a short time packed pork. We had Davies' at Toronto, Fearman's at Hamilton, and the Ingersoll packing house. Now, we have packing factories established from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Up to 1892 many hogs were brought in in bond and killed in the packing houses because they could not get a continuous supply in Canada. When the United States put a duty of 20 cents a bushel on barley the effect was virtually to shut our barley out of the United States. What occurred? Coincident with this fact grew up a larger supply of hogs in Canada and our packing houses had a continuous supply. The feeding of the barley to the pork instead of shipping it gave better results, and has increased the hog product of this country. I have here a statement showing the average delivery of hogs at inspected packing houses during last year, 1910, which shows how continuous the supply was :

January	112,814
February	75,088
March	116,574
April	106,995
May	107,263
June	103,082
July	93,017
August	79,203
September	108,926
October	142,847
November	147,504
December	138,898
Total	1,332,211

That is a very important matter in the interests of the industry, a continuous supply of hogs. That has grown out of the fact that we have raised a great deal of barley but instead of exporting it we

have fed it to hogs and given the finished product, so far as the farmer is concerned, to the factories of the country and we made more money. I need not refer to the exports of meat which have been falling off to some extent owing to the larger consumption of hog products in the western country. I do not look upon that question of barley as of much interest to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. We will never become the producers of that malt barley which they sought after a few years ago. That is a strong statement to make but I wish to show why I make it. I live in a section of country which 25 or 30 years ago produced one of the finest malt barleys in the Dominion—mellow, rich and high grade. The American malster and the Montreal malster always looked after that grain for malting purposes. But a strange thing occurred. I had some experience in the barley market some 25 or 30 years ago, and in 1891 this happened. I had bought ten to fifteen thousand bushels and undertook to place them with Canadian malsters. But what did I find? I went to the malster of Dows brewery, an old gentleman of long experience and told him the locality from which the barley came. He said that they used to seek after it but did not want it any longer because it did not malt properly. I then took it to a broker who had a German instrument for testing barley for malting purposes and he found that 30 per cent of it would not sprout in time to malt with that which first sprouted, and it was simply feed barley. That is the position in which we will be so far as the American market is concerned. We will be simply shipping feed instead of malt barley.

There is another reason. New York State used to be the great malting centre of the United States but that centre has moved to Chicago, Milwaukee and Minneapolis. That western country has come to be the finest barley producing country in the world and grows the largest barley crop in the United States. Thus we have lost our position in that respect and cannot regain it. The value of barley in the State of New York has fallen from $9,000,000 to $7,000,000, and the whole business has been transferred to the western states which formerly was done in New York. So that whatever effect this agreement might have on the western provinces, it will not have the effect in Canada which some people think it will.

Besides if a policy which encourages people to ship out their raw product is not the proper policy, why revert to it? Why should the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), reverse his teaching of the last 15 or 20 years. We have been telling the farmers to feed their hay to their stock and make their farms profitable. We have been telling them to feed their coarse grains to their cattle. A bushel of oats sells at from 25 to 30 cents but it is worth 45 cents made into butter. We are therefore now simply reversing our teaching of the last 25 years, which is a great mistake. It is no kindness to the province of Quebec to encourage its farmers to ship their hay. But it would be a kindness to induce them to feed that hay to their stock at home. An hon. member spoke of hay growing on the shores of Lake St. Peter for hundreds of years, but that is coarse fibrous hay which is not fit for export and which will grow for thousands of years. It is not timothy. It is a mistake to ship our hay out of the country. It may be well enough in the case of those marshes in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia which are always replenished by the sea water, but it is not a good policy in the case of other agricultural lands. If a farmer can use his hay at home, it is much better for him to do so and convert it into a finished product.

While on this subject I want to say that the United States have two great factors in their agricultural wealth which we can never hope to have to the same extent. They have their corn and cotton. We grow corn of course in a limited area in Ontario and Quebec and some in Nova Scotia but not to any considerable extent. It is impossible for our farmers to raise pork on peas, oats and barley, which is a superior article, and compete with the cheaper corn fed product in the United States. Last year the United States produced 3,125,000,000 bushels of corn, the largest crop in their history. What does that mean? That means that the country during 120 days of sunshine and moisture produced $15,000,000 a day. Is that all they can do? My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller), says the United States have about reached their agricultural limit. Why, the man who says that has not studied conditions there.

Mr. MILLER. I did not make that statement from my own personal knowledge but on the highest authority in the United States.

Mr. BRODER. Well, the authority my hon. friend quoted did not know what he was talking about. What is the fact? It is simply this, that the United States, with their enormous acreage, have only improved 50 per cent of their farm acreage. But is that the limit of their farm acreage? Why, we have no idea of that limit. This country is producing wheat 13 bushels to the acre. The crop in England is 33 bushels to the acre. Now the United States have increased their product per acre about a bushel in the last eight years. If they would adopt scientific farming and a proper agricultural system, then

they could double their product, which would give 26 bushels per acre, and still be seven bushels per acre less than England, and they would then export 700,000,000 bushels of wheat. That is the position in which we are when dealing with these people in an agricultural sense.

What about their corn? They have started in the south what they call corn clubs. We hear a good deal about our boy scouts, but I am not sure that it would not be better to put these boys into corn clubs, and get them to work the corn fields. They have 1,043 boys, from 10 to 18 years of age, under the instruction of scientific teachers. Each boy has an acre of corn to take care of. His father ploughs the ground and seeds it. What happens?

On page 158 of their year book of 1909 I find some figures in this matter. That year book gives the results of a corn contest by the boys in one of the counties on the Mississippi. The average production was 74 bushels per acre on the land cared for by these boys while the average production on the other farm lands was less than 20 bushels per acre in the whole state.

And here is one boy who had a measured acre and produced 152½ bushels, while the average in the state was less than 16 bushels. These figures show the possibilities of that great country in these matters in which some of us say they have reached their limit. There is not a State in the Union that does not raise corn in quantities except Nevada. If they adopted advanced methods, what would it mean? It would mean cheaper beef and cheaper pork. Ah, but you say, beef went up in the United States within the last three or four years. Yes, but why? In 1906 or 1907, I have forgotten which, the federal government passed what is called the 'no fence' law. This interfered with the rancher. the ranchers were being broken up and divided among settlers. This threw the cattle off the ranches, and many of them went into the slaughter-house. Consequently beef went down in the United States—They had reached their climax in beef production on the ranches. Those animals that were not sent to the slaughter-houses were taken to the barns to be fed on corn. That lessened the pork product, and pork went up. What has happened and is happening now? In January, 1911, they had 1,400,000 more hogs on United States farms than they had in the January before. And pork in Chicago, the day before yesterday—there was no quotation yesterday, being a holiday—was $15.70 for May pork a barrel, while mess pork in Montreal was $23 a barrel. And, while we are on this subject, let me quote some figures in reference to pork in the United States. These figures are taken from a book issued by Bartlett, Fraser & Co., grain and provisions, Chicago, and it is sent to me by J. S. Bache & Co., a large brokerage house of good standing. These figures generally are made up from the official documents of the United States. One table gives the price of mess pork for fourteen years past. In January, 1910, it was $22.50 a barrel, while in 1897 it was $7.55 a barrel; that is, $7.55 for 200 lbs. of pork. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Nanaimo) what about the consumer in 1897, when he got pork for 3½ cents a pound, was he as well off as he is to-day when he has to pay $20 a barrel? These figures show that the price was highest in 1910. There is a good deal of speculative market in the United States. This does not help our farmers, because before they can get into the market the prices change. He cannot contract on these figures, but has to go into the market, and take the price he finds when he gets there. Now the average price for seven years, as given in this book is $6.22 per hundred weight, live weight, and the average price for five years, as I quoted, is $6.85 per hundredweight.

Now, a good deal has been said about eggs. Eggs are being shipped freely into this country by the United States to-day. Why do they come in here? Because the United States market is better than ours? No man would say that. The fact is the owners find a better market here. Now, as to the consumer, the consumer will get from the American jobber a good deal of inferior produce as compared with that which he has at home. Are these eggs that are being shipped in from Chicago the kind of food that our consumer wants? And what about the apples they will ship into our western country? There are what may be called tramp cars of apples—three sent to Ogdensburg, four sent to Malone, twenty sent to Buffalo, and so on to be sold at any price that can be got, and sent by a dealer, who is willing to leave the grade of production in order to make his own profit. Do our people want the market flooded with this poor stuff, while the American eats the best? And what does this admission of our wheat into the northern states mean? It means that the American will eat the better grades of wheat and will have a better opportunity to ship the worse grades to Europe, and so we shall lose our distinctive character as a wheat producing country. Now, these are the problems that we ought to look in the face. We in Canada to-day have a milling capacity for 13,000,000 people. When our western farmer looks over to some point in North Dakota or Minnesota, he may find wheat 8 cents a bushel higher than on our side. Well, how is that? The area of hard wheat in the United States is confined to a very small limit, and the competition by the American millers to get hard wheat to mix with the softer wheat has put the price up. But when our wheat

goes in, that distinction will be gone. But some may say: We have had for ten years the right to ship wheat in bond and grind it in bond. Yes, but they could not sell the by-product to their own people; the bran and shorts had to go out of the country as well as the flour, and it could not be shipped successfully because of its bulk and the high freights in consequence. That is the reason they did not avail themselves more of the grinding of wheat in bond. What will be the effect of transferring our milling interests to Minneapolis and other points in the American northwest? It means that the shorts and bran will be sent to the western states, instead of being sent east as at present. You can ship the bran on the wheat, but you cannot ship it in bulk after it has gone to the grindstone. These things affect our people, and we ought to deal with them in a common sense way. But some people say our western people have a perfect right to get a better market. True, but any one who knows the west must know that the west must go into mixed farming in order to really succeed. I wish to call the attention of the House to this point. Our western country is not likely to repeat the history, in an agricultural sense, of the western states. The reason is that these western states grow great quantities of corn, and corn is a cleaning crop for their land. They plant corn and cultivate it, and clean their land. Then they can sow wheat and raise a clean crop of wheat. Is that the case in our country? The serious problem of our western country is to keep the land clean, and that is a problem the government ought to take in hand. For even the eastern country is being injured by noxious weeds coming in from the west in carloads of wheat and being scattered along the railway. A very serious matter for Ontario and Quebec. We have not got the cleaning crop that renovates the land, and it produces a better crop of wheat after the corn crop has cleaned the land. That is something our people ought to think about.

Then there is another feature. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars opening up our western country, and we have spent a good many anxious hours. I venture to say that hon. gentlemen sitting on the treasury benches have spent a good many anxious hours dealing with the problems of the western country. Well, are those who have not spent a dollar, who have not spent an anxious hour, to go in there and participate in the markets of the west, or are the people who have spent their money, and their anxious hours in opening up that country to have the right to go in there and feed those people with the articles they cannot produce? If you go down to Nova Scotia we find immense coal fields. We have spent millions of dollars on the development of that great province and no honest Canadian will grumble at it. Is the American who has not spent a dollar to come in and participate in that market? When it is Canada that has made the sacrifice, ought she not to have some benefit in going into the markets of Nova Scotia? These are questions we are supposed to look squarely in the face. My hon. friend yonder was talking about potatoes in New Brunswick. Well, so far as I am concerned—to use plain English—I dont want to see New Brunswick made the potato patch of the United States, nor that the future occupation of those noble people in New Brunswick should be the extermination of potato bugs in order that the citizens of Boston and New York may have potatoes for dinner. I say they are worth something better than that. Then the noble little island of Prince Edward. I would rather build a tunnel across Northumberland straits than to see the future destiny of that little island tied up to the Boston wharfs. These are problems that should appeal to the Canadian people, and we must deal with them. Oh, well, we are old, our geographical position is difficult. That is very true. But nature's God intended the Canadian people should be strong, and able to overcome difficulties. Is there a Canadian who is not proud of British Columbia? That province with her great range of mountains, holds in her rugged embrace the record of the ages, and she may hold also the future destiny of the Canadian people. I am not disposed to say that the Canadian people cannot work out their great problems on this northern half of the continent, and I am not disposed to say that the Canadian people should be carried away into political annexation with the United States because they happen to deal with these people. But I say this, and I say it after a good deal of consideration, when you look into the conditions of commercial life in this country and in the United States, what do you find? The man who says that a few capitalists in Toronto shall not dictate to the western farmers, is he willing to jump into the arms of the great American trusts, that may one day embrace the Canadian business and the Canadian people? I say that the day of the village and the small town, as a business and social centre, has largely gone in this country. Where are the people to look for their ideals? Where are they to look for their business methods? Into the great centres? And what shall become of our great western country looking into the great centres of the United States? What do we find? Starting from the Atlantic coast you will find these great centres between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and what are they? Why it is enough to make a man with the welfare of his country at heart feel very serious when he looks at the condition that confronts us to the south. You

have Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Kansas city, Omaha, Denver, Salt Lake City, Portland, Oregon, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle—the energies of that whole people centring in these great centres of population, their network of business, their great capital, their business methods. Does any man want to see our people getting their ideals from these great centres, and come under the influence of those great trusts which, with their body in the United States, will reach out their arms to control our Canadian interests? What do you find further? Ex-president Roosevelt, under an Act of Congress, undertook to prosecute the Standard Oil Company. They spent two millions and a half, and they never collected one dollar of a fine, they never curtailed one solitary interest. And if the Standard Oil Company is stronger than the United States Congress and its president, will it not be stronger than the eight millions of Canadians who will come under its power? That is a question before the Canadian people to consider. The Steel Trust controls seventy per cent of all the iron in the United States, a handful of lumbermen control eighty per cent of the lumber, the Standard Oil Company controls all the oil in that country, and then there are trusts that control coal and meat. These are things that Canada must consider in viewing this proposed agreement. The United States are after our raw material, I do not blame them for that. The hon. gentlemen who went to Washington must realize that the conditions of this country have changed. Our position is very different from what it was 25 or 30 years ago. And there is this to be said, that we have this vantage ground over the United States and many other countries in that our great resources are still largely undeveloped. That is something that every Canadian should be proud of. Why? Because a wilful waste of the country's resources now will astound the economist of the future. I tell you that what the American wants to-day is the raw material of this country, and the question is whether, with our business equipment, and with our business men, as keen as any in the world, shall be allowed to develop these resources instead of allowing Americans to come in and take away our raw material into their own country, and make it worth twice its original value by the labour they put into it.

Now people have said a good deal about loyalty. Well, I am always willing to fight for my country when she needs me. I am glad she has not needed me very often. If it is necessary, I believe the Canadian people will stand to their guns irrespective of party. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) the other day referred to Sir John A. Macdonald as the Premier who waved the flag. Well, there were days when it was necessary to wave the flag, and I think everybody admits that it is a wise thing to do when it is necessary. Our friends opposite make a lot of noise about the British preference. Well, let us look at this thing. I have figured out, or a better man has figured out, the proposition. The free list from the United States in 1910 amounted to $106,000,000. What about the free list from England?—$23,000,000. The average rate of duty on goods imported from the United States, free and dutiable, was 13·71 per cent. Some of you say that there is a lot of raw material. That is not a consistent argument for a free trader to use because he is not supposed to hurt one country to help another. In 1910 the average rate of duty on goods from Great Britain was 19·9 per cent, over 5 per cent higher than the average rate of duty on goods coming from the United States. It is a strange thing that the overseas trade shows a much higher duty than that coming from the United States. The average rate of duty on goods coming from the whole British Empire was 18·06 per cent, and from all foreign countries 15·31 per cent, or less than from Great Britain. The average rate of duty on goods coming from foreign countries, exclusive of the United States, was 26·9 per cent.

They have done a great deal more shouting about their little loyalty than the Conservatives do about the big bulk they have on hand. They say: The free list is large. But why should the free list be so large, particularly for free traders? I do not think there should be so much said about this loyalty question when you come to look at the matter squarely in the face. I could enumerate a lot of articles that come from these favoured nation countries, and remember that under the treaty of 1854 there was no favoured nation clause. It simply applied to the United States and no other country. As my hon. friends know, at that time England did not have treaties affecting this question and obliging us to give to other nations what we gave to any single foreign country. That is a distinction that we ought to bear in mind because in 1854 there was nothing of that sort facing the people of Canada.

We are making history. When the northmen came down they settled in that part of France called Normandy. They went over and conquered the Saxons in the eleventh century, and for 400 years they had control of these Saxons. What happened? I do not want to refer to history in so far as our country is concerned. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) the other night talked about his ox. If he is going to stay in his stall with his ox I am quite willing that he shall, but do not ask me to stay in the stall with the ox. While the Saxon was taking care of the ox, feeding him,

getting him ready for the Norman's use, it was Saxon, but when the ox was placed upon the table of the Norman it was beef, it was French. When the hog was in the pen, and the Saxon was looking after him, and was carrying the swill, to use plain language, it was hog, but when it got up on the other man's table it was pork, it was French. It was hog in one place, but it was pork in the other. While the Saxon was herding the sheep in the fields it was Saxon, it was sheep, but when it got on the other fellow's table it was mutton, it was French. When the Saxon was running after the calf in the field, and trying to feed him and it is no small matter, I would have you understand—it was calf, it was Saxon, but when it got on the table of the Frenchman, with all the other viands around, it was veal, it was French. That is what we are coming to with the United States: we will take care of the ox in the stall, it will leave Canada as the ox, but when it gets on brother Jonathan's table it will be beef, it will be United States. So it will be, with the hogs, the horses, and the sheep. When my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs was talking about delving in the mines of Frontenac I wondered who would use the picks and shovels. They would be Canadians, but when the product gets into the finished springs of the automobile in which Brother Jonathan is riding around at his ease it will be United States. I say, make it Canadian. I am not disposed to carry swill to feed the hogs to feed Brother Jonathan. If my hon. friends want to do it they can give lots of their friends jobs; we do not want them. Yes, they can give them jobs out in the west or anywhere else that they like. The Canadian people are made of better stuff. The hon. gentlemen who went to Washington are made of better stuff than that and they would not want such an effect, and I believe that they now realize that this bargain will not work out as they first thought.

The right hon. leader of the government and his friends went behind the backs of the people once in their history. It is said that they went to the manufacturers and assured them that they would not hurt them in 1896, or a strong friend of theirs who is now in his grave, did it for them. If they would go behind the backs of the people before, let them wake up those old men over there in the Senate and tell them to strangle this child born out of due season because if they do so it will do this country a lot of good. I hope that the common sense of these hon. gentlemen will induce them to adopt this course. Let us have a decent funeral and we will all go as pallbearers.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Mr. BRODER

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. GERMAN presented the third report of the Privileges and Elections Committee.

Mr. MONK. Are all the proceedings of the committee and the evidence now before the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose that the report includes the proceedings, the evidence and everything.

Mr. MONK. If they are before the House, I would like to ask when it is intended to take into consideration the report of that committee. There were no draft reports, and I suppose that, as is usual, a time will be fixed for the consideration of the report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I had not thought of fixing any date. We are approaching the Easter recess, and I suppose it was not intended to take this report up before Easter.

Mr. MONK. Am I to understand it will be taken up after the Easter recess?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Unless there is some reason to the contrary, that is my intention.

Mr. PERLEY. I understood from the chief government whip that the Prime Minister would arrange a time for taking up this important report, so that it might be understood on both sides when the discussion would take place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will give due notice. We will fix a date across the floor as usual for the consideration of the matter.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 161) to incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.—Mr. Fowke.

Bill (No. 162) respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 163) for the relief of Mary Jane Beatty.—Mr. Congdon.

Bill (No. 164) for the relief of Walter Harvey Kirkland.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

VALUE OF CANADIAN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Mr. BRADBURY:

What was the total product of the farms in Canada, including animals and the dairy products, for the years 1908, 1909 and 1910?

Mr. FISHER:

The estimated value of field crops in Canada in 1908 was $432,534,000, in 1909 $532,992,100, and in 1910 $507,185,500.

The estimated value of dairy products of Canada in 1908 was $96,000,000, in 1909 $98,000,000, and in 1910 $100,000,000.

The estimated value of farm animals in Canada in 1908 was $531,000,000, in 1909 $557,223,000, and in 1910 $593,768,000.

QUEBEC BRIDGE—FAIR WAGE SCHEDULE.

Mr. AMES:

1. Does the Department of Labour intend to establish a minimum scale for those who shall be employed upon the Quebec bridge?

2. Does the schedule contain a minimum wage for bridge workers, and will such schedule form part of any and every contract, or sub-contract, that shall be made with those who shall build the bridge?

Mr. KING. 1 and 2. The following clause prepared by the Department of Labour was inserted in the form of tender for the contract for this work and appears as part of the contract:

All mechanics, labourers or other persons who perform labour in the construction of the work hereby contracted for, shall be paid such wages as are generally accepted as current for competent workmen in the district in which the work is being performed, and if there is no current rate in such district, then a fair and reasonable rate, and shall not be required to work for longer hours than those fixed by the custom of the trade in the district where the work is carried on, except for the protection of life or property, or in the case of other emergencies. In the event of a dispute arising as to what is the current or a fair and reasonable rate of wages or what are the current hours fixed by the custom of the trade it shall be determined by the Minister of Labour, whose decision shall be final.

These conditions shall extend and apply to moneys payable for the use or hire of horses or teams, and the persons entitled to payment for the use or hire of horses or teams shall have like right in respect of moneys owing to them as if such moneys were payable to them in respect of wages.

In the event of default being made in payment of and money owing in respect of wages of any mechanic, labourer or other person employed on the said work, and if a claim therefor is filed in the office of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and proof thereof satisfactory to the minister is furnished, the Minister may pay such claim out of any moneys at any time payable by His Majesty under such contract, and the amounts so paid shall be deemed payments to the company.

The company shall post in a conspicuous place on the works under construction the general clause above mentioned for the protection of the workmen employed.

The company shall keep a record of payments made to workmen in its employ, and the books or documents containing such record shall be open for inspection by the fair wages officers of the government at any time it may be expedient to the Minister of Labour to have the same inspected.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the twelfth instant, it stand adjourned to Wednesday, the 19th of April.

Motion agreed to.

ANGLO-JAPANESE TREATY.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. SPROULE. Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance a question. I notice in this morning's 'Citizen' a statement that the Anglo-Japanese Treaty has been ratified at Tokio. May I inquire whether there has been any correspondence between the Canadian government and the imperial government with regard to the advisability of not including the favoured nation clause in this treaty so as to affect Canada; or, if Canada is included in this treaty, was there any correspondence between the Canadian and imperial governments on the question?

Mr. FIELDING. The question of whether or not Canada will desire to adhere to this treaty or make an independent treaty is now under consideration. But the treaty does not touch Canada at all.

Mr. SPROULE. As to the favoured nation clause?

Mr. FIELDING. We have not yet a copy of the treaty, and whether it includes the favoured nation clause or not we are not informed. We shall have a copy, no doubt, in due course, and then the question will have to be considered whether Canada shall seek to adhere to the treaty or make a special treaty.

SOREL SHIPYARDS—OFFICIAL INQUIRY.

Mr. MONK. Has an inquiry been instituted at Sorel by the government? If so, who is conducting it, and what is the object of that inquiry?

Mr. BRODEUR. Immediately after the charges were made in the House, as it referred to the department, an inquiry was entered into by the inspector of agencies and the agent.

Mr. MONK. Who is conducting the inquiry and what is the subject of the inquiry?

Mr. BRODEUR. Statements were made in the affidavits filed before the House that affected the department, and we are investigating these allegations. Previous to that,

certain statements were brought to the attention of the department, and these also are being investigated.

Mr. MONK. When was the investigation ordered?

Mr. BRODEUR. After the charges were made.

Mr. MONK. Is that inquiry being conducted by Mr. Wiallard, the private secretary of the minister?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but by the agent of the department in Montreal and the inspector of agencies.

Mr. MONK. That is, by Mr. Wiallard?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Wiallard is one, Mr. Boyd is the other.

Mr. MONK. Is Mr. Wiallard the private secretary to the minister?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was formerly my private secretary, but not now.

MANITOBA SWAMP LANDS.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) with regard to an article that has appeared in several Manitoba Liberal papers to the effect that this government is willing to concede to the province of Manitoba, 6,000,000 acres of swamp lands in addition to the 2,000,000 acres the province is already getting. I would like to know whether this article is true, and whether the government endorses the ideas of the Minister of the Interior in this instance?

Mr. OLIVER. There is an arrangement between the province of Manitoba and the Dominion of Canada, dated many years ago, whereby the swamp lands within the province become the property of the province after survey and examination and decision that they are swamp lands. No person is able to make an offer to the provincial governments of the swamp lands, for they belong to the province under that agreement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That does not cover exactly what is contained in the Winnipeg papers. May I ask the minister if he wrote a letter for publication to any of the papers in Winnipeg with regard to an additional grant of land in Manitoba?

Mr. OLIVER. I have written several letters both to persons and newspapers, and amongst these letters I have written to papers in Winnipeg explaining the position, as I understood it, of the Dominion government; and, in the letters which I have seen published, an estimate is made that the province of Manitoba will become entitled to about 8,000,000 acres of swamp lands altogether under the agreement that I mentioned.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is not anything outside of that agreement, this is no new grant, it is only to carry out the terms of the old agreement.

Mr. OLIVER. In any document I have ever written or seen published, there was no suggestion that the Dominion government was going to make any additional grant in regard to swamp lands. The statement was merely made that there was an agreement, and an estimate was made of the area of those swamp lands.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have brought this up because a wrong interpretation has been put on the letter of my hon. friend published in a Winnipeg newspaper. I would like to ask further if it is the intention of his department to hurry on a survey of those swamp lands in Manitoba, so that at some time in the life-time of people living there now, the province will get some benefit from the lands? I say that for this reason, that the Manitoba government have adopted a policy of drainage, and the swamp lands that are now unsurveyed, and for that reason cannot be handed over by the Dominion to the province, will be in a year or two dry land through the efforts of the province and of others, and the land they should have will be taken away from them. If the Dominion will give some guarantee that they will hurry up the survey, I think it will be well received in the west.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to surveys, I want to say that in the province of Manitoba they have been pushed, if not as fast as in other provinces, they have been pushed further in advance of the demand for settlement than in any other province, with a view of bringing into play the agreement in favour of the province that I have already mentioned. The government is quite prepared from time to time to hand over those swamp lands after survey. I can hardly think that the condition is such as my hon friend has suggested, that the province is so far ahead of the present survey in the matter of its requirements of swamp lands, that our failure to make more rapid surveys constitutes a detriment to the province in its schemes of reclamation. I would be glad if my hon. friend would give me any instances of that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister misunderstands me. The lands are surveyed, I admit that, but after the survey the swamp lands have to be examined by certain commissioners, and the work of these commissioners is so far behind the requirements of the province, and the rapid movement of the government in its drainage policy, that the lands that ought to belong to them, had they been gone over and examined by the commissioners, are not being reclaimed, and the province is losing

its right to those lands. I can instance Glenella and the McCreary district, up northerly and northeasterly from these two points, where big drainage works have been made.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure we have no desire to do anything except to carry out the exact agreement made with the province of Manitoba. It is true that the commissioners are not able to make an examination of the swamp lands as fast as they are surveyed, but I can assure my hon. friend that as regards any drainage schemes of the province, if we are made aware of those schemes, we will see that the lands are inspected, and will see that no advantage will be taken of the province such as my hon. friend suggests. There is no desire at all to allow that.

MARKEY FISHING LEASE.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before you leave the Chair, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), to recur again to a subject that must be getting distasteful to him and to this House, in regard to the Markey lease. It is over two years since the Minister of Marine and Fisheries decided to cancel the lease, and he handed it over, I understand, to the Department of Justice. Up to date nothing has been done, and the fact that nothing has been done militates against the interest of the people in that district. Those leases cover a very large territory, and no man outside the Hudson Bay Company can get a fishing lease. Now, surely something can be done to expedite this cancellation, so as to throw open the fishing that otherwise would be open under the law. I would ask the minister if he cannot do something at once, so that even before the cancellation has taken place, private individuals can get an ordinary fishing license to operate there.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. This is a matter of considerable importance, and I can assure my hon. friend one of very considerable difficulty from the standpoint of a lawyer trying to ascertain what is best to be done. I think it would not be in the public interest that any public statement should be made in regard to the difficulties which impress my mind, at any rate, in connection with the legal position. But I should be glad to discuss the whole subject in the most full and frank manner, either with my hon. friend or with any other gentleman interested, who would like to know the exact way in which the matter strikes my mind. It is now, I think, nearly two years since the whole subject was referred by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the Department of Justice for advice and action. Circumstances with which every one in the House is acquainted, have made it practically impossible, up to the present time, to make much progress in the way of actual litigation. I was not in the country for some four or five months immediately following the reference of the matter to the Department of Justice; and again was absent from the country for an even longer time during the season of 1910. After considering the subject as fully as I was able, I thought it a case in which I ought to have the best legal assistance I could secure, and shortly after returning to Canada in the fall of 1909 I took the matter up with Mr. Shepley, of Toronto. We had a discussion of it between ourselves for some time, and we thought we had better have a conference with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and Mr. Shepley and I separated at that time with the arrangement that we would get together with my colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, at the earliest opportunity. Not long after that he was seized with a very serious illness, which made it impossible for me or anybody else to see him up to the time when I left Canada in May last. Upon the return of Mr. Shepley and myself to Canada in October last, only a few days intervened until Mr. Shepley was seized with an illness of equal seriousness. In that situation, and in the impossibility which now appears of having any assistance from Mr. Shepley in the matter for some time to come, I have consulted Mr. Chrysler of this city, and all the papers in connection with this matter are now in his hands, with the intention that at the earliest day possible he will advise with me and with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to the course that should be adopted. That is the exact position in which the matter is. Just one word as to the consequences or effect of the unfortunate delay which has taken place. Every one, I think, is agreed that in the public interest these leases should be got rid of, if it is possible by legal means. When any litigation is decided upon it is in the interest of every one concerned that it should be brought to a close at the earliest date possible, but in this matter, fortunately, I think no actual harm takes place by the delay, no change of condition upon the ground takes place so far as I understand, and, in any event, the leases would probably be impregnable as far as the original term of some few years is concerned. That original term is still current in each case, and in that state of matters, while action and result are, in every sense, most desirable, the Crown is in no worse position by the circumstance that no definite action has yet been taken.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Allen

Aylesworth) does not intend to recompense this party for the cancellation of the leases.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that I cannot allow any debate on the orders of the day. Perhaps, when the motion is made to go into committee, the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I am just making an inquiry; I am not going to discuss the matter at all. If such is the intention of the hon. gentleman I must lodge my protest because this is as nefarious a transaction as ever was perpetrated by any government, giving all those immense waters in the Northwest Territories to a lawyer in Montreal for no other purpose that selling the privilege and making money out of it.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. You will see, Mr. Speaker, that it is no question of governmental or departmental action. It is a question simply of whether we can obtain from the court a judgment declaring the leases at an end, and the matter will be entirely one for action by the court, not for action by the government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice on what he bases his remarks that there is no change in the condition on the ground there. There is going to be a tremendous change of condition on the ground with reference to these fishing leases the moment the Hudson Bay railway is built, as it runs through a great portion of the territory covered by these leases, and I would like to ask the minister if the fact that he knows now that there will be a change of condition will incite him to quick action.

Mr. BRODEUR. What my hon. friend the Minister of Justice said was that there was no change in so far as the legal position of the government was concerned, that whether there has been a delay of a year or two the situation is not changed in so far as our legal rights are concerned.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is there any doubt about the government being able to cancel these leases?

Mr. BRODEUR. That would be a question for the courts to decide, because that is the question which is going to be submitted to the courts.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Under existing conditions is it possible, while this matter is sub judice, for an ordinary fishing lease to be granted to any one up in that district authorizing him to catch fish in these waters, or are the waters to be tied up indefinitely?

Mr. BRODEUR. For my part I would see no objection to anybody else getting a license.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark).

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a question. When this matter was before the Public Accounts Committee I think Mr. Markey stated that he was quite willing that all the leases he had should be cancelled. He did not think them of great value, he was only paying $10 a year for them, and we had a promise in this House that they would be immediately cancelled. If I understand, this parliament is supreme, and can cancel them. Does the Prime Minister intend to cancel these leases absolutely? If it is a question for the courts, or if there is any doubt about it, will he cancel the leases rather than submit the question to the courts? I think the matter is of so much importance to the northwest in the future that if there is any question about their cancellation we had better bring it before parliament, and ask parliament to cancel them. It would save the country the expense of going to the courts, and this submission to the courts would seem to be needless in view of the fact that Mr. Markey was quite willing to cancel the leases at the time he appeared before the Public Accounts Committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend, I am sure, on reflection, will not persist in this advice that parliament should substitute itself for the courts, and, acting on its own wisdom, cancel this contract. A contract was entered into, whether wisely or unwisely I have no opinion to express at this moment, but certainly the contract having been entered into, it should be set aside by the court, and my hon. friend, I am sure, will not persist in advising that parliament should substitute its authority for that of the court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) misunderstood my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). My hon. friend said that the lessee was perfectly willing to have these leases cancelled and, therefore, there was no need to go to the court, as parliament could cancel the leases with the consent of both parties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If Mr. Markey is willing to cancel his contract there is no need for coming to parliament at all. The government can act upon the consent.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand that at the Public Accounts Committee Mr. Markey was willing that the leases should be cancelled. He had spent only a small amount, some few thousand dollars, and he was willing that they should be cancelled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But now perhaps he is making up claims on account of the

different position created by the railway going through there. Is the Prime Minister going to allow this thing to go on year after year until there is an immense claim on a $10 lease, or is the question to be decided immediately, because, if that is the position that the Prime Minister is going to take, I think we had better have it up in parliament and let parliament decide. If the Prime Minister is going to allow the matter to go on year after year I for one think that we should bring it up in this House and see what the position is, because it was distinctly intimated by the government across the floor of this House—I am satisfied I can look it up in 'Hansard'—that the lease was cancelled or would be cancelled immediately.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and I cannot say what took place there, but if Mr. Markey has stated that he is willing to cancel the lease the thing is at an end and he has only to register his consent. If he is not willing, we have no authority to do anything except to refer the matter to the courts.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This parliament has authority to cancel the leases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think that my hon. friend would ask that parliament should interfere with and set aside a contract.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think parliament has a right to set aside a contract that is unfair and unjust.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the reason for granting such an absurd lease in the first place?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is another matter.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The evidence with regard to this matter is contained in the Journals of 1907. What surprises me is that when I go to the Library to inquire for it, I am informed that that particular volume is not in the Library and never was there. May I ask the Prime Minister if he will see that one of these books is placed in the Library at once, so that members may see the evidence showing the position taken by Mr. Markey at that time?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend knows that the Library is not under the control of the government, but under the control of the Senate and the House of Commons. Why the public documents cannot be found in the Library I do not know. I will ask the officers of the House to look into the matter.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It has always been understood that all public documents are kept in the Library, and if so, I want now to see that Journal. I suppose the Prime Minister admits that I am entitled to see it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will he tell me where I can see it, or have a copy of it placed in the Library. It is the only volume that is missing since Confederation. If there is only one left, and the Prime Minister will let me see it, I will send it back to any department he wishes.

SETTLEMENT OF NORTHERN ONTARIO.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege for the purpose of directing the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to a statement made by him which I find in 'Hansard' of March 13, page 196, in which he said:

> We have not taken up the question of the settlement of northern Ontario for the reason that until the Grand Trunk Pacific is in operation, the clay belt which has been spoken of so much is not available for settlement. There is land along the line of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway between North Bay and Cochrane, but I do not know that the field for settlement there is sufficiently desirable to warrant the government in making any special effort. But as soon as the clay belt is made available by the construction of the Transcontinental and its operation, no doubt the government will be ready to take up the question of directing colonization into that part of the country.

I would like to point out to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) that immediate steps should be taken to direct colonization into that part of the Dominion. From New Liskeard or from Haileybury up to Cochrane where the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway reaches the Transcontinental railway, is a distance of 150 miles, and the Transcontinental is now practically built at least 50 miles east and west of Cochrane. Between Cochrane and New Liskeard on the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario there are several hundred thousand acres of land which is as fertile as is to be found anywhere on this continent, and better than which there is none in the Northwest. This year agricultural implement firms have shipped into that country no less than forty cars of machinery, and I myself have seen places where forty bushels to the acre of wheat was produced. No time longer should be lost in waiting until the completion of the Transcontinental before the minister takes that energetic action he is capable of, and which he has been applying to the Northwest territories, to induce settlers to take up this land. Ontario has been paying into the Dominion treasury something like 40 per cent of the gross revenue, and Ontario

is more entitled to consideration than it has been getting in the past from the Dominion Immigration Department. One reason why agriculture has not been more rapidly developed in that country is that the rich mining districts in the vicinity allure those who otherwise would settle on the land. I trust the Minister of the Interior will do me and the country the justice of investigating for himself the facts which I have presented with regard to the fertility of that land.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure the House has heard with a great deal of attention the evidence given by my hon. friend (Mr. Gordon) as to the agricultural capabilities of the country lying between Haileybury and Cochrane, and no doubt it will be a field for agricultural settlement in the future.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It is now.

Mr. OLIVER. The business of the Immigration Department is to draw the attention of possible immigrants to the advantage of any particular section of the country; and as my hon. friend has pointed out, people are being attracted to that country, or its immediate vicinity, in thousands, without any effort on the part of the Dominion Immigration Department. If we want to use our resources to the best advantage it seems to me that our money should be spent in attracting people to parts of the country which are themselves desirable, but to which people are not otherwise attracted. It does not appear to me, even on the showing of my hon. friend, that there is the same necessity for effort on the part of the Dominion government to attract people to that section as there is to attract them to a part of the country further removed from that magnificent mineral development, namely, to what is known as the clay belt along the Grand Trunk Pacific, and where, so far as we know at present, there is no great mineral development. The province of Ontario is not by any means ignored in the efforts of the Immigration Department. The amount of money expended by the department in attracting people to Ontario, and dealing with them after they have come there, has been given to the House in a former statement, and although the particular section of the country which my hon. friend (Mr. Gordon) represents, has not been directly dealt with, the province of Ontario has been dealt with directly just as well as other parts of the Dominion.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. OWEN (East Northumberland). I rise to a question of privilege. The Toronto 'Globe' stated a few days ago that I found the travel in my riding very hard because I was an opponent of reciprocity, and I have noticed in a later issue of the 'Globe' the statement that East Northumberland was in favour of reciprocity. I received a letter this morning from my own town, stating that in one manufacturing place there which employs 47 men, they have taken a vote on the question of reciprocity, and 46 were against reciprocity and one for it. I make this statement in the hope that it may be of some consolation to the 'Globe.'

WAYS AND MEANS—CONDITION OF THE PARLIAMENT GROUNDS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the most delightful and odoriferous scene which presents itself to those of the general public who may approach the parliament buildings. The Minister of Public Works has evidently in charge of these grounds some antediluvian gentleman selected from the sons of toil in the remote regions of Ontario or Quebec, and, the minister has evidently in charge of the parliament building itself some one who is familiar with cow stables, horse stables and barns, because if the minister visits almost any of the lavatories, or wash rooms connected with this institution, he will find that they are not up to the standard of any second-class hotel in any part of the Dominion. The scene that presents itself on Wellington street, on the approach to these grounds, is not such as can be found in any farm-yard in Canada. No farmer would have such a horrible exhibition. I direct the minister's attention to it as he may not have seen it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know the particular locality to which my hon. friend refers, but I will see that the attention of the proper officials is called to it.

Mr. HUGHES. Look at the lawn in front.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We expect to see the hon. minister out there with his shovel.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON. I would like to invite the attention of the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Graham) to a subject that is of deep import to the people of the maritime provinces, who are particularly interested in the Intercolonial railway. Hon. members will recall the fact that there was legislation at the last session of this parliament, initiated by the government, with respect to the acquisition of the branch

lines of railway connecting with the Intercolonial, to serve as feeders to that railway. So far as I know, no action has been taken by the government to give effect to that legislation, and I would like to ask if any action has been taken, or if any action will be taken during the session, towards carrying out the spirit and the letter of the Act to which I have referred.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question of acquiring the branch lines, under the statute passed at the last session of parliament, has not escaped the attention of the government. That statute, if I remember correctly, required that the recommendation should be made by the board of management and the chief engineer along certain lines. I have had both of these examine the lines, and have asked them to furnish me with a memorandum as to what lines might be considered branch lines. It may be that the statute of last session will be found to be so restrictive that to adhere strictly to it would preclude us from leasing the branch lines, but it may be possible to make provision that they can be taken over by certain expenditures being made upon them. However, I hope during the recess at Easter to get further advanced in the matter, so that I can make some definite announcement to the House after the vacation.

Mr. RHODES. I believe it is now something like ten months since the commissioners examined the branch lines in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and it seems to me that there has been ample time for their report to be in the hands of the minister and to be placed before the House. I would urge upon the minister the necessity of having this report brought down at the earliest possible moment, because the question of taking over the branch lines is one of vital importance to the maritime provinces, and is also in the interest of the Intercolonial itself.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is in error in supposing that any report was to be presented to the House by the officials named. That was not the intention. The Act provided that no railway should be taken over unless it was recommended by these officials, and these reports were for the consideration of the government.

Mr. RHODES. The minister misunderstands me. What I asked was that the minister should take the House into his confidence as to the nature of the report made by the commission on these branch lines.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, the question of the proposed reciprocity agreement, which has been discussed in this House for some time, is probably the most important one that has come before parliament for the last twenty years. Whatever any one may think on the subject, whatever may be said for or against this proposed pact, I think we all agree that it is absolutely necessary and reasonable that every information should be available to this parliament and to the people of Canada when the matter is being discussed. This compact, if carried out, will undoubtedly make great changes in this country. It will alter the laws of trade and change our point of view in a business way and in a national way. The result may be good or evil, some think one and some the other, but whatever any of us may think we must all agree that we ought to have every necessary information, all the statistics possible to enable us and the country to understand this great question and to make up our minds reasonably about it. For this purpose no statistics are more necessary than the statistics of the comparative prices and cost of production in the United States, in Canada, and in the most favoured nation countries, to enable us to make comparisons with regard to all the items included in this proposed agreement. We on this side have been endeavouring, without success, to get some of this information. The day after the Minister of Finance introduced his proposal, the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), asked the Prime Minister whether there were any other documents to be brought down in connection with the proposal presented the day before by the Minister of Finance. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), suggested at that time:

> Before we go on with the debate we should have some commercial statistics to guide us, and give us a basis of information.

On January 30, the hon. member for North Toronto again brought this question up, and amongst other things said:

> Just as soon as possible the statistics of trade bearing upon the arrangement which the Finance Minister laid before the House on Thursday should be put into the possession of members of the House.

On the 2nd of March the same hon. member said:

> I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the message sent by President Taft in reply to a request from the Senate, in which statistics are given as to the different items affected by the schedule in the agreement now under discussion. These statistics include the prices of various commodities such as beef, pork, butter, &c., in Canada and the United States for a series of years, and especially for the last year. In reply to the request the President sent down a list which gave the exact information required by the Senate.

Mr. Fielding in his answer said:

Of course we had to use our own sources of information and hon. gentleman who criticise the agreement will have to do likewise.

In other words, the government from the start have taken the position that they are not under any obligation to provide anybody with facts and figures necessary for a proper discussion of this question. They say: We have a staff of clerks in the service who are employed by both Conservatives and Liberals in this country but if we get any information from them, we will keep it for ourselves and you can hunt up what information you require for yourselves.

On March 9, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), brought this question up again. He said:

I wish to mention to the Prime Minister that very important and valuable statistics have been brought down to the Senate of the United States, compiled I believe by the Statistical Department or the Tariff Board, and that we seem to be entirely without similar information in this House. I have not had an opportunity of looking over this pamphlet which I received only this morning, but it seems to give a great deal of information as to industrial conditions, as to wages, and more than that as to the price of commodities in both countries. I would ask whether or not any information of a similar character is available here, and if so whether it is the intention of the government to lay it upon the table of the House?

Further on he said:

Perhaps I have overlooked it, but I would ask whether there has been any information submitted, with regard to wages, price of commodities and things of that kind.

Mr. Fielding in his reply said:

One hon. gentleman in debating the matter in the House referred to information to some extent of that character which will be found in the book of the Minister of Labour which is accessible to us all. The question of prices was dealt with rather fully and statistics brought down by the Minister of Agriculture. There is no other information available.

In other words, the Minister of Finance referred us at that time to the report of the Minister of Labour which had a few figures in this connection. But what we need and what we want is an official report similar to that provided in the United States.

On Monday last I again brought this question up in connection with an answer to a return. A return had been asked for by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), of a statement showing the average prices of butter and eggs in London, England, for the past five years, in comparison with the prices respectively in the Eastern Provinces, in Montreal, in Toronto, in Minneapolis, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Buffalo, in Boston and in New York.

A reply was sent by the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce to the Under-Secretary of State which I read at that time:

Trade and Commerce Department,
Ottawa, 25th March, 1911.

Order of the House.

Sir,—I beg to return you herewith your reference No. 172 for statement showing comparative prices of butter and eggs in London, England, and certain points in Canada and the United States. This department has no information upon the subject. Such average prices of butter and eggs, however, are published in trade papers all over the world which can be referred to by any one desiring the information.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. C. T. O'HARA,
Deputy Minister.

Thomas Mulvey, Esq.,
Under secretary of State,
Ottawa.

I may say in this connection that knowing Mr. O'Hara as I do, I am quite satisfied he did not intend to be discourteous himself, and I can imagine how much he disliked signing a letter of this kind in his official capacity. He has since written me a letter which I shall read later on, telling me that this communication of his was sent to the Under-Secretary of State and was not intended to be read in the House. But I can imagine how his chief, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, may have said to him in his gruff way: Oh let them go and hunt it up themselves, and that meant that Mr. O'Hara had to write a letter of this kind. The St. John 'Daily Telegraph' in referring to this discussion of last Monday says:

The somewhat frank intimation that the opposition is beginning to realize that it has too hastily taken an unpopular and indefensible position was bolstered up by petulant complaints that the government was responsible for their misfortune.

And in another place:

Even Mr. Perley, the chief whip of the party, added that it was impossible for the opposition to express a reasonable opinion on the merits of the proposal without further information.

I simply wish to say positively that we have not taken the unpopular and indefensible position with regard to this question. We have taken the position which the great majority of this country would commend, and will commend when they thoroughly understand this proposal. As it is being understood and threshed out in the country I firmly believe that every day the people of this country are becoming more strongly opposed to this extraordinary reciprocity agreement, and that they will con-

tinue to become more opposed to it the more clearly they understand it. We have a great mass of private information and private figures regarding this question. We have taken the trouble to inform ourselves, and to my mind it is evident that we know far more about what effect this arrangement will have upon the country than the government themselves know. But what we ask for, and what we asked for on Monday last, was an official statement by this government, figures that could not be denied or gainsaid by them. The Liberal newspapers and Liberal speakers are claiming that the agreement will raise prices for the farmer. We know that in most cases that is incorrect. But we wish to have statistics in official form which cannot be denied. We all know, those of us who have rural constituencies, what happens at the meeting in the country schoolhouse. One of the Conservative speakers makes a statement that is absolutely correct and truthful and, unless he has the book for it, the Liberal speaker denies it. Then the poor voter says: 'It's the same old story; one side says one thing and the other side says the other; and how am I to tell which is true?' We claim that we are entitled to a comparative statement of prices and cost of production in Canada and the United States, that cannot be gainsaid throughout this country, so that the government may be prevented from trying to bunco the people as they are evidently trying to do today. On Monday, I asked a question of the Minister of Customs, (Mr. Paterson), and that question and its answer are as follows:

Mr. PERLEY. Did the hon. the minister, or did he not, in Washington, have the statistics of comparative prices of the various farm products as between the United States and Canada when he was making this agreement?

Mr. PATERSON. We had all the information that we thought was necessary to justify us in making the agreement.

In other words, the minister practically acknowledged that he had not the information in his possession. I see that last night, during the speech of my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) the following occurred:

Mr TAYLOR. You had no facts or figures over there, but they had them all.

Mr. PATERSON. We had all that they had.

In other words, the Minister of Customs had no information as to prices and cost of production, but what Mr. Taft and Mr. Knox were kind enough to hand over, and on that he decided. These ministers journeyed to Washington, having no mandate from the people of this country to discuss this question, and no mandate even from the Liberal members of this House, for we have been told in the House that the Liberal members of parliament did not know any more about this matter, until it was brought into the House on the 26th of January last, than did the members on this side. Then the government forced these Liberal members into caucus and forced them to support this agreement whether they wished to or not—that is, they forced all they were able to, but three gentlemen at least had the courage of their convictions, and, if rumour speaks true, there are others. These ministers had no information to show what effect this agreement would have upon the trade of this country, what effect it would have upon prices, and, particularly, what effect it would have upon the farmers. So far as we have been able to find out—and we have tried hard—they had not such information; they had not any information whatever with regard to prices. In other words, these gentlemen went to Washington and made an agreement with the American president and Secretary of State, when they were in the dark; they come back here and ask their supporters to agree to it in the dark, and now they want this House and parliament to allow it to pass, still in the dark. To show that this is correct, I will read a letter received yesterday from the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. O'Hara:

Ottawa, April 4, 1911.

Dear Mr. Perley,—I much regret that my letter of the 25th March to Mr. Mulvey has been interpreted as an act of discourtesy to a member of the House. This was furthest from my intention. When I wrote to Mr. Mulvey, I was not aware that my letter would be sent down to the House. The Department of Secretary of State in certain cases prepare composite answers from information received from the various departments. In this case, I thought perhaps some of the information might also have been requested from the Department of Agriculture, inasmuch as they have much to do with agricultural produce such as butter, eggs, cheese, &c. The last sentence in my communication was intended for the information of Mr. Mulvey.

I have already said, I do not accuse Mr. O'Hara of any discourtesy. At the same time, I think it a most extraordinary thing that the government should allow a reply of that kind to be sent in as part of a return to an order of this House.

The compilation of statistics such as that requested in the return has more than once engaged the attention of this department, but we found that it required very considerable work which this department has as yet been unable to undertake. The work of the department has developed with such enormous strides that to-day we have not desk room for a single additional clerk.

That seems a very extraordinary excuse. If this information is considered necessary

for a return, it strikes me very forcibly that it is the duty of this government to employ some one to prepare that return.

I have searched in vain through the regular United States publications for the information requested in the return. In the 'Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance' of the United States they publish some exhaustive statements as to 'wholesale weekly prices of leading articles in United States markets.' This must have entailed an enormous amount of labour, but no reference is made to eggs, butter or cheese.

The only items contained under the heading 'Provisions' are lard, oleostearine, tallow, pork and beef. I am quite aware that the information requested would be of value could it be obtained with any reliability, but prices are fluctuating so constantly that the department might not, even were the information obtainable, be able to hand it out as official. We have found prices to materially differ in the same commodity on the same day in the same market.

That is all very true we all understand it, but at the same time the United States government has been able to prepare such a statement. They knew all about it in the United States before we made this pact at all, and while it is impossible to give definite prices, that is, prices that may not vary the fraction of a cent, it is easy to give a statement fairly accurate for all practical purposes.

But in general I may say that this department, as well as other departments of the government, suffers considerably in comparison with the work done by corresponding departments in the United States, those offering criticism quite forgetting that they are expecting Canada with its population and revenue to do the same exhaustive work as that performed by the Federal Departments of the United States, a country with nearly 100 million people and a revenue of over $600,000,000.

Now, Sir, to my mind that is a most extraordinary excuse, that this country is so poor, that it has so small a revenue, it cannot afford to provide these statistics which the United States have provided, and which are absolutely necessary to a complete understanding of this agreement. This country is so poor that it cannot do that, but at the same time it is ready to enter into an important agreement of this kind absolutely in the dark with regard to these figures.

We are daily sending out exhaustive statements specially prepared, which we do not consider any trouble, and we are always glad to furnish the fullest possible information, but this is one of those cases where the facilities at the disposal of the department are not adequate to the demand.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd) F. C. T. O'HARA.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Who is that letter addressed to?

Mr. PERLEY.

Mr. PERLEY. It is addressed to me. Now, I wonder why the government refuses to give this information, and on thinking it over, it seems to me that there can be only one reason. This government pretends to say that this agreement is going to be of great benefit to the farmers, particularly to those of the northwest; but they want to deceive the farmers. They make statements to them that this agreement will give them larger prices, but they do not want the actual facts to come out; they want the farmers to believe their statements without any proof. Now, I want the farmers of this country to know that this government entered into this important agreement in Washington without having before them the facts regarding the comparative prices, and cost of production with regard to agriculture in Canada and the United States. There can be no question about that, this letter I have just read shows that plainly. This government have been asked several times to bring such figures down, but they have refused to do so. Now, I propose to show that these statements of the hon. gentlemen, that the farmers of this country are going to obtain more for their farm produce under this agreement than they do at present, are contrary to the facts, because I can show that prices are higher in the United States than in Canada. I have here the Senate white-book, 849. I wish to prove my contention that this government do not want the facts to come out to the farmers, do not want them made official; they want to be able to assert that the farmers will benefit without giving anything to prove it. In this white-book, 849, on page 110, there is a statement with regard to the average value per head of live stock on the farm in various states and provinces, in 1910. In the United States the average price of horses was $108.19, in Canada, $133; dairy cows, in the United States, $35.79; in Canada, $43.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN (South Huron). Mr. Speaker, I ask you if this is in order.

Mr. PERLEY. Before you give your decision, I would like to say that all I wish to do is to quote a few figures to prove my contention that this government does not want to supply these statistics.

Mr. SMITH (Middlesex). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the quality of the animal is the same in the United States as in Canada?

Mr. PERLEY. I am giving the average over a great many states, and over all the provinces. Dairy cows in the United States, $35.79, in Canada, $43; other cattle, in the United States, $19.41, in Canada, $31; sheep, in the United States, $4.08, in Canada, $6; swine, in the United States, $9.14, in Canada, $11. On another page they give the

prices of mill feed in the United States and Canada. I wish you to note, Mr. Speaker, that in these cases prices are higher in the United States; in other words, this government, if they brought down a blue-book containing these facts, would be showing that under this agreement the farmers of this country will have to pay a larger amount of money for their feed than they do at present. In January, 1910, the price of bran in Minneapolis was $22.50, and of middlings, $22.50. In Winnipeg, bran was $17, and middlings $18. In Toronto bran was $21, and middlings $23. In Buffalo, bran was $25.50, and middlings $25.50. In Montreal, bran was $22, and middlings $23.50. Now, I will make another quotation from this Senate white-book, found on page 132, with regard to the wholesale prices of beef per hundred pounds. In February, 1911, No. 1 beef carcass was $9.50 in Chicago, and $9.50 in Toronto. No. 2 beef carcass was $8 in Chicago, and $9 in Toronto. Lamb was $8.50 to $9 in Chicago, and $12 in Toronto. Mutton was $6 in Chicago, and 9 in Toronto. Pork was $10 to $12 in Chicago, and $10.50 in Toronto. Now, I submit that it is not to the advantage of hon. gentlemen opposite to provide these statistics in an official form to this House, in order that they may be able to deny them. We want to put them in black and white so that hon. gentlemen opposite cannot deny them. I have a letter here to show how detailed information of this kind can be obtained by the government. It shows how the farmers on our side of the St. Lawrence are going to be very much fooled if they think they will get better prices for their milk and cheese under this proposed reciprocity agreement.

Rockport, Ont., March 31, 1911.

Mr. John G. Mitchell,
Mitchellville, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Many thanks for the pamphlets you sent me some weeks ago which I received all O.K., and I enjoyed reading them very much. I have been away from home for a few days over the river in Jefferson county, right among the farmers, and having one brother and two cousins in charge of milk stations, I was able to gather some valuable information regarding the price of milk and cheese. At all three milk stations they are refusing the milk of the nearby farmers. The supply is greater than the demand at $1.25 per hundred pounds, and that price is only given to those who contracted last fall. And the milk stations where they have the apparatus for manufacturing the over-production of milk up into cheese, they are offering only 65 cents per hundred pounds for the hay milk, as they call it; and they are offering only 9 cents per pound for the March and April cheese. One of the largest farmers and dairymen in the town of Theresa, Jefferson county, New York, told me that his opinion was that they would be shipping their cheese through Canada the same as they have done before, and that would be a very short time, perhaps in three months, as there was such a slump in the milk and cheese market of the United States. If some of our farmers would only take the pains to go over even just to Watertown and see how prices are on farm produce they would come back home, and I am sure be well satisfied that reciprocity would do them no good. Horses and cattle are much lower in prices over there than they are over here. Fresh eggs, 16 cents; butter, 20 cents, and many other things on the same basis.

Well, John, I must close for now.

Yours truly,
J. F. FITZSIMMONS.

We ought to have an official blue-book issued by this government showing the statistics regarding the comparative prices and cost of production in the United States and Canada of the various articles and commodities that are going to be affected by this proposed reciprocity agreement. This country is not rich enough to afford to make this agreement without having those facts. These hon. gentlemen who went down to Washington without having those facts did something they had no right to do, seeing that it was utterly impossible for them to give proper consideration to this agreement unless they had these facts and figures before them officially. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance whether he would be willing to exchange his house and the contents, down here on Metcalfe street, in this city, with a keen friend in Washington for his house and contents, provided that that friend knew all about both houses and he, the Minister of Finance, knew nothing except about his own. I would like to ask whether he would agree to make a trade with a keen American friend when the American friend knew more about value and costs than he did. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Customs whether he personally would have made a bargain for his own account if he were as much in ignorance as he was with regard to prices and cost of production of these articles in Canada and the United States? I would ask him whether, if a carload of biscuits got down to Washington by mistake and some friend in Washington who had seen this carload of biscuits said: I have a carload of biscuits at Montreal that got there by mistake and I will trade with you, he would trade with his keen friend in Washington without looking at the biscuits in Montreal or having them looked at. Would he trade, or would he not want to find out whether the biscuits in Montreal were toothsome biscuits, such as my hon. friend makes, sweetened biscuits, biscuits full of butter and eggs, or whether they were only plain white water biscuits which the gentleman in the United States was trying to palm off on him? He has gone down to Washington as a minister of the Crown not knowing anything about it, he acknowledges that he did not

have any of these facts or statistics, and he allows the people down there to palm off water biscuits on him for the toothsome, sweetened biscuits that we have on this side.

I believe that there is some truth in the rumour that there is a reciprocity microbe floating about, and that it must have affected these two hon. gentlemen when they went to Washington. I was told a couple of days ago about an old lady talking of the hard luck here in Ottawa this winter, and who said: We have had all sorts of trouble—first typhoid, then measles, and then this reciprocity. So, I think these hon. gentlemen have been affected by the microbe.

Mr. BLACK. There are lots of old women opposed to it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Speak for yourself.

Mr. PERLEY. Yes, and there are a good many who know more than my hon. friend does. I wish to enter my protest against the action of the government in refusing to bring down proper official information that cannot be gainsaid, that cannot be denied by their own followers. It seems to me that the government were derelict in their duty to go to Washington and make such an agreement as they have done, without having the facts and figures which were absolutely essential to them to enable them to make up their minds properly regarding this question.

It strikes me that this is one of the most extraordinary business transactions that I ever knew of. What makes it far worse is that now the government refuse to provide any one with this information, and they are trying to force the agreement through parliament without knowing what its effect is going to be, without providing these facts and figures about the prices of commodities and the cost of production which will enable the farmer, the manufacturer, every voter in this country, to decide for himself whether the price of commodities is going to be increased or reduced in this country. They keep them in the dark, and they want the House and the country to swallow this thing, they want to gag us and prevent us from knowing officially the whole of the facts regarding it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move,—

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor:

The government should cause to be forthwith laid on the table of the House in respect to the products and commodities included in the proposed reciprocity agreement with the United States, full and reliable information respecting prices and cost of production (a) in Canada, (b) in the United States, and (c) in the twelve other countries to which Canadian markets will be open under said proposal.

And that the government has been neglectful of the public interest in hitherto failing to prepare such information and to submit the same to parliament.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, there is only one part of the address of my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) with which I can sympathize; it is that in which he takes exception to the terms of the returns made by one department of the government to an Order of the House. I want to say frankly, that I think that, while no discourtesy was intended, the return was not one which ought to have been sent to the House. I do not regard it as a reference to any particular member; it is an Order of the House. And, although we might not have the information available, nevertheless when the Order of the House passed I think we should make an effort to obtain the information. I do not hesitate to express my regret at the terms in which the return was couched. I am quite sure no discourtesy was intended, but I recognize at once that hon. gentlemen opposite may have the right to take exception to the form of that return.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It is a proof that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is kicking some.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no indication of anybody kicking on this side of the House. Can my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) say as much with regard to his side?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Ask the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) whether he is kicking or not?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) had better not talk about kicking; there is no kicking among the Liberals.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no division among the Liberals; my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will find that an unprofitable question to raise. I do not agree with the mover of the motion as respects the lack of or the need for information. In the first place I call the attention of the House to the fact that very much information has been given about this matter from the beginning down to the present day. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in the exercise of their right, have from day to day asked numerous questions and made numerous motions for information, and they have got the information they asked for. I am not prepared to say that in every respect it was of great value to them, but they were the judges of that, and the information has been supplied. So, I think there is more information on the subject than hon. gentlemen opposite are willing to acknowledge. Then, with regard to what took place at Washington, I want

to say to my hon. friend that we had abundance of statistics. We had the various documents and public books of the United States and Canada, to which we were able to refer from time to time, and we did not fail to make use of them. We also had in the matter of price lists, comparisons which have been included in the information which has been laid before the House. But while I say that, I wish to add that in my judgment that information, for the purpose of this agreement, was not necessary at all. The United States have been proposing a new and radical departure from their tariff policy of many years. They have had a tariff commission at work for many months gathering information—not particularly with regard to the reciprocity agreement, because that came up incidentally—but with regard to the work of tariff revision generally. There is a sufficient movement on that question in the United States to call for a variety of information and for that purpose a tariff commission was appointed about a year ago. That commission has been conducting investigations not only here but in other countries, and the information was probably necessary for our American neighbours, when they were entering upon a new and radical departure from their past fiscal policy. No such tariff commission and no such information was required to enable this government to deal with the question of reciprocity in natural products. There was no need of statistics to satisfy this government that reciprocity in natural products was a good thing.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was not Canada's departure from her fiscal policy just as radical as that of the United States from hers?

Mr. FIELDING. No. What we have done is no departure from the policy of Canada; it is in accordance with the policy of Canada for forty years. There is no more reason for statistics and price lists to-day than there was when the Conservative party brought in the National Policy, and included in it practically the same offer of reciprocity in natural products to the United States. When the Conservative party in 1879 put into their National Policy the offer of reciprocity in natural products to the United States, and which the United States could have accepted at any moment for many years, nobody then asked what was the price of wheat in Argentine.

Mr. LANCASTER. What did you do in 1907; you changed all that then.

Mr. FIELDING. No, we did not change anything in 1907. The Conservative party from confederation down to 1896, when they went out of office, stood for reciprocity with the United States, and their public offer of reciprocity was on record. When they offered reciprocity to the United States in 1879 did they send to inquire what was the price of wheat in Bolivia? Nobody moved in this House then to inquire what was the price of eggs in Venezuela? Nobody thought that was necessary, and nobody seriously thinks it to-day. In 1885, when they sent Sir Charles Tupper to the United States and offered reciprocity in natural products, did anybody then inquire what was the price of wheat in Bolivia? Year after year it was the acknowledged policy of all parties in Canada, to have reciprocity in natural products and no one wanted statistics, no one had any doubt about its value. We frankly say that in the matter of manufactured goods the larger capital and the specialized organization of the United States give them an advantage over us, but when you come to what may be called the natural products of the country, what Canadian is prepared to admit that the people of the United States are in any respect superior to us. Is not our soil as good as theirs; is not our climate as good, and in some respects better; are our people not as intelligent as theirs; in what respect have we any reason to fear competition with the people of the United States in natural products? No man has hitherto ever questioned in this parliament the value of reciprocity; all parties had acknowledged that reciprocity in natural products was a thing to be sought for and obtained if possible.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the Minister of Finance say that reciprocity with the United States has always been the acknowledged policy of the Prime Minister?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; reciprocity has never ceased to be the desire of any public man in this Dominion until the day this agreement was brought before the House. If there did come a time when reciprocity ceased to be talked about it was not because it was not desirable, but because there was no prospect whatever of obtaining it. So long as the Americans continued in that attitude reciprocity was with us a forgotten issue, but when we found that our American neighbours had come to saner and better views it was our duty to meet them in the right spirit, and the economic conditions which existed before continuing to exist, that is why we want reciprocity in natural products.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it true that when the Canadian representatives met President Taft at Albany in regard to the maximum and minimum tariff question, a year ago, that the only condition upon which the government of Canada would enter into the reciprocal discussion on that occasion

was that it would be followed, as it has been followed, by this reciprocity compact?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, if it were true, what harm?

Mr. HUGHES. I am just asking the question.

Mr. FIELDING. As a matter of fact it is absolutely untrue, but I do not see what bearing it has on the question. We now come down to the year 1888, when Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington, seeking reciprocity, and was only able to make a partial treaty, and nobody demanded statistics then, nobody ever questioned the desirability of it. And when, in 1891, the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald put in the last speech to the throne that he ever prepared for a Governor General, the declaration that he wanted reciprocity and was going to the United States to get it, did any one ask statistics then; did any one want to know the price of wheat in Bolivia? And, when the old chief had passed away and others succeeded him, and Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Foster, and the late Sir John Thompson went to Washington in 1891, and almost begged for reciprocity in natural products, did any one demand statistics, and ask the price of wheat in Venezuela?

Mr. LANCASTER. They had the statistics.

Mr. FIELDING. If they had them they would be in the department, and they are not there. Does the hon. member want it to be inferred that they had the information and stowed it away somewhere else?

Mr. LANCASTER. If the Minister of Finance will look for those statistics he will find them there.

Mr. FIELDING. I would be glad if my hon. friend would be more exact, and I will look for them. I think he will find that he is speaking without knowledge of the facts.

Mr. LANCASTER. They were in my hands when I was making speeches at that time on the hustings, taken from the official records. You cannot bluff me that way.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want to bluff anybody.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what you are trying to do.

Mr. FIELDING. I can assure my hon. friend that I do not quite know the meaning of the word.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman found out the meaning at Washington. He was pretty well bluffed there.

Mr. HUGHES.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, no. My hon. friend must have had experience in Washington which I have not. Down to the last day of the Conservative party in office, they were demanding reciprocity in natural products, and nobody in those days ever worried his soul about what was the price of wheat in Venezuela and Bolivia. There is an important difference in the position of the United States government then and now. They were proposing a radical departure from the policy of the country, and they may have needed information of that sort to support their case, but we certainly did not.

Mr. PERLEY. How can a Canadian farmer determine whether he is going to get a better price for horses, wheat or hogs under this agreement unless he has the comparative prices?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the farmer will find that in some circumstances he will get a larger price and in some circumstances he will not.

Mr. PERLEY. How can he tell?

Mr. FIELDING. Because the price statistics will fluctuate. Somebody has said that there are three forms of unveracity: there is the lie, the blank lie, and statistics. You can make statistics prove pretty nearly anything; but there are kinds of statistics which are reliable and valuable.

Mr. BOYCE. That is a curious proposition to lay down in view of the hon. gentleman's budget speech.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will notice that I did not give many statistics in the budget speech this year. The facts were so strong that they did not need statistics. There is a homely phrase which says that money talks, and with the pleasant and cheerful statement of a surplus of $30,000,000 it did not need many statistics to impress that on the mind. I cannot hope that I have satisfied our hon. friends opposite that they do not need these statistics; and yet the dreadful thought occurs to me, is it just possible, after all the denunciations of this agreement by hon. gentlemen opposite, after not only showing to their own satisfaction if not to others that it is going to ruin our country and disrupt the empire, that if we gave them only a few more statistics, they would support the agreement? Surely my hon. friend is not going gravely to assert that if I could give him the price lists of cows in Buffalo and in Toronto, he would withdraw all his opposition to this agreement.

Mr. LENNOX. Not by any means.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the hon. minister have any objection to placing before the House all the statistics and information which he and the Minister of Customs had when they went to Washington?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that I would have to place on the table a large number of blue-books, and my hon. friend would then say that I had invited him to dig out the facts for himself, as we had to dig them out as we required the information. If I brought all those blue-books, my hon. friend would say that I was not treating him with proper counrtesy.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it possible that the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs went to Washington with only a lot of blue-books in their possession and without definite knowledge as to prices or statistics bearing on the subject they dealt with?

Mr. FIELDING. We had a definite knowledge obtained from the history of the question, and we have brought down some statistics that we used at Washington, and they are already before the House. Our point of difference is that I do not agree with my hon. friend that those statistics were necessary for the consideration of what was the settled policy of the Dominion of Canada for the last 40 years. I am prepared to defend anywhere in this country the declaration that reciprocity in natural products was the settled policy of all political parties in this country, and that we did not need price lists or statistics to support such a policy. We founded our belief in reciprocity in natural products upon our faith in the resources of Canada, the conditions of our soil and climate, the intelligence of our people, and we said: By the common rule of business if to that intelligence, that good soil, that good northern climate—to the products of all that—we could open up the wider market of 90,000,000 people on this continent, it would be a good thing for the people of Canada. My hon. friend, however, was not content to deal merely with the question of information. He broadened out the discussion into the effect of this agreement on the farmer generally. I did not think this was quite the right moment for that. I rather thought that was a phase of the matter that we could better discuss in Committee of the Whole. But my hon. friend has departed from that rule and has emphasized the great harm that it was going to do to the farmer of Canada and the great good that it was going to do to the American farmer. He says that the American farmer is going to get all the advantage and the Canadian farmer is not going to get any. I want to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that in the face of all these statistics which he has from the United States government, in the face of the comparison of prices which he has read partially, the agricultural classes of the United States to-day are largely opposing this arrangement.

Mr. HUGHES. Why?

Mr. FIELDING. I will tell my hon. friend why, in the language of one of the farmers themselves. The National Grange of the United States, speaking in the name of 1,000,000 farmers——

Mr. HUGHES. 6,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. 1,000,000 they claim to represent. That only goes to show that they are a modest and sincere people, and would not magnify one into six, as some hon. gentlemen opposite would. The National Grange, claiming to represent a million farmers, has filed strong objections to this treaty. I read from a despatch:

> The machinery of the National Grange, an organization claiming a membership of 1,000,000 farmers in thirty States, has been started to defeat the ratification by Congress of the Canadian reciprocity treaty.

It is very strange that they should want to defeat it if it is so much in their favour.

> The legislative committee of the Grange, at a special meeting to-day in the hotel Manhattan, adopted a resolution protesting against the enactment of the Reciprocity Bill, called upon the membership to exert pressure upon Congressmen from their various districts to vote against the measure, and decided to go to Washington to map out a campaign there.

They have issued a manifesto on the subject, and have given the reason why.

Mr. HUGHES. And did they not give evidence at Washington?

Mr. FIELDING. Very likely. This is part of their manifesto, one of the reasons why they thought this reciprocity agreement was not a good thing for the United States. They say:

> The Canadian farmers by reason of their lower general tariff and their preferential trade arrangements, can buy manufactured goods at lower prices than those prevailing in this country. The prices of farm lands in Canada are much lower than in the United States. These conditions give the Canadian farmers an advantage over us and the free admission of their products will submit us to unfair competition.

They had all these statistics——

Mr. AMES. Would the minister read the entire resolution and state all the reasons why they objected.

Mr. FIELDING. I would have no objection to reading it but I have not the whole resolution here. I happen to have made their clipping.

Mr. AMES. Has the minister the evidence submitted before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. AMES. If he will send it over to me I will give him the whole resolution.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not it under my hand now.

Mr. AMES. Will you read the entire resolution?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I have not it here.

Mr. AMES. Will you produce it and read it?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. AMES. I do not think the minister is justified in reading one clause out of a resolution without reading the remainder.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think that is quite a legitimate interruption.

Mr. AMES. The resolution contains a number of reasons.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member can speak after the minister concludes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. AMES. Oh, those members who can only bawl——

Mr. FIELDING. I was answering the question put to me by the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes).

Mr. AMES. Do I understand that the minister has that evidence?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not it here; I have seen it and I have the published volume, but I do not agree with my hon. friend that it at all affects the consideration. The point I am giving now is the advantage which, in my judgment, the Canadian farmer possesses under this agreement.

Mr. AMES. But I think it does affect the situation very much to know why the National Grange passed the resolution. The other reasons given in the resolution are quite as important only they do not suit the hon. gentleman's book quite so well.

Mr. FIELDING. The general tenor of the resolution or manifesto was that the farmers ought to have a general reduction of tariff all round. That I remember was the general tenor of it, and they complained that while they were going to lose their protection the United States manufacturer was going to retain his protection.

Mr. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. Speaking from memory that was the general tenor of their report. But this does not alter the fact which I gave to my hon. friend that they said under this agreement the Canadian farmer is going to have a substantial advantage over them. I do not insist that this is correct. Our American friends naturally make the best case they can for their agreement. I make what I consider from the Canadian point of view, the best case I can, and if somebody at Washington to-morrow were to say that Mr. Fielding had said that this is a beneficial agreement to Canada and therefore it must be bad for the United States that would be a very foolish reason, just as quoting what has been said on the American side, is foolish. I do not blame the Americans for making the best case they can in support of the agreement. I desire to make the best case I can in support of it from the Canadian point of view, and it is quite possible and I hope it is true, that both countries will prosper under this agreement.

I have here an extract from an authority which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), should accept. I shall only give the headlines. I think a great deal of public opinion has been created in this matter by headlines, and this happens to be in the Toronto 'Mail,' referring to representations made to the United States Senate:

UNITED STATES SENATE WAS DELUGED WITH FARMER'S PROTESTS.
DECLARED THAT ADOPTION OF CANADIAN RECIPROCITY WILL SET BACK THE INDUSTRY ONE HUNDRED YEARS.
WILL BE PARTICULARLY DETRIMENTAL ALONG THE AMERICAN SIDE OF THE CANADIAN BOUNDARY.
AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS NEVER SO ROUSED SINCE THE DAY FORT SUMTER WAS FIRED ON

And that after all these statistics had been unloaded on the farmers of the United States. They do not seem to take them as cordially as my hon. friend. My hon. friend from St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames), was good enough to ask a question or two, which I do not complain of, and I am glad to be able to quote another Ames on this question. I have here an article which reads:

SENATOR AMES SHOWS CANADIAN TREATY WILL INJURE THE IOWA FARMER.

Senator Asa L. Ames, of the Benton-Tama district, and one of the best informed and most successful farmers of Iowa, is very much concerned about the proposed trade agreement with Canada.

In an interview in the Des Moines Capital he says he believes that such an agreement simply means disaster to the farming industries of Iowa. He saw Senator Young just prior to his departure for Washington Saturday night and urged him to do everything in his power in Washington to defeat this trade agreement. Senator Young gave

him his personal assurance that he would do that very thing.

In discussing the proposed trade agreement with Canada, Senator Ames said:

This proposed trade agreement with Canada spells disaster for the farming interests of Iowa. Lands in Iowa are now worth as high as $200 per acre. Those same lands will be worth less than a hundred dollars per acre if this proposed trade agreement is adopted. Not only will lands be affected, but this agreement will take forty dollars from the price of the Iowa horse.

What about those statistics about the prices of horses in the United States and Canada? I do not want to weary the House with long extract. I could spend the next hour in reading quotations from the representative farmers and public men of the United States who take the ground that this treaty is going to be a great damage to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister allow me to quote from the National Grange the evidence submitted before the Committee of Ways and Means on February 9, 1911. This is what the chairman said:

We wish to enter our emphatic protest against the proposed reciprocity agreement with Canada.

I have been a working farmer all my life; have been actively identified with the Grange, or patrons of husbandry, for more than 20 years, and was for eight years master of the National Grange. I have gone among the farmers in every state of the Union, and have met thousands of them at various state and national grange meetings. I am thoroughly familiar with their views on this and other public questions, and I am here to declare that the farmers of the country are unalterably opposed to the reciprocity bill which you are now considering, and that they believe it would inflict a serious and permanent injury to their industry.

The principle on which the protective policy has been defended during the past 20 years is that all classes and interests of the country should receive protection against the competition of foreign products. It was to carry out this principle that the duties on farm products were imposed by the McKinley law and re-imposed by the Dingley and Payne tariff Acts. Had it not been for the tariff on farm products the protective system would long ago have been abolished.

Further on:

In view of these undeniable facts the farmers have learned with amazement and indignation the proposition to abolish the comparatively slight protection now given them and to establish free trade in practically everything that they produce. Let there be no mistake about the effect of this reciprocity bill. The only country from which any considerable quantity of farm products can be imported in the United States is Canada. We do not fear the competition of other countries. The purpose of the tariff on farm products has been to exclude those of Canda from our markets, and if this bill becomes law it means the end of protection so far as farmers are concerned.

Now the entire argument is based on the allegation that protection to be justifiable at all must be general, but that protection is made class legislation, which is the principal thing that the National Grange objects to.

Mr. FIELDING. I have already intimated that the farmers of the United States as the farmers of our own west, take the view that they want lower tariffs generally. Surely that did not require any explanation, we all understand that, My hon. friend, at an earlier period of the session—I had not intended to refer to it—laid down as a proposition that, where you have free trade in natural products, you must necessarily have free trade in manufactures—that the two must go together.

Mr. AMES. I said it logically followed.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. My hon. friend is a supporter of the old National Policy. He and I are young men, but we have read of these things. What has he to say, then, of the actions of his friends who, in the very Act in which they fixed these protective duties for manufactures, made a standing offer of free trade in natural products to the United States?

Mr. AMES. I support the National Policy of the year 1911.

Mr. FIELDING. I must say I had not expected that of my hon. friend. I thought he wanted to get in under the mantle of Sir John Macdonald and to support the National Policy of 1879. But, after all, I ought not to be surprised that he repudiates Sir John Macdonald on the National Policy. He has certainly repudiated Sir John Macdonald on the question of reciprocity, and he might as well repudiate him also on the National Policy of 1879.

Mr. AMES. I am not too old to change.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, if the hon. gentleman is not too old to change, I hope he will see the error of his ways and support this arrangement which, on reflection, his judgment must tell him, is for the good of Canada. Let me give you one or two more. Here is a paper published in Illinois, the 'Centralia Democrat' which thus summarizes public opinion:

The Taft reciprocity treaty with Canada is violently opposed by farmers in states along the Canadian border. They say they will be ruined if Canadian agricultural products are permitted to come across the line duty free. They vehemently declare they cannot sell their products in free competition with Canadian farmers, and that they must be protected or they will be destroyed.

Yet we have hon. gentlemen here who tell us that we cannot sell any of our products

in the United States, that the prices there are lower than the prices in Canada. To those who think the prices are lower in the United States than in Canada, I can only say that there is nothing in this agreement to oblige a Canadian farmer to send his products to the United States. Unless the prices suit him, he need not send his goods across the border.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Yes, but the Yankee stuff will come in here.

Mr. FIELDING. I am frank enough to say there are times and places when and where the American stuff will come in. And we are glad it will come in, to give the working classes in our great cities a chance sometimes to get some of the products of American soil free of duty. I have not found it possible to understand the attitude of my hon. friends opposite on this question of farm products. Last night I heard my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder), and I always listen to him with interest; he is a good fellow and has a quaint way of putting things which is always agreeable. He spent most of his time in knocking down the greatest argument which has been set up against this agreement. We were told that trade was going to be taken from our transportation lines; that the National Transcontinental railway, the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway would be ruined. Why? Because our wheat would go southward into the United States. The tariff reform journals in England expressed the fear—which is loudly re-echoed in Toronto Conservative papers—that England would not get our wheat, because the United States would take it and consume it. But the hon. member for Dundas spent most of his time in proving that the United States do not want our wheat at all. He says that the producing power of that country is only a trifle of what it can be made; that the Americans can produce and will produce a vastly greater quantity of farm products than at present, and they will not want ours. This is one of the things in which we are helped by hon. gentlemen opposite. Very few of the arguments which were advanced against this arrangement at the beginning of the discussion have not been answered by gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would like to ask a question. He and his friends have stated that this arrangement will improve the prices the farmers will get for their products. They also say that it will reduce the cost of living in the big cities. How can these two positions be reconciled? Moreover, what statistical information was before the minister at Washington when this pact was formed by which he could prove that the people of large centres such as Toronto would buy their stuff cheaper and thereby have an advantage over the people similarly situated in large American communities, such as Buffalo?

Mr. FIELDING. I have a second cousin, far removed, who is Irish, and that gives me the right to answer a question by asking another. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonell, Toronto) and his friends are telling the farmers that they will get no better prices for their products as a result of this arrangement; and his friends who are canvassing Montreal, Toronto, and other large centres for signatures to petitions tell the people to oppose this agreement on the ground that it will increase the cost of living. How does the hon. gentleman reconcile these two things? Will he, since he has asked me the question, give me his own opinion?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What does the minister——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) is asking a perfectly fair question. If he will repeat it, I will try to answer it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The government is bringing this proposal before the people. and claiming that it is going to have certain effects. What facts has the minister to show that these effects will follow?

Mr. FIELDING. I thought I had rather explained that. I lay it down as a principle that wherever you create a wider market, you give the producer a better chance. And if we have that faith which we ought to have—and my hon. friends opposite do not do themselves justice in that matter; the inference that will be drawn from their speeches is that they have no faith in the farming interest of Canada, they do not think we can meet competition, but I think that in reality they have the same faith that I have in the quality of our soil, in the character of our climate, in the intelligence and industry of our people—if, I say, we have the faith we ought to have, we shall see that when you give the people a wider market for their products, that must be a good thing for them. Is that a fair answer to the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Words, words, words.

Mr. FIELDING. But I have asked my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell, Toronto) his view, and he has not even given us words. I have quoted some extracts of several weeks ago. In the face of the statistics which my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has quoted, statistics which, he

says, prove that the prices of farm products are much better in Canada than in the United States, and therefore, that this arrangement is of no advantage to us to get that market, I have quoted the opinions of eminent public men—one bearing the excellent name of Ames—and of representative farmers in the United States, which show that these people are much disturbed by this arrangement. The fact is that protection, like conscience, makes cowards of us all. Why, if you were to put two factories on the Niagara river, one on the Canadian side and one on the American, and both were engaged in the production of icicles, I believe that each would be afraid that if the products of the other were allowed to cross the border its business would be ruined. So, the effort is made to frighten our farmers by telling them that this arrangement will result in harm to them, and there are people across the line playing the same game, trying to frighten the farmers of the United States. Let me give one quotation from yesterday's paper. This is a despatch from Grand Forks, North Dakota:

> Six hundred delegates, representing every county in the State, assembled in this city to-day to protest against the ratification of the Canadian reciprocity agreement. They will seek to form a combination with other agricultural States for a nation-wide fight.

Why, it is absolutely clear that on both sides of the line men are needlessly disturbed and alarmed. We had the fruit-growers here in great numbers to make representations on the subject. My information is that many of them have since revised their judgment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, that may be a matter of opinion. But I know whereof I speak. Well, it is a matter of opinion. But I say it is a natural condition of things that the people on either side of the line should be alarmed at any change. When I find the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) trying to scare the farmers on the one side, and certain people on the other side of the line trying to scare the farmers there, I think we may put one statement against the other.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. After the minister has read all the messages from the different newspapers in the United States, is he trying to lead the people of Canada to believe that the statistics prepared by the experts in Washington are not founded on facts?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I think probably in most cases they are accurate, and in some cases they are a matter of controversy; but I do not question their accuracy. I have no doubt the statistics are prepared in good faith. But statistics are matters as to which there are differences of opinion, they are incapable of mathematical proof one way or the other.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister observed the statement attributed to Mr. J. J. Hill on more than one occasion, that the passage of these two Bills would head off any possible chance of Britain giving preferential treatment to her colonies in matters of trade, and that they have now got Britain where they wanted?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a matter of opinion. I do not wish to enter into a broad statement on this question.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the United States view.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Hill is an American citizen, and his views ought to be taken for what they are worth. They are not conclusive. Even the opinions of the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), while entitled to great respect, are not always conclusive. I submit that these alarms on either side of the line are uncalled for.

Mr. RHODES. In view of the argument that the minister is just making, I would ask him why he did not put manufactured articles in the reciprocity arrangement?

Mr. FIELDING. I have already stated frankly that I regard the manufacturing interests of the United States as so strongly organized, with greater accumulation of capital, with a special organization in certain lines, that I do not think we can compete with them on even terms, and I am not such a strong free trader that I would like to wipe out the manufactures of Canada that at the present time are flourishing. If they can be sustained by a moderate duty, I am going to stand for that moderate duty.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the exact argument that the 800 fruit growers put up.

Mr. FIELDING. That only shows that great minds run in the same channels, and if our argument is confirmed by 800 fruit growers, that shows excellent judgment on one side or the other. I do not wish to read these extracts further, but I do want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the claim that this agreement is to ruin the farmers is entirely unwarranted, and when you can point to the fact that on the other side of the line there is precisely the same cry against the agreement, I think the public may come to the conclusion that they should not be led away by it.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has given us a lot of evidence to show that on either side of the line the farmers generally think this agreement will ruin them. Does not

that indicate that the farmers have not sufficient data to show them the facts, and that they need more information?

Mr. FIELDING. I certainly did not contend that the farmers, speaking generally, had any doubt on the matter. I say that on each side of the line there are farmers who, I think, are needlessly alarmed. But in Canada there is no doubt that most of the farmers are in favour of this agreement. We have brought the evidence and submitted it from day to day, and it is now on the records of this House. Undoubtedly there are a few farmers here and there who dissent from it, some of them, I think, on political grounds, but they have a right to dissent on political grounds if they like. I say there is a great breaking away from political parties on this question to-day; and I say that the farmers of this country, irrespective of politics, except a comparatively few who are strong party men—and I am not going to quarrel with a man for that, because I am one of that kind myself—I say that with the exception of a few men whose party feeling is so strong that they will not break away at all, the farmers of this country, in every province, are supporting this agreement, as my hon. friends, before long, will have an opportunity of finding out. Let it be remembered that this is not a treaty, this is an agreement which we make for the time being, and emblazoned on that agreement—

Mr. COWAN. For how long a time?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not for any fixed time.

Mr. COWAN. Is it for any time?

Mr. FIELDING. Until either party makes up its mind that it don't want it any longer. Why, the hon. gentleman's friends were dreadfully alarmed that we were going to make a formal treaty. The whole cry of the hon. gentlemen was that we do not want any entanglements with the United States, we do not want to be tied up with them. Well, we are not tied up with them.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes, you are.

Mr. FIELDING. If we pass this agreement, as pass it we shall, and if, within a comparatively few months, how many it is not for me to say, in the natural order of things, before many months pass there will be an appeal to the people of this country, and we are putting our judgment at issue. We are telling the people that this is an agreement for their benefit and their advancement, and when the time comes we will make that a prominent issue with hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen opposite, if they find that the people are hostile, as they say, will effect a change. We will go out and they will come in, and they will repeal the agreement. No, I won't say that, I won't say that they will repeal it. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I venture to predict that it will not be repealed. But nothing is gained. If this were a long term treaty there might be some force in the contention that before we make it we should consult the people, although that was not always the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. But this is an agreement for a short time. Within a few months, before many months, we will go to the people on this question, and if we are wrong we will pay the penalty of our error, and hon. gentlemen will come back, and they can repeal the agreement, and the empire will be saved. So what is wrong?

Mr. BOYCE. Did the hon. gentleman say that this treaty was to be in force only a short time?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I did not say that.

Mr. BOYCE. It slipped out of the minister's lips, I think, possibly unwittingly. But I would ask whether it was not the intention of both parties that it should remain in force for a considerable period?

Mr. FIELDING. The letter which forms the basis of the agreement declares that it would certainly not be wise for the two governments to devote the time and labour to this matter unless they both had the expectation that, if approved by Congress and by Parliament, it would remain in force for a considerable time.

Mr. AMES. What would the minister consider a reasonable time?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think there ought to be any doubt about this, and since the point has been raised, let us see what the exact statement is:

> The governments of the two countries having made this agreement from the conviction that, if confirmed by the necessary legislative authorities, it will benefit the people on both sides of the border line, we may reasonably hope and expect that the arrangement, if so confirmed, will remain in operation for a considerable period. Only this expectation on the part of both governments would justify the time and labour that have been employed in the maturing of the proposed measures. Nevertheless, it is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States congress or the parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any changes of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement that may be deemed expedient. We look for the continuance of the arrangement, not because either party is bound to it, but because of our conviction that the more liberal trade policy thus to be established will be viewed by the people of the United States and Canada as one which will strengthen the friendly relations now happily prevailing and promote the commercial interests of both countries.

So, I repeat what I said a few moments ago that in the natural course of things, before many months pass, we shall have a constitutional appeal to the people. If we are right on this question and on the general record of this government, then these ministers will come back and continue the agreement. If we are wrong, the people will so declare and those who come after us will be absolutely free to strike down this agreement and make any change they desire. We stand by the agreement in the firm faith that it is a good thing for Canada and a good thing for the United States, that, while here and there, there may be some particular section, or even some particular individuals, who may feel for the moment that they are affected, looked at in the large, it is a good thing for the Dominion and for every province in the Dominion and as such we ask this House to proceed to pass it.

Mr. PERLEY. The hon. Minister of Finance states that there is a good deal of difference of opinion regarding this question on both sides of the House. In order to determine it I would like to ask the minister whether he does not think it would be better to give us the official information regarding the various facts rather than to read newspaper reports and unofficial statements as he has done this afternoon.

Mr. FIELDING. I regret to say that I do not believe I could produce any information which would satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). Mr. Speaker, about a year prior to the negotiations with respect to the proposed agreement, the President of the United States attempted to put into force what is known as the Payne-Aldrich tariff; that is that unless Canada would make some concession to the United States he would place the maximum tariff, imposing an extra duty of 25 per cent, upon goods going from Canada into the United States. The President was either acting in good faith in that matter or he was not. We have a statement from the Minister of Finance himself that the concessions which he made to the President of the United States were so small and trifling that the President simply wanted a decent excuse for not enforcing the Payne-Aldrich tariff. I want to ask the Minister of Finance if it ever occurred to him that the reason the President of the United States flourished the Payne-Aldrich club over his head was not for the sake of the slight concessions which the President required Canada to make but was really for the purpose of extracting from the Finance Minister a promise that he would come back again a year later and negotiate a reciprocity treaty. The Minister of Finance himself says that the concessions which he made were so small and trifling that nobody ever observed their effect. Now, does he suppose that the President of the United States, for the sake of those small and trifling concessions, would give to the Canadian people the concession of not enforcing that extra 25 per cent tariff? Not a bit of it. What the President of the United States desired was not the granting of these trifling concessions, but the securing of a guarantee from the Minister of Finance that he would come back a year later and enter into a negotiation for the treaty that he proposes to put on the statute-book to-day.

All we are asking for to-day by this resolution is for information from some official source as to the prices of articles in the United States included in the present agreement. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the object of this agreement is to get the farmers of this country better prices for the agricultural products which they have to sell and which they say are going to go into the United States. These agricultural products are not going to go into the United States unless the prices upon the other side are higher. If the government are going to convince the people that this pact is in the interest of the country then they have to convince them that such a state of affairs exists, as will enable them to get more for their agricultural products on the other side of the line and if they cannot do that the whole object that they have in view is gone. That being the case I think it was essential that the ministers should have had the information before they went down there so as to enable them to compare the prices on the American side with what they are on the Canadian side. Does the Minister of Finance tell me that when he negotiated that treaty he had in front of him the current prices of the products included in this agreement in the United States compared with the prices of similar commodities in Canada? I venture to believe that he will not say that. If he had it was his duty to have laid that information before the House so that we would have had the same information as he had and would have had the same means of forming a judgment upon it.

Just as soon as President Taft got the promise that the Minister of Finance would negotiate this treaty he got his experts to work and during the whole year prior to the time when these gentlemen went over to negotiate this treaty these experts on the American side were busily engaged doing for their own country what the Minister of Finance has refused to do for us, namely, getting a comparative statement of the prices on the American and Canadian sides. We had a greater right to expect information in this respect,

because while the United States only had to consider the prices of these articles coming from Canada into the United States, we have to consider not only the prices of these articles coming from the United States into Canada but we have to consider the prices of these very same articles coming from thirteen other countries as well as the British colonial possessions. Does the Finance Minister undertake to say that he had any information as to the production of similar articles included in this treaty coming from these thirteen other nations? He tells us that it is immaterial to him. Is it immaterial to him that the Argentine in the last 25 years has increased its production of wheat from about 20,000,000 to 106,000,000 bushels per year? Is it immaterial to him that, as his own Postmaster General points out, you can employ labour in the Argentine Republic for 64 cents a day without board? Is it immaterial that they can produce wheat more cheaply and ship it here for 5⅞ cents a bushel as compared with 16 cents a bushel from Saskatchewan, our wheat centre, to Halifax? All these things are absolutely immaterial to the Minister of Finance. But, they are matters of first importance to us. How is he going to know unless he has this 106,000,000 bushels of wheat from the Argentine Republic is not going to be dumped into eastern Canada to compete with our western wheat when he removes the duty of 25 cents per bushel?

Mr. FIELDING. Does the hon. gentleman know that, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), went to Washington, he and his friends made a standing offer of reciprocal trade in agricultural products and they offered it at the same time to the Argentine?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Well, I may ask my hon. friend this question: Does he not know that up to 25 years ago the Argentine Republic was shipping no wheat at all practically while, if the minister had had the information he would have known that to-day they are shipping 106,000,000 bushels?

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend permit me a question? I will not interrupt him again—Does he know that when the standing offer was made and when the Conservative ministers went to Washington seeking reciprocity in natural products, that they offered free butter to Denmark?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the Minister of Finance know that the conditions in Canada to-day are totally different from what they were 25 years ago?

Mr. FIELDING. But the conditions in Denmark, in the matter of butter, are not.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister of Finance know that to-day Denmark is producing from 10 to 15 times as much butter as she did then? Does the Minister of Finance know that under the intensive system of farming in Denmark, (the best system of farming in the world to-day), we have got in Denmark a competitor ten times more active than we had then. Does the minister know—he does not know, because he did not have the figures—that there was an export from the Argentine Republic last year of $21,000,000 worth of chilled beef and frozen beef. Does he know that 1,200 carcases of mutton came from New Zealand through St. John, New Brunswick, under the present tariff a few weeks ago, and undersold the local mutton in Montreal, and Toronto, and other Canadian cities. What will it do when the tariff is more than cut in two? The minister evidently does not know these things, and we have had to gather that information for ourselves. When I was preparing the few remarks I delivered on the question in this House I sent a communication to the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the humiliating reply came back: We have no information as to the price of any articles in any of these other countries or the United States; we have no information as to what it costs to bring agricultural products from these 13 different countries into Canada, and consequently we have not the least information as to whether they can compete with us or not. I am ashamed to say that I had for instance to write down to the produce exchange in New York to ask what was the rate for carrying grain from the Argentine to Canada, and then I found that you can carry grain from the Argentine Republic to Halifax for 5⅞ cents per bushel, while it costs, to carry it on the Canadian Pacific railway from Regina a centre of our western wheat growing district, to Halifax, 16 cents a bushel. And I came to the conclusion, as any sane man would come to the conclusion, that as Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec consume more wheat than they raise, and if, as the Postmaster General told us the other night, you can grow this grain so much more cheaply in the Argentine Republic where the climate is more favourable and where you can get cheap labour at 64 cents a day—I came to the conclusion that in the eastern portion of Canada where we consume more wheat than we raise, the inevitable consequence will be that if you take off the duty of 25 cents per bushel eastern Canada will be supplied with Argentine wheat. Why did not the government place this information before the House? They either had it or they did not have it, and if they had it why should they keep it from the House? If they did not have it then they negotiated

a treaty without having the necessary information before them. I can imagine the Minister of Customs sitting down in solemn conclave at the table in Washington, and when the question of the tariff comes up the American commissioner says: Will you give us free talc, and the Minister of Customs replies: Why certainly we will give you free talc, that is an article for aiding in promoting the beauty of ladies, and we will allow the exportation of raw talc for the purpose of stimulating that industry, but the Minister of Customs did not know that talc is an article that goes to the United States for the purpose of stimulating the manufacture of paper.

Mr. PATERSON. How clever.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am surprised at the Minister of Customs.

Mr. PATERSON. Because the hon. member knew that we were particularly requested to get the Americans to add talc to the free list and that there is a gentleman in this House who is very pleased we got it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Yes, and the Minister of Customs was sending Canadian raw material to stimulate the industries of the United States when he thought he was only assisting in promoting the personal beauty of the American ladies. The other evening, for 20 minutes, the Postmaster General delighted the House with a dissertation on what great advantages this treaty would be to the province of Nova Scotia, because under it they would be able to send lobsters into the United States market free of duty, but the wind was knocked out of his sails when the member for Digby asked him if he knew that lobsters had been on the free list for several years. And here we have the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce writing that the department had no information.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is he?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Mr. O'Hara. I am not blaming him, because he can not do what he is not authorized to do, but we had the Minister of Finance getting up in this House the day before yesterday, telling us that the country had a surplus of $30,000,000 this year, the largest ever, and that the trade of the country is from $60,000,000 to $70,000,000 more than it ever was before, and yet the government has not enough money to get out a little book which would give information that would tell us whether or not this very reciprocity arrangement is going to kill the trade about which they are boasting. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) told us that political and fiscal resolutions never came about unless there was discontent. But here we have the Minister of Finance telling us that he never saw a time in the history of Canada when the people were so prosperous, and yet in this very time he proposed a drastic fiscal revolution. I confess I am unable to understand upon what basis the government is proceeding. The onus is upon the Minister of Finance and the government of Canada to say what the effect of this treaty is going to be. They are on the affirmative, they are bringing in the measure, they have to prove what the effect of it will be; they claim it is a benefit to the country, but they must prove it, and in order that it may be proved or disproved we ask the government to give us the information which will enable us to come to an intelligent conclusion on the question. The government cannot say in one breath that it is going to benefit the farmer and in the next that it is going to benefit the consumer. How are you going to benefit the consumer by lessening the quantity of agricultural products in this country? If you decrease the quantity of agricultural products here you must of necessity increase the price to the consumer. How are you going to enhance the price to the Canadian farmer if he sends his products to the United States when by increasing the quantity there you must decrease the price? The government is forced to take one side of the question or the other, and it has pleased them to take the side of the question which says that this arrangement is going to benefit the farmer. My answer is: If you are going to benefit the farmer in the way you say, you must surely injure the consumer. We want the government to prove their side of the case that it is going to benefit the farmer, because we say that we think it is going to injure the farmers of this country. And, if gentlemen on the other side of the House deny that statement, then we say: Give us the information which we ask, if you think it will prove your case, and if you don't the country will naturally conclude they are afraid now to give the information because it will prove beyond a doubt that the treaty will injure the farmers of Canada.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the position taken by the Finance Minister on this question, because the resolution submitted to the House is certainly a reasonable one and worthy of our consideration. Unless we have the necessary data to give to the people in reference to the matters under discussion, we may expect that many of the men who are supporting the government on

this question will say that we are presenting false statistics. I am surprised indeed that many members of the government are not anxious to have a number of such statistics as we have been asking for, so that they may be able to convince the people of this country that they have taken the right position on this question, if they have confidence in that position. I would like to ask the Finance Minister, what harm would be done to any industry in this country or to the people in general by presenting to this House a number of statistics such as those that have been presented to the Congress at Washington. I have here Folio Document No. 849, presented by President Taft to Congress, and in a letter accompanying that document he makes the following statement:

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of February 23, 1911, requesting the President, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate all the information secured and the tables and statistics prepared by the board of experts, composed of Henry C. Emery, James B. Reynolds, and Alvin H. Saunders, relating to the various articles and commodities named in the Canadian reciprocity measure, and especially to the following: Pulp wood, wood pulp, and paper of whatever value; wool, whether raw or further advanced in manufacture; woollen thread, cloth, and clothing; cotton thread, cloth and clothing; carpets; boots and shoes; iron ore, pig iron, and manufactured iron and steel, agricultural implements; coal; meats; flour, and lumber; I transmit herewith a report from the tariff board giving the information in its possession relating to pulp wood, pulp, and news-print paper, and farm products (including live stock), and current relative prices in Canada and the United States of wheat, barley, and food products of the farm, including meats, poultry, eggs, dairy products and vegetables.

These are some of the statistics that are contained in this report. On the 20th of April the President presented another report containing a lot of valuable information with reference to the prices of commodities on both sides of the line, wages, and other matters of public interest. When we asked the Finance Minister if he would be good enough to present to this House the statistics that he had before him when he went to interview the commissioners who had charge of tariff matters at Washington, all that we were able to obtain from him was the statement that he had with him the blue-books from which we would be able to get just as many statistics as he did. I can only say that if that is all the statistics that the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs had to go by, they were certainly in a humiliating position. When you compare the small amount of knowledge that these two men going to Washington had as to the prices on both sides of the line with the statistics which were gathered in the past year by the seventeen experts in the United States and presented to the Congress and to the Tariff Commission at Washington, you can readily see that our two representatives were placed at a very unfair advantage. Let me go further. In to-day's 'Globe' you will find a report of President Taft's message to Congress, which bears out the statement which has been made time and again on the floor of parliament that the two representatives of this government who went to Washington went there practically with their hands tied. Let me read a portion of this message:

This agreement was the consummation of earnest efforts extending over a period of nearly a year, on the part of both governments, to effect a trade arrangement, which, supplementing as it did the amicable settlement of various questions of diplomatic and political character that has been reached, would mutually promote commerce and would strengthen the friendly relations now existing.

I ask the Finance Minister how is it that, in face of the fact that he knew a year ago that he was going to be asked to enter into some kind of trade arrangement, he did not feel it his duty to gather statistics, as the United States experts gathered them, so as to be able to present to this House such an array of figures as were presented to the United States Congress? If the United States government saw fit to place a body of men in the field to gather these statistics, so that their representatives could deal with this question intelligently, it was the duty of the Finance Minister, a year ago, when he knew that he was likely to enter into such a trade arrangement, to gather up statistics not only for himself but to assist the members on both sides of this House to come to some kind of reasonable conclusion on this question. The President further says in his message to Congress yesterday:

I felt assured that the sentiment of the people of the United States was such that they would welcome a measure which would result in increase of trade on both sides of the boundary line, would open up the reserve productive resources of Canada to the great mass of our own consumers on advantageous conditions, and at the same time offer a broader outlet for the excess products of our farms and many of our industries. Details regarding a negotiation of this kind necessarily could not be made public while the conference was pending.

Evidently the President of the United States believed that he was giving to the farmers of the United States a great boon in opening up to them the Canadian market; and if you follow up the statements in the report which he sent to Congress, made by his experts, you cannot come to any other conclusion than that the farmers of Can-

ada, instead of reaping an advantage from this reciprocity arrangement, are going to reap a very great disadvantage. Let me call attention to one matter which I would like the Minister of Agriculture to explain. Why is it that on page 94 of these statistics that have been furnished to Congress, we find that the average price of spring wheat in the whole of the United States is only 90 cents per bushel, while the average price in the Dominion of Canada is 93 cents per bushel? But what I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture is if he can furnish statistics to show the reason why wheat in the province of Quebec is worth $1.19, while in the province of Ontario it is worth 89 cents.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know anything about these facts, and I am not going to try to explain them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is the same story, that is just what we might expect from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. I have not been studying American statistics.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is very true, but the minister was studying some of our own statistics. In his speech he made statements in reference to the agriculturists of this country altogether in opposition to what should be the aim of the Agricultural Department, of which he is the head.

Mr. CARVELL. Will the hon. gentleman give the different points in Canada which he takes into consideration in arriving at the average price of Canadian wheat?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is the average price in all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. TALBOT. Are these Canadian or American statistics?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They are American statistics, they are the only statistics we have.

Mr. TALBOT. At what time?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. These statistics were furnished by the United States on February 23, 1911.

Mr. CARVELL. Would the hon. gentleman give the prices in each province?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The prices are as follows:

Prince Edward Island	$0 95⅞
Nova Scotia..	1 12
New Brunswick..	1 12⅝
Quebec..	1 19⅞
Ontario..	0 89.4
Manitoba..	0 80
Saskatchewan..	0 69⅛
Alberta..	0 67⅞

This is the statement for last year.

Mr. CARVELL. Has my hon. friend taken any means to find out whether wheat is worth $1.12 in Quebec to-day?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is what I was trying to ascertain from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CARVELL. I am asking my hon. friend if he has verified the figures.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman has no right to interrupt my hon. friend. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. FIELDING. I support the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). I do not think the hon. member should be interrupted. I was interrupted twenty times, but I do not think any opposition member should be interrupted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend think it is fair in striking an average to take a province like New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, where there is comparatively little wheat, and add that to the province of Saskatchewan, which raises 70,000,000 bushels, and simply strike an average as to the prices in the different provinces without taking into consideration the quantities?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not strike an average. These are statistics gathered from the United States.

Mr. TALBOT. You struck a snag.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Oh, no, if I struck as many snags as my good friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), I would have lots of trouble. The same statistics apply to the United States. It is very plain that the Finance Minister did not have the necessary information with him at Washington, in comparison with the splendid lot of statistics which, as the President of the United States has distinctly said, the tariff experts in that country have been gathering for a year, so that they could deal with this question on its merits, but on the other hand, we find the Minister of Finance practically making the statement to-day that he went over there taking with him the blue-books which any of us could obtain from the library of parliament, and that he gathered out of these sufficient to convince him that he had obtained a very great concession from the United States. I feel that the opposition would be justified in constantly demanding, day after day, from the Minister of Finance, such information as is asked for in the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) and that the Bill should be held over until that information is furnished. We need the commercial statistics to guide us, we should know the prices and wages in the different countries. The Finance

Minister claimed that he did not need these statistics, he said that he had given the House all the statistics he had and that the farmers were in favour of the agreement, while the consumers would be greatly benefited by it.

I observe in the Toronto 'Globe' of today a most unfair comment on the splendid speech made yesterday by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). The 'Globe' heads its comment on his speech 'Mr. Bradbury is a political gymnast.' I feel that this is a most unjust and unfair reflection for any paper to make. Widely differing views on this agreement have been presented by different members. For instance the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) speaking at a meeting at Mount Brydges, western Ontario, is reported to have said:

> Mr. Ross thought that more might have been done in reducing rates on agricultural implements. He saw no reason why the duties should not now be taken off entirely.

Surely he must have been in possession of statistics that would lead him to believe he was justified in making that statement. I cannot but feel that the people of his constituency will not appreciate these remarks of his unless he had some statistics with which to back up his statements.

I heartily support the resolution presented by the hon. member for Argenteuil, and I am sorry the Minister of Finance has taken the position he has on this question, because we are in need of this information, and we are entitled to have it placed before us.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). There is not much need of any answer to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) because he answered himself in the course of his remarks. He put forward the proposition that no inquiry is necessary into prices, or the cost of production in the United States, or in the other twelve countries to which our markets will be opened by these proposals; and almost in the same breath he said that the markets of this country should not be opened to the manufacturers of the United States because the manufacturers of that country are highly specialized, and their industries more thoroughly organized, so that their cost of production is less than in Canada, and Canadian manufacturers could not be expected to hold their own in competition. I state his argument as I understood it, and I think I am stating it fairly. He was promptly asked by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) whether that was not precisely the argument put forward by the men engaged in the fruit industry in Canada, and he had to admit that it was. But instead of meeting the point made by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo, he evaded it, he simply said that the men engaged in the fruit industry had the same idea on this subject that he had. Well, if he had the same idea on the subject as the men engaged in the fruit industry had, why did he not apply the same principle to them that he is applying to those engaged in manufacturing industry? Why did he give these men the answer: 'It is too late'? When the Minister of Finance says that there is no need of inquiry into this question, he surely speaks either without reflection or with utter recklessness of that which he is putting before the country. Upon what does he base his proposition that our manufacturers should not be exposed to competition with the manufacturers of the United States? Upon the principle, I suppose, that, for the reasons of which I have spoken, the competition would be absolutely destructive to our manufacturing industries. Then, is it not necessary, before exposing our farmers to the competition of the United States, and twelve other countries, to inquire into the cost of production in these countries, and at what prices their products can be laid down in Canada to compete with the products of this country. If such an inquiry is necessary so far as the manufacturers are concerned, are not the same considerations to be regarded with respect to the farming and fruit-growing industries, and many others?

Mr. TALBOT. Does the hon. member (Mr. Borden, Halifax) think for a moment that the prices of farm products can be controlled as readily as those of our manufacturing industries? Let me illustrate the question by stating that in my own county I have seen potatoes selling one year at 19 cents, and in the following year at 75 cents.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite see the point of the hon. gentleman's question, or suggestion. The prices of agricultural products may vary greatly here or in the United States. But is it not, after all, a question of the cost of production in either country? There is also the question of supply and demand, but does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) believe that, if beef can be laid down in this country from the Argentine at less than seven cents a pound that will not affect the market for our farmers who have been receiving a much better price?

Mr. TALBOT. Not that year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the prices of that product in the Argentine vary in the way he suggests? I have not heard that they do, and I do not think that facts can be adduced to show that they do. But that is not the point of this motion. The point

is that before we enter into an arrangement of this kind we should have definite, and reliable information upon the very point to which my hon. friend has called attention.

The United States Congress did not enter into this agreement blindfold. Before they took this arrangement into consideration, they had in the first place, a thorough hearing before the Ways and Means Committee of their House of Representatives. We had copies of it here—hundreds of pages setting forth the views of persons who were heard before that committee. In the second place, they had a similar hearing before the Ways and Means Committee of their Senate. We have had this in our hands also, another pamphlet of hundreds of pages. Then there was brought down to the Senate of the United States, in a message from the President, every scrap of information on the points connected with this treaty which could be made available by the Tariff Board or Commission of the United States, and all the experts whose services were at the command of that commission under the law of that country. And what have we had in this parliament? Absolutely nothing. What did the Minister of Finance and Minister of Customs have when they entered into this arrangement with the United States? So far as we know to-day, absolutely nothing. So, this arrangement was not only conceived in secrecy at Washington, but so far as our representatives are concerned, it was conceived in the most absolute ignorance of the conditions which would result therefrom.

As I have said, the Minister of Finance answered himself. He evaded some very pertinent questions that were put to him. I must admit that a great many questions were put to him in the course of his remarks, and I must admit also that to the great majority of these questions he did not give a very straight answer, or one that contained much information of service to parliament. He has told us that, apart altogether from the question of price, wider markets are good for the farmers of this country. Is it any advantage to our farmers to have opened to them a wider market in which the prices are from twenty-five to fifty per cent lower than in Canada? He puts it as an inconvertible proposition that the mere opening of a wider market is of advantage to our farmers. It is only of advantage provided our farmers can sell in that market at a profit, and no such arrangement should be entered into with the idea of advantage to the farmer unless the farmer can sell his products in that market at better prices than he can sell them in Canada. What has been the argument of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher)? During this very session he has told us that population in Canada was increasing faster than the production of farm products. There is no doubt about that. If our home market is so good as the Minister of Agriculture suggests, why was it necessary, in a time of prosperity and progress in this country, to go into a proposal of this kind, the outcome of which no man at present can foretell so far as economic considerations are concerned?

I think my hon. friend from Argenteuil has done good service to the country in bringing this matter before parliament. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, harped upon the same old string. He did not deal very fully with the proposal of my hon. friend from Argenteuil, indeed I think I may go further and say that he did not deal with it at all, but he harped on the same old string that reciprocity had been asked for in this country from 1867 down to 1891. When he says that it has been the policy of this country for the last forty years to seek reciprocity with the United States, I take issue with him, and I say that ever since 1891 the idea of reciprocity has been absolutely dead in this country—except on one occasion when he and some other members of the government went to Washington and asked for it, without success. They came back from Washington on that occasion, and declared to the people of Canada that so far as they and their party were concerned, there would be no further demand for reciprocity with the United States. I say that since 1897 there has been absolutely no thought or desire in the minds of the people of this country for reciprocity with the United States, until these hon. gentlemen saw fit to enter into negotiations about a year ago, which have finally resulted in the proposals now before parliament.

Now, how is it possible, I ask hon. gentlemen in this House, how is it possible to get any idea whatever of the economic results which will follow the adoption of these proposals, unless we know about the cost of production in the United States and in the twelve other countries to which our markets are open, as well as in the British possessions which are likely to enter into competition with our farmers in the markets of Canada? How is it possible to arrive at any correct estimate as to the economic results of this treaty unless we have these data before us? Not only have we not such data before us, but it is abundantly clear from the statement of the Minister of Finance, and from the statement of the Minister of Customs, that these gentlemen entered into this treaty arrangement without having the most elementary idea of these considerations to which I have adverted, and without the least knowledge as to what would be the outcome of these proposals. Now, under these circumstances what does the hon. member for Argenteuil ask? He simply asks:

That the government shall, at the earliest possible moment, place upon the table of this House full and reliable information respecting prices and cost of production in Canada, in the United States, and in the twelve other countries to which the Canadian market will be opened under said proposal.

A reasonable proposition to put forward, a proposition which I think ought to commend itself to the government in the first instance. Because I affirm that when the government of Canada laid that proposal upon the table of this parliament for our approval, a proposal affecting the future destiny of this country to a remarkable extent, not only from a national but from an economic point of view, when the government, I say, laid that proposal upon the table of this House, they should have accompanied it with full and reliable information respecting all these matters which is now demanded by the motion of the member for Argenteuil. I say that too much time has been lost by the government already, and that it is their first duty, without one hour's unnecessary delay, to give to parliament that information which is absolutely essential in order that this matter may be debated with any degree of intelligence. What is the use of beating the air with regard to all these matters? What is the use of hon. gentlemen opposite making assertions with regard to the cost of production and prices in all these different countries, in the United States, in Canada, in the twelve other nations, and in the British possessions which are also admitted to the benefits of this treaty? Why, such discussion is simply beating the air, until we have reliable information, information which must be in the possession of the government, which ought to be in possession of the government, and which ought to have been laid on the table of this House before parliament was ever invited to discuss this proposal. I say, therefore, that I support most heartily the proposal my hon. friend from Argenteuil has made in his amendemnt to the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I do not propose to traverse the ground which has already been so well covered this afternoon by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The statements which he then made have not been controverted, the arguments he then put forward have not been traversed. But there are one or two points which perhaps are worthy of a little consideration by the House. First, let me say a word to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition who has just taken his seat. He asked why we did not consider the case of the farmers and the protection of their products while we were so jealous in regard to the protection of the manufacturing industries of Canada.

The reason is very obvious. The manufacturers have come before the government from time to time, and pleaded that they could not stand outside competition, and they protested against reciprocity in manufactured articles. But the farmers of Canada came and asked for reciprocity in natural products; the manufacturers did not. I venture to think, with all due deference, that the farmers understand their own business and know what they want, and are well able to take care of themselves.

Mr. BEST. If the farmers asked for free trade in farm products, did they not also ask for free implements, and when they got the one why did they not get the other?

Mr. FISHER. In the one case the farmers were dealing with other people's products, in the other case they were dealing with their own products, and they have a better knowledge of their own business and their own products than they have of those of other people.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have not the fruit growers also?

Mr. FISHER. The fruit growers were represented in that delegation, which I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition listened to, and other farmers were also represented. That delegation were representative of the farmers of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. There were something like 400 from the west, 250 from Ontario, and over 100 from east of Ontario. They represented not only themselves, but they represented the farmers' organizations for whom they spoke. Those organizations had carefully considered these matters and discussed them in their meetings all over Canada, and in resolutions had formulated their desires and their opinions in regard to these tariff matters.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend not know that the market gardeners of Canada, on more than one occasion interviewed this government for an increase of duty? Does he not know also that the farmers' representing the pork industry asked for an increase of duty on pork; and does he not know that the day or two after that deputation was here, another deputation came and asked the Prime Minister to leave the duties as they were on farm products?

Mr. FISHER. I am aware of that, and I am also aware of the fact that that delegation that came here represented the farmers at large. There are interests among the farmers, as there are amongst other classes in the community, and those interests may have special desires. At the same time I know, and it cannot be denied, that the organization which came here and made those representations before parliament, were representative of the great farming organiza-

tions of this country who had considered this question from all sides, considered every little interest that was affected, and they spoke as representing the farming classes of the whole community.

My hon. friends opposite are very fond indeed of saying that the manufacturers and business men are best able to deal with their subjects and best able to answer for themselves. That is, I dare say, to a certain extent, true, but they do not seem to be willing to allow that the farmers can do the same with regard to themselves and that they can speak for themselves. I do not wish at all to enter into an argument with regard to the general question of reciprocity. That is not the particular question before us at this moment, but I would just like to say that the farmers, under this arrangement, are given the option of selling their products in three markets instead of in two, but they are no more obliged in the future to sell their products in the United States than they have been in the past. If they desire, they can still sell their products in the English, the American or the Canadian market, as they have in the past, and I have confidence enough in the business capacity and judgment of the farmers at large to believe that they are quite able to decide for themselves in which market and in what form they will sell their product. I have confidence enough in the farmers' judgment and business capacity to believe that they will sell their products wherever they can get the highest price and the largest return for their toil. If they can do that in the United States this arrangement gives them the opportunity. To-day they do not have that opportunity, or they do not have it to the extent that they will have it. They have it to-day to a certain extent and, last year, speaking from memory, I think they sold some $30,000,000 worth of agricultural products in the United States, notwithstanding the high duties, notwithstanding the fact that they were prevented as far as possible from doing so. But, in future, they will be able to do it more easily and they need not do it if they do not want to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister has been telling us that the farmers would receive a still higher price than that which they have received in days gone by. Does the minister not believe that when cheap cheese and butter come in here from the United States stamped as Canadian, when they go out to the British market as Canadian and are sold on the same platform with Canadian, it will reduce the value of our Canadian products?

Mr. FISHER. I am not going to argue on false premises. The statement that the hon. gentleman has just made is impossible of completion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why so?

Mr. FISHER. Because cheap cheese from the United States cannot come into Canada and go to England marked 'Canadian' because the officers of my department will see that it is not done. No American cheese can leave a Canadian port marked 'Canadian' cheese. They tried it and they were stopped, they have been fined for trying it and they will not be able to do it in the future any more than they have in the past. Canadian laws governing the manufacture and commerce in and marking of cheese and butter and dealing with oleomargarine, butterine and all those false products, are just as strict to-day as they have been since they were put on the statute-book, they will be just as strict when this agreement goes into force and they will be just as effectively administered in order to maintain the credit of Canadian products in the European or other markets as they are to-day. But the very legislation which has given that credit and reputation to Canadian products in the British markets will govern them also on the American market, and I venture to think that Canadian butter and cheese, when it is exhibited on the New York, Boston and other markets, will get a higher price than American butter and cheese because we have those laws for the purposes referred to while the Americans, unfortunately for themselves, perhaps fortunately for us in our world competition, have not got, there is no danger and the premise which my hon. friend alleged as a foundation upon which to base his argument is entirely false.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is it not a fact that the price of butter was better in Canada last year and has been so far this year than in the United States?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Well how is it that they sold so much butter to the Canadian people last year if they had a better market over there?

Mr. FISHER. Because it happened that certain parts of Canada were more convenient to the butter producing districts of the United States, and the butter was able to come in. Now, I have a bone to pick with my hon. friends at the present moment. These hon. gentlemen want statistics, but when we give them statistics they will not accept them.

Mr. PRICE. We say they are no good.

Mr. FISHER. We have given these hon. gentlemen statistics but they say they are no good.

Mr. LANCASTER. Your Finance Minister said that.

Mr. FISHER. Excuse me; I might just recall to the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite one incident that occurred a little while ago in this Chamber. I was speaking on this question and I referred to certain statistics which had been prepared by a valued and efficient officer of my department, with regard to the comparative prices of certain articles in Canada and the United States. I had a statement for some time and I did not wish to read over the full list, day by day, week by week, and month by month, I asked to be allowed to summarize the figures, which I did, and to lay on the table the statement and have it printed in 'Hansard,' but hon. gentlemen opposite refused to allow me. I offered them my statistics, and I asked to have them put in 'Hansard,' so that they might have them at their command. These were just the kind of statistics that they are reproaching us for not giving to them. I offered this statement to them and they would not have it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why did you not put your figures in proper form and then we would have accepted them.

Mr. FISHER. They were in the form of truth, and because they are true hon. gentlemen opposite do not like them. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) refused to agree to have them put on 'Hansard.' A couple of days after the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked for them, and a day or two after that I laid them on the table. They are before the hon. gentlemen opposite. They have had an opportunity of consulting and examining them and yet they have themselves brought up other statistics, which they say conflict with these and disprove them. What is the use of our bringing up statistics, laying them on the table and giving them to hon. gentlemen opposite if they will not accept them, if they ignore them? First of all, they refuse to let us put them on 'Hansard,' then, another hon. gentleman asks for them, not knowing, probably, what had occurred a few days before, then they ignore them, and only last night my hon. friend the member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) made a speech in which he himself brought other statistics, other figures, and said that these were the only true ones. I can only say this for the statistics that I laid on the table, that they were prepared by the chief officer of my Extension of Market Division, a man who has been working now for ten years almost in that particular division, dealing with the exports and imports of agricultural products, keeping close track of the prices of these goods all over the world, watching the markets with the aid of the papers which we receive in the department, in all the producing countries, and in the consuming countries, like England and the United States, and keeping track of all this information. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about information, but when that officer has compiled a statement and I offer to put it on 'Hansard' they will not allow me to do so and, when I lay it on the table, they will not acknowledge it. That is enough to show the insincerity of the arguments, the statements and the motion which these hon. gentlemen have brought forward to-night. I leave the case there because I am satisfied that while to-night these gentlemen opposite want to vote on this motion, to-morrow they will want to vote on some other, and they will continue to do everything in their power to avoid voting on the main motion. And, Sir, on the main motion itself there are men over there who are afraid to vote yea, and then again there are men over there who are afraid to vote nay, and they will take every step they possibly can to put themselves on record on some little side issue, so as to avoid voting on the main motion. But I want to warn them that before this session ends they will have to vote on the main motion, and put themselves on record, and go before their constituents and answer for their vote.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I have listened to the Minister of Agriculture on three or four occasions telling this House he was prevented putting a certain statement on 'Hansard.'

Mr. FISHER. This is the first time I have alluded to it.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman's memory is not good, because I have heard him say so on different occasions, and the peculiar part of it is that there is not one member on this side of the House or on the other side of the House either who could have prevented it. He had an absolute right to put his statement on 'Hansard' if he wanted to and therefore he has no right to reflect on any member of this House because the statement is not published. There is no foundation whatever for such a statement.

Mr. FISHER. It is absolutely correct.

Mr. HENDERSON. I also take issue with the hon. gentleman when he said that the deputation that came here on the 16th December represented the farmers all over this Dominion. It did not. A comparatively small number of the farmers all over this country were represented by that deputation, and we know perfectly well that the deputation did not represent the farmers all over Canada. I am sorry the Minister of Finance is going out of the Chamber.

Mr. FIELDING. I will be happy to come back and listen to my hon. friend.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall refer to a statement made by the Minister of Finance this afternoon and on three or four other times during the session. He stated there was no necessity for bringing down information because reciprocity had been the policy of the Conservative party for 40 years, and I think he also said it had been the policy of the Liberal party. So far as the Liberal party is concerned he can take that to himself, but when he says that reciprocity has been the policy of the Conservative party for a great many years I take issue with him. In 1879, Sir John Macdonald did place in the tariff a standing offer and why he did it I cannot say. I assume that he wanted to show a friendly feeling to the people of the United States, and possibly he wanted to show a friendly feeling to those who were then in opposition to him. He was bringing down a tariff which was a radical change in the fiscal policy of the country, and possibly he was not sure he could carry it, and he said: Here is an alternative. But it is a remarkable thing that in the debate on the tariff of 1879 Sir John Macdonald never made the first reference to this reciprocity clause at all; he never advocated it, he never said it was his policy.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend mean that he put it in the tariff because it was not his policy?

Mr. HENDERSON. I mean to say that he put it there not as his policy. His policy was a protectionist tariff to build up the home market.

Mr. TALBOT. With a bribe to the farmer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly he put it in to show a friendly feeling to the people of the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. And sacrifice the Canadian farmer.

Mr. HENDERSON. And to show a friendly feeling to the Liberal party because they had sent Hon. George Brown to Washington to negotiate a treaty. But, what I do contend is that though it was put in there, Sir John Macdonald or Sir Leonard Tilley never opened their mouths in support of it.

Mr. TALBOT. He never meant it?

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly he did not. He showed conclusively that it was not his policy because his policy was to build up the home markets and reciprocity being diametrically opposed to that, how could it be his policy?

Mr. KING. In to-day's 'Citizen' under the heading 'Just twenty years ago to-day' I read:

The Canadian ministers, Messrs. Tupper, Thompson and Foster have returned from the Tariff conference at Washington. The conference has been postponed.

Would my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) tell me what conference they were attending and what they were trying to get?

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, and it is not necessary for me to educate him on that point. At any rate, so far as the 'Citizen' is concerned I do not know what it was 20 years ago, but I am not responsible for it to-day, and I take very little stock in its editorials.

Mr. FISHER. You cannot escape from the facts.

Mr. HENDERSON. What I maintain is that so far as I am personally concerned, and I think I can speak for a great many on this side of the House, whether or not Sir John Macdonald did place that resolution in the tariff of 1879, is the Conservative party of to-day to be bound by a policy announced 32 years ago under conditions entirely different from those which now exist? No sane man would say so. I do not believe the Minister of Customs would say that he would be bound by the policy of his leader 32 years ago.

Mr. PATERSON. This is only twenty years ago.

Mr. BROWN. During the by-election in the county of Huntingdon, which took place twenty years ago, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper spoke from the public platform, and he there stated that he came as the unworthy representative of his father who had gone to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Does the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) say those words are not correct?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not saying whether they are correct or not correct. I know nothing about them; I am not responsible for them in any way. I understand that in 1879 the hon. Minister of Customs favoured free coal in this country. Is he bound by that policy to-day? Does he not remember voting for it in 1879?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not deny it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Did the hon. minister put free coal into the pact that he made at Washington a short time ago? Yet he voted for it in 1879, with his then leader, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and with his present leader, the right hon. the Prime Minister. They were all free coal men then, but we hear nothing about it now. They say that the Conservative party ought to be bound by a resolution in favour of reciprocity which Sir John Macdonald put into the tariff of 1879, but they go back on their own resolution in favour of free coal. Will the Minister of

Finance go down to Nova Scotia and tell the people that free coal is his policy because his leader voted for it in 1879? There would be just as much sense in that as there is in asking us to be bound by a reciprocity resolution that was placed in the tariff of the same year. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite should be bound by that free-coal resolution, because conditions have changed; neither can they justly say that the Conservative party are bound by a resolution put in the tariff of 1879 under very different conditions.

Mr. LANCASTER. Which they took out in 1897.

Mr. HENDERSON. Just to show how these reciprocity clauses were played with, let me say that when Sir Charles Tupper returned from Washington after negotiating a fishery treaty, the government framed a new standing offer which was very much objected to by a number of us. I remember that men from the Niagara peninsula made a strong protest because it offered reciprocity in fruit. I remember myself strongly protesting with Sir John Macdonald, and what was his answer? I give it just to show that he was not so anxious about reciprocity

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will use the other word if hon. gentlemen wish, because he was not sincere he was playing with the Americans. I am not afraid to make the statement. Sir John Macdonald was very anxious that the fishery treaty which Sir Charles Tupper had just negotiated should be ratified, and he wanted to show the most friendly feeling towards the people of the United States, and therefore, one night he drew up this reciprocity resolution and placed it in the Votes and Proceedings. As I say, we protested against it, and he gave this as an excuse: We are anxious to have that fishery treaty ratified,and we have made this offer in order to gain the friendly ear of the Americans; and if they do not ratify the treaty we will cancel the standing offer. That was about all the sincerity there was in it. We said: Suppose they do ratify the treaty. He said he would cancel the offer anyway. I mention that circumstance to show that the standing offer has been played with, I fancy. by both Liberal-Conservatives and Liberals, for a great many years.

Mr. FIELDING. We did not have any.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very sorry you began the business this year. I am very sorry you made an offer which is more than a standing offer perhaps. I am very sorry you have gone as far as you have gone.

Mr. FOSTER. So are they.

Mr. HENDERSON. I take this stand: I do not feel myself bound, nor do I believe the Conservative party feels itself bound, by a standing offer put in the tariff of 1879 any more than the Liberal party are bound to vote for free coal because the right hon. leader of the government and the Minister of Customs and the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and Sir Richard Cartwright all voted for free coal, with every other member of the Liberal party at that time. Is the hon. Minister of Customs prepared to vote for free coal to-day? Why did he not put it into this reciprocity agreement?

Mr. PATERSON. Because we put in something else.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman wants to hold the Conservative party bound by an offer that was made by Sir John Macdonald in 1879, and he will not be bound by what he and his leader voted for at the same time. I mention this to show the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman's position. I hope we shall hear no more about this standing offer being the policy of the Conservative party.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be a very simple question. We have a motion censuring the government for not giving the House sufficient information. As the Minister of Finance is not here at present, I would like to ask the Minister of Customs if he is prepared to furnish us any more information or not? I think we are entitled to an answer, yes or no. I would like to put that question direct.

Mr. PATERSON. When we get to the details, we will endeavour to give you all you can ask.

Mr. PRICE. An answer of that sort is not good enough for us or for the people of this country. We do not intend to be humbugged by this kind of thing. We want this answer: yes or no. The Minister of Customs may laugh at this, but we want to know. Are you afraid to give us this information, or are you not? My hon. and genial friend smiles sweetly; but he dare not give this information.

Mr. PATERSON. So you say.

Mr. PRICE. And why? Simply because you have not got it.

Mr. PATERSON. That would be a good reason.

Mr. PRICE. Two representatives of this government went to Washington to negotiate—two men calling themselves business men to deal with members of the American government, to deal with some of the cleverest men on this continent. And what do they take with them? Do they take statis-

tics? They take a lot of blue-books, and when they get to Washington, do any of us imagine they were looking into these blue-books all the time? They simply made up their minds, as the Minister of Finance told us, that reciprocity was the platform of both the Liberal and Conservative parties. So far as the Conservative party is concerned, I will not go back to how many years, but for a number of years reciprocity has not been part of our platform. You may say what you like, it has not. I want to ask the Minister of Customs whether in the elections of 1900, 1904 and 1908 this was part of the Liberal platform. Did you ever mention it?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it was part.

Mr. PRICE. When did you mention it?

Mr. PATERSON. On the platform.

Mr. PRICE. Where?

Mr. PATERSON. I spoke in a great many places.

Mr. PRICE. Where?

Mr. PATERSON. I spoke of it in many places on many platforms.

Mr. PRICE. On reciprocity as part of the Liberal programme?

Mr. PATERSON. Read the Liberal platform and you will see it is there, it has been there ever since the platform was enacted.

Mr. PRICE. And the leader of the government had it as part of his platform?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. You do not seem to understand. It is part of the platform, read it.

Mr. PRICE. Of the Liberal platform?

Mr. PATERSON. The platform of the Liberal party.

Mr. PRICE. For what year?

Mr. PATERSON. It was enacted in 1893 and has been there ever since and is there now.

Mr. PRICE. The platform of 1893? We all know that the platform of 1893 has been considerably changed. The hon. the leader of the government for instance was given the Cobden medal for being a free trader, still he and his government were quite ready and did actually steal the Liberal Conservative platform.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PRICE. I ask the Minister of Customs if he can deny that?

Mr. TALBOT. It was not worth stealing.

Mr. PRICE. Well you have taken it. I think I am entitled to an answer on that question.

Mr. PATERSON. I certainly did not steal it, but the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) this afternoon dropped it. He said he supported the National Policy of 1911.

Mr. PRICE. That kind of wit may do for Brant, but I do not think it does for us here. I want an answer to this question. If you have got such an awfully good policy in this reciprocity surely you ought to be ready to come out and give us the information we want. You do not seem to give any. My hon. friend you may laugh as much as you like, but this is a pretty serious question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PRICE. You may laugh as much as you like, but I tell you it is a much more serious question than you think it is. You cannot answer a question when it is put to you.

Mr. PATERSON. Let me ask you one.

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec). Was it a good thing that we got $1.25 taken off the American duty on lumber?

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Fair play.

Mr. HARTY. What about your interruptions this afternoon. Nobody dared to say a word to you.

Mr. PATERSON. I say that was one good feature, was it not?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Stand up.

Mr. PRICE. It seems to me a very extraordinary thing that after this motion has been moved the Minister of Finance should get up and talk all around the question, and that he will not give us an answer. What are we to understand by this? Instead of being frank and plain about it he started in on all sorts of side issues saying that this was the policy of the Conservative party. We deny that it is the policy of the Conservative party. The leader of the government the other day took up about three-quarters of an hour to prove that it was the policy of the opposition. He may talk for an hour and a half today, and he cannot prove that because it is not the policy of this opposition. The Minister of Agriculture also talked around the question. Are you all afraid to come out frankly and tell us?. It seems to me a most extraordinary thing that this strong government cannot answer a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. PRICE. No, you are not through with me yet.

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec). What about lumber?

Mr. PRICE. Lumber will be all right under this so far as that goes, but I do not consider my own personal interests in this matter. I am not elected by my people to represent them in parliament, and think of my personal interests, and I will stand no insinuations of that sort on my character; I am not that kind of a man. After the exhibition of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, and the Minister of Agriculture I have no doubt whatever, what the people of Canada will say when it comes to the next election.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, there are two or three points of interest in this which I think it would be well for us to consider for a very short time. The Minister of Finance, in answering the hon. member who introduced this subject, said: I do not agree with the hon. gentleman who made this motion in regard to lack of information, or need of information; in the first place I do not agree with him that there is any lack of information; in the second place I do not agree with him that there is any need of information. Is it possible to furnish too much information? Is it possible to furnish more than we have had? If we have not got it, and do not need it there can be only one assumption, and that is that we are willing to go it blind. Is this House willing to take up such an important question without information, and go it blind? If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) would get closer together, they could speak without being heard.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Speaker, remarks such as the hon. gentleman has made just now come with very bad grace from him, and those on the other side of the House. If I have occasion to say a word quietly to my colleague I can do it. When the Minister of Finance was speaking this afternoon, two or three of the hon. gentlemen opposite were on their feet at the same time, so that it was absolutely impossible for my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) to make himself heard. I want the hon. gentleman to remember this——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON—that a minister of the Crown——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson), seems to display a good deal of temper about nothing. I say —and, in my judgment—I say that when a member is addressing ministers of the Crown he has a right to expect that they will show him the common courtesy of listening to him. I say that that is demanded by the rules of the House and by the courtesy of parliament. When two or three ministers are talking among themselves, they do not show the courtesy to the hon. member who happens to be addressing the House at the time, to which he is entitled.

Some hon. MEMBERS, Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to say something if the hon. gentleman would permit me.

Mr. SPROULE. To say something, or to ask a question?

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to say something on the question the hon. gentleman is discussing.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson), has had his say for the present. If he wishes to ask a question, I shall be glad to give him the floor. But if he wants to debate, I think he has had sufficient opportunity till I have finished.

I was referring to the statement the Minister of Finance made. He does not agree that there is any want of information on the part of the House or any need of it. If there is no want of it, it must be that the information is all supplied. Have we had a reasonable supply of information? I think I can leave that to this House and the country. What has been furnished us? We have the speech of the Minister of Finance giving the articles included in the treaty, and also a small blue-book with a similar list of articles. That is practically all that has been furnished to the House. Yet the minister does not think there is any need of information. If the House is satisfied there is only one conclusion we can reach, and that is that this House is willing to go it blind, for the fact is we have not sufficient information. If we do not desire information, we show no interest in the very vital and important question on which we are asked to legislate binding the people of this country for the future. Is that consistent with what is expected of parliament and members of parliament? In my judgment it is not. Then, is there any need of information? Surely we cannot have too much information. If there is any information to be had with which we have not been furnished, surely we are entitled to it. We are the representatives of the people, and we are asked to enact a law that will bind the people for weal or woe.

Mr. FOWKE. With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would like to ask a question. He is one of the diligent members of this House and in that respect is an exemplar to many younger members. He has stated that all the information before the House is contained in the blue-

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec County).

book brought down by the minister when he made his report to the House. I am aware that other information has been laid on the table. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he is quite certain that he has availed himself of all the information that is in the possession of the House?

Mr. SPROULE. I think I have. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowke) has more, he may profit by it. Now, what information was supplied to the House and the Senate at Washington which have to deal with this same question? Have they only the same information as was furnished to us? I have here the evidence that was given before the Committee on Ways and Means, a book containing 340 pages of evidence, upon which the members could base their judgment. This House has been sitting as a Committee of Ways and Means on this measure, but what information has been given us? But consider how many interests have been heard before the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of the United States? I find the following list in this report to which I have referred: Allen Shingle Company, Portland, Oregon; American Hay Company, New York city; W. O. Andrews, Gloucester, Massachusetts, (Fish); Edgar G. Barrett, New York city (wood pulp and paper); Herbert W. Blanchard, Boston, Massachusetts, (lumber); J. H. Bloedel, Bellingham, Washington, (lumber); Hon. Thomas W. Bradley, M. C. from New York (pocket cutlery); Freeman Brown, Gloucester, Massachusetts (fish); Malt Manufacturers Association of Buffalo; C. W. Buttz, Buttzville, North Dakota, (reciprocity); Thomas J. Carroll, Gloucester, Massachusetts (fish); Kimberley Clark (paper); Eugene F. Cranz, Columbus, Ohio; Fred. A. Earce, Gloucester, Massachusetts (fish); D. Daun Egan, Seattle, Wash. (fish); American Society of Equity (barley and barley malt); Everett Pulp and Paper Company, Everett, Wash.; Bruno E. Fink, Milwaukee, Wisconsin (barley and barley malt); Harrison G. Foster; Hon. Augustus P. Gardner, M. C. from Massachusetts and others, (fish); R. P. Grant, Clayton, N.Y. (hay, cheese, &c.); Loren Grinstead, chief clerk of the House, Olympia, Wash. (reciprocity); Alfred S. Hall, Boston, Mass. (wood pulp and paper); Hon. L. B. Hanna, M. C. from South Dakota; Arthur C. Hastings, N. Y. city (wood pulp and paper); James J. Hill, St. Paul, Minn., (letter to); Edward S. Hines, Chicago, Ill., (lumber); W. Howarth, Everett, Wash.; Howell Shingle Company, Portland, Oregon; Francis M. Hugo, Watertown, N. Y., (wood pulp and paper); Hon. William E. Humphrey, M. C. from Washington; Aaron Jones (National Grange); M. Wes Lubbs (barley); C. E. Ludorci, Freeland, Mich.; E. W. McCullough, Chicago, Ill., (agricultural implements, &c.); C. H. McLaughlin, Buffalo, N. Y. (barley and barley malt); Hon. Geo. R. Malby, M. C. from N. Y. (reciprocity); Malt Manufacturers Association of Buffalo, N.Y. (barley and barley malt); Malt Manufacturers of Wisconsin; J. R. Mauff, Evanston, Ill., (barley and barley malt); Orlando Merchant, Gloucester, Mass., (fish); Capt. Robert N. N. Miller, Gloucester, Mass., (fish); Arthur L. Millett, Bureau of Fisheries, Gloucester (fish); National Grange (reciprocity); National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, president of; Theo. G. Nelson, Indianapolis, Ind. (reciprocity); N. Y. and Pennsylvania Company, N. Y. city (paper and board); John Norris (wood pulp and paper); P. J. O'Brien & Co., Gloucester, Mass. (fish); Occidental Fish Co., Seattle, Wash.; Senator George T. Oliver, Washington, D.C., (letter to); Oregon and Washington Lumber Manufacturers' Association, Portland, Oregon (lumber); Augustus G. Paine, New York city (paper and board); Isaac Patch, Mayor, Gloucester, Mass., (fish); Capt. George H. Peoples, Gloucester, Mass., (fish); Port Blakeley Mill Co., Port Blakeley, Wash., (lumber); Herman Ridder; Edwin Ripley, Seattle, Wash., (fish); Charles J. Roberts, Bradford, Mass., (fish); D. Rothschild, Grain Co., Davenport, Iowa (barley and barley malt); Don. C. Seitz (wood pulp and paper); Senate and House of Representatives of the state of Washington (reciprocity); F. J. Sensenbrenner, Neenah, Wis., (wood pulp and paper); Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., (lumber); D. E. Skinner, Seattle, Wash., (lumber); Capt. Sylvanus Smith, Gloucester, Mass., (fish); L. G. Spencer, Columbus, Ohio; Stanwood & Co., Gloucester, Mass., and others (fish); University Lumber and Shingle Co., Portland, Oregon. Then we have the western Codfish Company, on fish, we have the Whitehead North Carolina Lumber Company, and we have two or three other men on fish.

Now all the evidence of these various men representing those industries was taken before that Committee on Ways and Means. They needed that information before they could deal with this question. The question is put to the chairman of that commission: Could this reciprocity pact be amended? The answer is, Yes. I take that large volume of 342 pages, I have gone through a large portion of it, and I find that a great many of the most important industries affected by this reciprocity pact are dealt with, and evidence concerning them is given by experts in those various lines. For what purpose? To give the Committee of Ways and Means the necessary information, information which was furnished to them, but which

is not furnished to us. We are told that we do not require any more information. If the American congressmen require this information in order to deal intelligently with this question, do we not also require like information? Is it not our right to have this information? Is it not the duty of the government to furnish it to us? I say that the government is granting scant courtesy to the representatives of the Canadian people in withholding this information. We cannot take evidence. Two ministers go down to Washington to make that compact without calling before them a single representative of the various industries that are going to be affected. We have in this volume a mass of evidence of the most valuable character laid before the Committee of Ways and Means, all of which we are denied. I say it is an insult to deny us that information, which we need in the interest of our constituents. Then I come to another item of information. What is that? Canadian reciprocity. This is from the American standpoint. A list of articles is furnished that are likely to come into that country on account of this treaty, it shows the price of those articles in the countries where they are sold, the current prices to-day, and the prices in the United States, in order to enable them to make a comparison to ascertain in which country they are the better price. That is what they require, that is what this government have not deigned to give us. Then they stand up and tell us that we do not need it, that we have got all the information we require. I go over these items of barley, wheat, horses, cattle, sheep, dairy products, pulp-wood, manufactured and partly manufactured, and lumber, every article accompanied with comparative prices of it in each country, to show what will be the result if this treaty passes. They require that information, and it has been furnished to them, but our government refuses to furnish it to us. Is that doing justice to the representatives of the Canadian people? I go over that return, and I find everything is included in it that will be affected by this reciprocity treaty. It shows how it will affect the various prices, how it will affect the lumberman's prices, how it will affect the fisherman's prices. All this is given to the American congress, not one iota is given to us, we are told we have all the information we want. I have before me here another report of that Committee on Ways and Means, full of practical information. Then they have the tariff negotiations between the United States and foreign countries, containing a great deal of most valuable information. Have we anything of that kind? Not a word; we are denied it. We are sitting here as a Committee of Ways and Means, and nothing is furnished to us. We are expected to cope with the able men of the American congress in holding up our side of the bargain, and we are expected to do it without any information. I take up two or three more reports of the same kind furnished to them, and nothing of the kind is furnished to us. Is that doing justice to the Canadian people? In my judgment it is not. I say that when any minister of the Crown stands up here in face of the evidence furnished to the American congress, and tells us that we have all the information we want, he is insulting the intelligence of this House, and showing that he is not fit to discharge the important duties assigned to a minister of the Crown. If we ask them why they made this bargain without calling before them the representatives of the various industries the answer is: We did not require it, we have all the information. I assume that the members of the American congress will compare favourably, man for man, with the representatives of this House in intelligence. They wanted that information; the United States Executive furnished them that information. But we are told that we do not need it, we can go it blind, and bind the people of this country, no matter how injuriously they may be affected. Then I say that we can go it in haste, and regret it at leisure. I want the people to know how their representatives are treated in this House, that they may judge as to whether the government have done their duty in failing to furnish us with the information that they ought to provide to enable this House to do its duty properly.

Mr. BEST. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), said that the newspapers did not bear out the assertion that the price of grain was higher in Canada than in the United States. I will refer him to to-day's 'Globe,' and surely that is an authority to which he will give weight. Wheat for May delivery is quoted in Winnipeg at 90⅛, while the quotation for Chicago is 86¼.

Mr. CARVELL. Will my hon. friend read the quotation for Duluth and Minneapolis?

Mr. BEST. Yes. For July delivery the price in Winnipeg was 91¾ and in Chicago 85⅞.

Mr. CARVELL. What about Duluth?

Mr. BEST. Wait just a moment—or a difference in favour of Winnipeg of six cents.

Mr. CARVELL. Will my hon. friend read Duluth?

Mr. BEST. A difference, as I said, of six cents in favour of Winnipeg. Now, I will give the balance. In Minneapolis the price for May delivery is 92⅛——

Mr. CARVELL. Ah.

Mr. BEST. And for July 93¾. In Duluth the prices are 94⅝ and 92⅝.

Mr. CARVELL. What about that?

Mr. BEST. Now, we come to oats: May, Chicago, 30½; Winnipeg, 33. If that does not prove that prices are higher in Canada than they are in the United States I do not know what does.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? How many pounds would there be in a bushel of Chicago oats?

Mr. BEST. I am giving you the markets in your own paper. You have contradicted the statements that we have made.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to answer my question. How many pounds would he get in a bushel of Chicago oats?

Mr. BEST. If you get your arithmetic you will see.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). How many pounds are there in a bushel of Canadian oats?

Mr. LENNOX. We do not want Chicago oats at all.

An hon. MEMBER. He does not know.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). No, but he should find out.

Mr. BEST. As far as I know there are 60 pounds in a bushel of wheat on both sides.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). It is oats I am talking about. You are not talking about the same grades. I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that there are only 32 pounds in a bushel of oats in the United States while in Canada there are 34 pounds in a standard bushel of oats.

Mr. BEST. I would ask my hon. friend if he denies that they are higher in Canada than in the United States?

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). It would depend on the grade.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish to say only a word on this motion before it passes. The hon. minister (Mr. Fisher), has stated that information was laid on the table of the House and that it was here for the use of members. When he lays a return such as he stated on the table of the House, and when he says that members have it for their own personal use he is hardly putting it in a fair way because one member will take that return and probably keep it for a week or two. It is not printed. All the members of the House who are entitled to examine these records cannot get a return such as this until the member who has taken it away has finished with it.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Reid, Grenville) is an old enough member to know that he can ask to have it printed and it will be done at once.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I might not have been in when it was laid on the table of the House. Why should not the Minister of Agriculture, when he is preparing information on such an important question as this, have it printed so that we could all see it? We are all anxious to see these returns, but he does not do that. Another point that the minister tried to emphasize was that a deputation of farmers came down here and asked for reciprocal trade with the United States. But, when that deputation was here, the Minister of Agriculture, representing the farmers, did not tell them that in making an agreement with Washington they must understand that the products of every other country in the world would be allowed to come in under the same terms as those allowed to Washington, so that the agreement would not be entirely with the United States. Neither did he explain to them that this agreement would do away with the Inspection Act, thus permitting butter and cheese to come in here without inspection. All they will have to do is to bring their products to this side and enter it free of duty; then, they are allowed to do what they like with it. Under the present Act we are able to stop the false branding of cheese. They used to ship it here in bond, brand it as Canadian and then ship it through. But, we have prevented them from exporting cheese branded as Canadian. Cheese going through in bond cannot be so branded, but the moment they bring it in, enter it, and make it so that it does not go through in bond, they can brand it in any way they like?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is no way of preventing them.

Mr. FISHER. Do not be alarmed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And that is exactly what will happen.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then there is another thing. This motion asks for prices. There is no doubt that that is what we should have. We should have statistics showing the trade between each of these countries so that we can show the farmers who are being affected by this agreement exactly the condition of trade not only between the United States and Canada but between the other countries that are going to have the same advantages as those accorded to the United States. I went over to the Department of Customs, and asked them if they would give me some information or if they would make up some statis-

tics for me. They very kindly did so, and no doubt it was perfectly right for them to do it. I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is willing, if there is any information in his department of use to any member of parliament, that he should have it. I have this document that I got from this department, and I think it will be so useful to all the members of this House that I am going to have it put in 'Hansard' so that every hon. member can see it, because if the government will not give us information we are only too glad to furnish it so that members of the Liberal party and the farmers of the country can have it. I asked for a statement showing the quantity and value of the undermentioned articles entered for consumption in Canada by countries during the fiscal years 1905 to 1910 inclusive, and here are the articles that were mentioned: Butter, eggs, potatoes, cheese, beef, bacon and hams, mutton, pork in brine, poultry and game, other meat products, cattle, horses, sheep, swine, barley, beans, buckwheat, oats, pease, rye wheat, hay, flax seed, apples, vegetables, all kinds except potatoes. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the other day emphasized the statement that we did not do any business with these twelve favoured nations, or practically with the British possessions. He led people to believe that that business amounted to nothing. Although the farmers have a very high protection at the present time I find by this statement that in each of the years mentioned we purchased butter, from Great Britain, Australia, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Norway, France, Italy, Turkey, and the United States, and that last year we imported from the United States $16,163 worth of butter. We buy eggs from Hong Kong, Great Britain, China, Newfoundland, France, Japan, and the United States, and last year we purchased $177,577 worth of eggs from the United States.

We are importing potatoes from Great Britain, Australia, Hong Kong, British West Indies, China, Hawaii, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Japan, Spain and the United States, and from the United States last year we purchased $179,849 worth of potatoes and paid the 27 cents a bushel duty. We are great exporters of cheese, but we imported cheese last year from Great Britain, Belgium, China, Greece, Holland, Italy, Norway, St. Pierre, Roumania, Switzerland, Turkey, and from the United States alone we imported $45,319 worth. We purchose beef from many countries, but from the United States alone we purchased last year 1,444,272 pounds valued at $75,864. Of bacon and hams we purchased from a number of countries and from the United States alone we imported bacon and hams to the value of $816,042. We imported mutton from Australia and the United States last year and from the United States alone to the value of $165,749. We purchased pork last year from the United States to the value of $930,000. I will not take time naming all the countries we purchased from because they will appear in this table. We purchased poultry from the United States last year to the value of $52,597 worth, and from all the favoured nations we also purchased pork. We purchased cattle from the United States last year to the value of $25,150. We purchased horses from the United States last year to the value of $401,503, and yet they tell us that under reciprocity we are going to do a great trade with the United States in selling horses to them. We purchased barley from the United States last year to the value of $99,810. This statement I will ask to be allowed to go on 'Hansard.' We purchased, in vegetables of all kinds except potatoes, from the United States last year to the value of $821,236. We purchased these vegetables from almost every country in the world. This is a statement we should have in addition to the prices because this shows all the articles we purchase from the United States, and yet we are told that we will do business with the United States in these articles, notwithstanding that we paid heavy duties on all the articles coming in. What will the result be when these duties are taken off. I have a statement here as to all these matters, and I will put it on 'Hansard' because I got it from the Trade and Commerce Department, showing the business done with all these favoured nations that will enjoy the benefit of this pact, and this statement shows that we are already doing an enormous business with these countries. The Minister of Customs is afraid to give us statistics. He should have a statement of this kind prepared and laid on the table for the benefit of every member of the House. He should have statements prepared showing the prices of these articles in the several countries. It is not too late yet for him to do so. If he gives us this information it will be interesting to the farmers, but he dare not do it because he knows that if he does do it the figures would be considered as official and he would have to stand by them and assume the responsibility for them. That is the reason why we cannot get these statistics. The Minister of Customs tells us that he had all this information before him in Washington, and that he got it from blue books, and if so, these documents are official, and we are entitled to them just as much as he and the Minister of Finance were. If the minister had any documents at Washington why does he not lay them on the table of the House?

Mr. PATERSON. I think you have had most of them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You are only thinking, but I want to know if we hav had them all.

Mr. PATERSON. Go on with your speech.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Customs is afraid to lay the documents on the table of the House because they will condemn him and his government. The whole thing leads us to believe that the information which came from Washington that the two ministers were acting like school boys the whole time they were there and did not know what they were doing. I have read part of the statement, and I ask that it be printed in 'Hansard' in order that the Liberal members may have it as well as the Conservative members, because I believe that if the Liberals get information such as this and more that we will be able to give them, by the time this vote is taken, we will have them convinced they are wrong and will vote with us. The Minister of Customs and the government are trying to deceive the farmers of this country, and they withhold information, but if that information is given I am satisfied there will be such a howl all over the country that the government dare not try to force reciprocity through, and I am satisfied that if the statement of the Minister of Agriculture is carried out, and that we will have an opportunity of voting on this question, the government will be defeated in this House, and if they are not defeated in the House they will be defeated in the country when the people get an opportunity to vote.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm.) (Translation.) Sir, I would not consider myself true to my mandate if I did not make any observations regarding the motion submitted to you, and I beg leave to answer as briefly as possible the remarks made during this discussion.

The hon. member who just took his seat is a proud man; he challenges the Minister of Customs and treats him impertinently saying: 'You acted as a school-boy'. When this gentleman has the experience acquired by the hon. minister who is a white-haired man, perhaps he will speak more prudently. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) who is presently leaving the House, tells us that if the government is not defeated in this House on this question, it will surely be when the people is called to vote. Prophet, prophet of evil who tells us: 'You shall be beaten.' In my turn, I answer: 'You and your party shall be beaten.' We are awaiting them and we do not fear to face with these gentlemen the opinion of the people.

It is easy to say: 'You shall be beaten.' The experience of these gentlemen is so broad in the matter, they were so often beaten, so often and so well, still they must commence and beat us. Let them take it easy, we both parties must be in it.

I listened with much pleasure but little interest, because indeed I did not learn much from the speakers of the opposition. They spoke about agriculture, but they said nothing new for the farmers. These gentlemen throw blame on the hon. Minister of Agriculture, they are serious men to attack as able a man as the hon. Mr. Fisher who is the natural most legitimate and most qualified protector of agriculturists' interest. This protector of the farmers' interests is on our side, and he and his colleagues took these gentlemen's places, they who closed their yearly accounts with great deficits. Now, we have surplus, and they dare blame these ministers who passed their lives studying these questions, men of such experience as the hon. Minister of Agriculture. These things are unconceivable. These gentlemen try to teach him. I declare this to remind me of the sexton who tried to tell the priest how to say mass.

I listened to these distinguished speakers of the opposition; but some amongst them are not very famous.

When I hear these gentlemen talk about agriculture, and represent themselves as unable to conciliate the producers' interest with that of the consumer, that is evidence to me that they do not know what they are talking about. How can you contend, they ask, that the farmers will have a better market, will have better outlets for their products, while at the same time the consumer will not be called upon to pay more. Well, there is no need of going to school very long to be in a position to answer such a question. For a great many years, I have been taking an interest in farming and breeding; I claim I have a thorough knowledge of all that relates to breeding and agriculture. These gentlemen do not seem to realize that when the farmer is provided with an additional outlet for his products, the sale of these products will thereby be facilitated; even should the prices not be any higher, we will be in a position to sell larger quantities of them, and therein lies the profit. If prices should fall, so much the better for the consumer. The farmer is not anxious to control the whole market; but he may reasonably expect that, through the opening up at his doors of a further market of 92 millions of people, he will have a better chance to sell his products. Buyers will be more numerous, and for instance, instead of piling up our potatoes in sheds, or dumping them in pits, we shall dispose of them and do away with the risk of losing them through spoiling; in that way, will our profits be increased.

I remember that, under the reciprocity treaty which was in force from 1854 to 1866, we had a good market for our horses, and they brought satisfactory prices. Then, following on the termination of that treaty, we had to give up horse breeding, which had become an altogether too risky business. When these reciprocity proposals are in force and we no longer have to pay duties of 45 per cent to get our products on the other side of the line, we will once more be in a position to take up breeding and secure profitable returns.

Honourable gentlemen have referred to market gardening. It is just possible Mr. Speaker, that when that treaty or tariff arrangement comes in force, it will not be entirely satisfactory to all of us. It may be that a minority suffer from it. The remedy will then be to alter our system of farming, of husbandry, and to take up new and more profitable lines in place of those which may be affected by the new tariff.

Were we called upon to conclude a treaty for a period of ten, fifteen or twenty years, I might agree as to the possibility of there being some danger to us in binding ourselves for such a long time. But in this case, what risk is there for us? None whatever. We are not running any risk at all, for both parties to the treaty have the right to terminate it without even assigning any reason in justification of such action. Why then should we not try the experiment? At the expiry of two or three years, should we find trade conditions to be unfavourable to us, nothing can prevent us from repealing the agreement.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds.) (Text.) I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is not speaking to the amendment, but he is making a speech on reciprocity.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation.) I am answering the arguments brought forward by hon. gentlemen opposite, and if my hon. friend is unable to follow me, that is not through any fault of mine.

Mr. SPEAKER (Text.) I have allowed a great deal of latitude during this debate to the members on both sides of the House who have spoken.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds.) I think that the rule limits the debate to the question before the chair.

Mr. SPEAKER (Translation.) I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the point of order which has been taken. Under the rules of the House, when an amendment is proposed to the main motion, the discussion should bear entirely on the subject-matter of the amendment. I stated a moment ago that it was rather difficult for me to enforce that rule very strictly, seeing that the trend of the debate had drifted to such an extent, without nobody objecting. For that reason, I did not consider it necessary to interfere. However, now that objection has been taken, I pray the hon. member to restrict himself to discussing the amendment and to confine his remarks to the question implied.

Mr. LAFORTUNE. (Translation.) That is what I am trying to do, and, as I have considerable ground to cover, I do not in the least feel inclined to go beyond.

What efforts have not Conservatives and Liberals made towards restoring the reciprocity arrangement we had with the United States. From the day it was repealed, to what lengths have not both political parties gone in the hope that this treaty would once more be concluded, but always without success.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Did you call the hon. member to order?

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I stated that the hon. member should restrict himself to discussing the amendement, though acknowleding at the same time that it was rather difficult for me to keep the debate within such bonds, owing to the excessive freedom granted to those who preceded him. However, I shall once more request the hon. gentleman to restrict himself to discussing the amendment.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation.) I am discussing the amendment, and if the hon. gentleman is unable to follow me because I speak French, there is no fault of mine. But his prompter knows well that I am speaking to the question.

I want to show—and I think it will be an easy task—in answer to hon. gentlemen opposite who complain of not being possessed of all necessary information, that they, after all, have more information than they say. When these hon. gentlemen have spent their political life in search of some means of reaching the very object we now have in view, how can they want us to believe that they are not conversant with the proposed treaty, that they have not the required information, blaming the ministers for their groping in the dark, calling them schoolboys because they were not sufficiently acquainted with the necessary documents to represent us properly in Washington? When you make such statements, you are not serious, not any more serious than the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) who stated a little while ago before this House and this country that when his leader, the late Sir John A. Macdonald did put in the statute a resolution offering reciprocity to the United States, the Conservative leader was not serious. Who does the hon. gentleman want to believe that? I have been very sorry to see that there has not been one man on the other side of the House to

protest against such an outrage on the memory of the leader of the Conservative party. This contention that Sir John Macdonald did put that reciprocity offer in the statute in order to please the Liberals is simply absurd, to say the least. He liked us the way we generally cherish a mother-in-law.

It has been stated on the other side of the House a moment ago that we have stolen their programme on the national policy. Well, when we have the main motion put through, you will see those hon. gentlemen turning round and say: 'They have stolen our programme; that programme belonged to the Conservative party.' That is the way they will give evidence of their great sincerity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I represent an agricultural riding; I represent a district where the people are conversant with agricultural matters, and I may say I would fail in my duty if I did not make before my country the statement that we are very anxious to get that treaty. And I may add for hon. gentlemen opposite that if they are not informed on this question, we on this side of the House do not lack information. We have studied the question and we do not want any additional information. In this matter, we trust to the long experience gained by the hon. Minister of Customs, the hon. Minister of Finance and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. And above all, we have the leader who guides us in whom we have confidence; whenever he asks us for something, it is because it is necessary in the interest of our country.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Perley).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,
Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Barker,
Barnard,
Beattie,
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden (Halifax),
Boyce,
Burrel,
Campbell,
Cowan,
Crosby,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elson,
Foster,
Fraser,
Gilbert,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes,
Jameson,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lortie,
Macdonell,
McCall,
Maddin,
Marshall,
Middlebro,
Monk,
Nantel,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sifton,
Sproule,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington),
Wright.—64.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allard,
Allen,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Boyer,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon (Kent),
Graham,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
King,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Low,
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McCoig,
McColl,
McCraney,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McMillan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Papineau,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Robb,
Ross (Middlesex),
Ross (Rimouski),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Stormont),
Sperry,
Talbot,
Templeman,
Todd,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Warburton,
Wilson (Laval).—98.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur, Hon. L. P.,	Haggart, Hon. J.,
Borden, Sir F.,	Northrup,
Clark (Red Deer),	Bradbury.
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Molloy,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
McGiverin,	Osler,
White (Alberta),	Taylor (New Westminster),
Macdonald,	Meighen,
Tobin,	Price,
Parent,	Smyth,
Tolmie,	Staples,
Pardee,	Stanfield,
McLean (Sunbury),	McCarthy,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Chisholm (Huron),

Guthrie,	Clare,
Carrier,	Worthington,
Champagne,	Magrath,
Conmee,	Kidd,
Turriff,	Bristol,
Verville,	Forget,
White (Victoria),	Broder,
Lapointe,	Lewis,
Geoffrion,	Porter,
Demers,	Lalor.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. PERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the vote of the hon. member for Labelle has been counted?

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for Labelle hear the question put?

Mr. MAJOR. I heard it read in French.

Mr. PERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would not like to question anything the hon. member says, but I think he will remember that you had read the greater part of the resolution in French before he came into the Chamber.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Speaker, I was observing the hon. member for Labelle when he entered this chamber. You, Mr. Speaker, had begun the reading of the motion in French, and had partly read it. There were loud cries of order, and I looked over and saw the hon. member for Labelle passing in, and stooping behind the back row of seats.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I took particular notice when the hon. member for Labelle took his seat, and I remember perfectly well that as soon as he took his seat you began to read the motion in French.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. My duty consists in asking the member whether he heard the question put. If he answers in the affirmative, the matter ends there.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to question your ruling; but I want to say, in reference to the statement of the hon. member for Bellechasse, that I had the opportunity of seeing and he had not, and that his statement is not in accordance with the fact.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think we had better have it settled and understood that if the hon. member only heard the motion partly read, he certainly ought not to record his vote. There is no doubt that a portion of the amendment was read in French before the hon. gentleman entered the Chamber.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. If we are bound to accept the hon. gentleman's word when he says that he heard the motion put, I tell you I would rather not be the hon. gentleman.

Mr. C. B. MAJOR (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have not heard the reading of the motion in English, but I think that I have heard the reading of the whole motion in French.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking on this amendment a few moments ago, I had a statement, which was prepared by the Customs Department, and which contained a great deal of valuable information. It was information that I thought every member of this House should have and that the farmers of this country should have. I read a part of it, but I did not take time to read the whole of it, because it is quite a lengthy document; but I am informed now from the 'Hansard' department that for some reason or other it cannot be printed. I mentioned it, and of course only intended to save time by not reading it. I want this statement printed, and I do not think the government should object to having it printed. There is not any rule that will prevent it being printed when I read it, and I intend now to read it. In addition to that, I have two other statements here. I did not intend to take up the time of the House this evening, but I am going to do it in order to give the people the information.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom of this House to accept statements from the Finance Minister, and from other ministers again and again to be handed in and printed. I think it is quite unfair that any hon. member should have to rise and read a statement that has been prepared by the government. If it were something from a newspaper, I would not object; but this is a return prepared by the government and laid on the table, and I see no reason why the hon. member should not have this handed in and printed in 'Hansard.'

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is a statement that I got prepared in the Customs Department. I have another statement here, prepared by the Department of Trade and Commerce. It is practically an official document. I went to the deputy minister and asked him to give me the exports of butter, cheese, eggs, beef, bacon, hams and other meats, taken from the official blue-books of favoured-nation countries, and I have the official document here. I also asked the Trade and Commerce Department for a statement of the imports from favoured nation countries, of various articles such as animals, fruits, grain, meat products, and so on. These are official statements from the departments, and they should be placed before the people of this country. I am very sorry to have to keep the House here to-night in order to place them in 'Hansard.' If the government will take them as official and print them in 'Hansard,' I will not read them, but I take it for granted that the government has stopped the printing of them, and I am going to read them.

STATEMENT showing the Quantity and Value of the Undermentioned Articles Entered for Consumption in Canada, by Countries, during the Fiscal Years from 1905 to 1910, inclusive.

COUNTRIES.	1905.		1906.		1907 (9 months).		1908.		1909.		1910.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
BUTTER—(Lbs.)		$		$		$		$		$		$
Great Britain	71,834	15,282	22,512	5,120	35,949	8,675	230,182	39,241	37,315	9,508	6,161	1,514
Australia	62,934	12,338	1,176	239	174,591	43,764	212,153	54,905	399,236	98,361	299,440	69,358
Newfoundland	100	19	.....	.....	21	1	18	3	.....	.....	3,820	763
New Zealand	47,432	8,634	15,512	3,702	30,912	7,537	.....	.....	16,128	3,741	21,840	4,871
Norway	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,200	240	3,200	436	1,000	200
France	.....	.....	25	9	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Italy	.....	.....	253	59	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Turkey	306	56	50	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	240	65
United States	230,763	58,555	103,923	25,810	34,657	9,239	294,647	74,674	473,805	112,219	61,081	16,163
Total	413,369	94,884	143,451	34,944	276,130	69,216	738,200	169,063	929,684	224,265	393,582	92,934
EGGS—(Doz.)												
Australia	694	109	710	92	.....	.....	9,720	1,658	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hong Kong	12,724	615	14,672	799	9,232	584	13,593	853	12,345	899	41,245	1,837
Great Britain	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,226	1,234
China	25,670	1,398	20,918	1,169	19,559	1,162	29,847	1,771	29,003	1,796	84,669	10,216
Newfoundland	.....	.....	.....	.....	8	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
France	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9	14
Japan	250	13	.....	.....	183	15	60	4	2,439	128	453	25
United States	267,229	65,424	426,369	86,877	632,122	141,422	1,096,766	210,708	1,092,333	236,304	750,476	177,577
Total	306,567	67,559	462,669	88,937	661,104	143,184	1,149,886	214,994	1,136,120	239,127	884,078	190 903
POTATOES—(Bush.)												
Great Britain	172	207	1,443	549	12	46	1,640	1,083	10	9	2,383	900
Australia	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9	10	.....	.....	.....	.....
British West Indies	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	23	23	.....	.....	128	174
British East Indies	.....	.....	3	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
China	17	7	17	6	21	11	165	56	15	6	27	10
Hawaii	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	54
Hong Kong	2	1	.....	.....	4	2	.....	.....	75	17	64	24

STATEMENT showing the Quantity and Value of the Undermentioned Articles Entered for Consumption in Canada, &c.—*Continued.*

COUNTRIES.	1905.		1906.		1907.		1908.		1909.		1910.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
POTATOES—*Con.*		$		$		$		$		$		$
Newfoundland					18	10			5	2		
New Zealand											845	720
Japan			34	8	230	70	213	98			5	2
Spain											550	427
United States	513,735	228,152	222,142	123,078	94,219	70,817	242,992	191,296	126,282	128,967	215,228	179,849
Total	513,927	228,367	223,639	123,643	94,504	70,956	245,042	192,566	126,387	129,001	219,330	182,160
CHEESE—(Lbs.).												
Great Britain	12,405	3,069	16,493	3,891	21,114	4,599	45,861	13,094	25,695	6,216	55,735	22,487
Hong Kong	615	82							240	7	79	12
Belgium							30	3	48	7	4,639	846
China					40	1	180	8				
France	29,962	5,276	43,328	7,904	44,893	9,570	42,666	8,853	59,817	11,136	72,791	14,459
Germany			50	20	525	46	1,400	140	822	231	167	54
Greece			110	3			720	80	2,361	174	1,710	83
Holland	3,747	460	6,722	976	10,485	1,648	13,122	2,019	35,548	5,573	17,231	2,303
Italy	57,943	9,009	90,725	15,528	94,353	17,613	84,197	15,895	175,453	33,853	203,313	40,341
Norway	170	27	10	2	1,457	259			172	22		
St. Pierre	177	41	66	10	60	17					220	53
Sweden			5,035	876	3,095	575						
Roumania											287	13
Switzerland	34,509	5,470	42,043	7,104	27,145	9,034	30,746	5,882	52,221	10,450	111,469	19,719
Turkey	26	3	1,060	157	4,032	437					396	25
United States	173,075	28,965	162,989	28,833	154,912	29,135	370,553	73,468	231,811	43,316	215,741	45,319
Total	312,629	52,402	368,631	65,309	362,111	72,934	790,475	119,442	584,188	110,985	683,778	145,714
BEEF, SALTED—(Lbs.).												
Great Britain	800	40	14,996	992	15,200	973	16,392	1,208	800	58	630	33
Newfoundland	2,200	126	1,450	109	1,042	56	400	21	2,100	178		

Norway							20,800	915	3,200	192	400	16
United States	1,152,569	50,727	2,358,069	110,761	2,253,312	91,176	2,020,394	93,793	1,300,507	75,642	1,445,272	75,815
Total	1,155,569	50,893	2,374,515	111,862	2,269,554	92,205	2,057,986	95,937	1,306,607	76,070	1,446,302	75,864
BACON AND HAMS—(Lbs.)												
Great Britain	5,739	983	3,397	576	11,599	2,242	27,633	4,789	3,388	580	4,721	1,066
Australia			3,711	514								
Hong Kong	1,100	64	1,694	101	1,103	81	3,053	263	2,079	159	2,617	148
China	993	69	362	25	588	54	533	34	506	43	826	83
Germany											42	6
Italy	20	8										
Japan	101	9							186	13		
Spain	62	10										
United States	4,220,381	483,299	7,073,978	775,226	5,162,912	643,290	7,276,730	847,215	5,877,303	735,367	5,453,257	816,042
Total	4,228,396	484,442	7,083,142	776,442	5,176,202	645,667	7,307,949	852,301	5,883,462	736,162	5,471,463	817,345
MUTTON—(Lbs.)		$		$		$		$		$		$
Australia	60,136	4,013	354,575	17,380	990,556	45,377	1,162,837	77,090	1,113,411	80,952	1,377,270	97,143
United States	41,928	3,233	48,667	3,982	45,733	3,870	88,124	9,624	317,795	29,047	716,753	68,606
Total	102,064	7,246	403,242	21,362	1,036,289	49,247	1,250,961	86,714	1,431,206	109,999	2,094,023	165,749
PORK IN BRINE—(Lbs.)		$		$		$		$		$		$
Great Britain	69,794	5,466	70,450	5,158	78,700	6,930	110,925	11,212	14,440	1,191	400	20
Hong Kong			290	19			186	16	478	17	10,410	825
Newfoundland	1,600	114	800	60	950	86	5,150	455	1,200	111		
China							125	13	430	41		
Norway							200	12	1,400	132		
United States	4,957,453	337,865	10,654,569	780,668	7,595,848	615,099	8,849,779	693,071	10,501,089	862,043	8,900,138	930,049
Total	5,028,847	343,445	10,726,109	735,905	7,675,498	622,115	8,966,265	704,779	10,519,037	863,535	8,910,948	930,894
POULTRY AND GAME.		$		$		$		$		$		$
Great Britain		587		379		1,106		3,384		4,041		4,907
Australia		9				41		670		20		1,159
Hong Kong		517		539		557		533		1,175		1,858
Aust.-Hungary						4		50				102
China		148		194		256		819		1,087		278
France												114
Japan						154		37		36		

STATEMENT showing the Quantity and Value of the Undermentioned Articles Entered for Consumption in Canada, &c.—*Continued.*

COUNTRIES.	1905.		1906.		1907.		1908.		1909.		1910.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
POULTRY AND GAME—*Con.*		$		$		$		$		$		$
Russia								30				
United States		33,767		38,679		38,812		45,512		42,490		52,597
Total		35,028		39,791		40,930		51,035		48,849		61,01
OTHER MEAT PRODUCTS (Lbs.)												
Great Britain	24,437	3,583	44,635	6,951	33,535	6,154	64,444	11,970	106,629	20,400	206,560	27,240
Australia	26,676	2,753	43,426	3,026	34,415	2,698	58,364	4,478	52,190	4,279	64,762	5,563
Hong Kong	22,733	1,509	30,251	2,303	34,282	2,678	28,330	2,096	35,171	3,105	88,692	6,619
Newfoundland	2,475	124										
New Zealand	4,605	761	3,657	273	2,644	407	3,324	496	2,318	308	2,584	231
Austria Hungary	480	34							92	47		
Belgium			548	85								
China	60,156	4,435	77,839	6,269	72,412	5,719	79,140	6,363	70,375	5,873	15,611	1,320
France	11,886	2,271	13,135	3,028	10,425	2,256	11,582	3,177	16,408	3,157	17,031	4,015
Germany	688	94	310	68	1,620	258	71	38	262	82	2,508	647
Italy	231	62	200	18					5,518	660	237	67
Japan	929	71	874	85	3,078	240	5,560	413	4,473	272	1,430	96
Norway	272	55	510	102	6,484	457	3,388	450	480	48	84	12
St. Pierre			3	3							90	11
Sweden							480	102	480	102		
United States	1,753,752	200,497	2,795,971	310,595	1,848,741	239,574	2,151,311	252,583	1,408,610	172,926	1,551,156	219,529
Total	1,909,320	216,249	3,011,359	332,806	2,047,636	260,421	2,405,994	282,166	1,703,006	211,259	1,950,745	265,350
CATTLE—(No.)												
Great Britain	31	500					1	60	12	1,089		
Newfoundland							1	36				
United States	19,616	272,785	14,277	182,963	4,554	64,519	2,993	50,363	2,589	43,049	1,012	25,150
Total	19,647	273,285	14,277	182,963	4,554	64,519	2,995	50,459	2,601	44,138	1,012	25,150

HORSES.—(No.)												
Great Britain	32	1,686	1	25	13	1,098	20	714	17	2,543	59	9,534
British West Indies			1	50							1	100
Newfoundland	7	200			24	766	25	1,195	89	4,110	88	4,385
Belgium											4	600
France											2	600
Hawaii							1	100				
Holland											1	60
St. Pierre					10	250						
United States	11,303	512,455	16,338	744,513	15,459	645,251	4,016	302,674	3,450	285,705	6,604	401,503
Total	11,342	514,341	16,340	744,588	15,506	647,365	4,062	304,683	3,556	292,358	6,759	416,782
SHEEP.—(No.)												
Great Britain							3	10	108	2,013		
United States	84,817	210,131	69,985	199,962	73,463	227,380	52,252	203,192	42,975	176,842	35,344	131,492
Total	84,817	210,131	69,985	199,962	73,463	227,380	52,255	203,202	43,083	178,855	35,844	131,492
SWINE.—(Lbs.)												
United States	50,182	2,833	124,795	7,233	330	50	6,592	415	60	25	2,760	2,140
BARLEY—(Bush.)												
Great Britain	4	10	240	263	253	294	2	5	331	377	2,561	3,093
China					700	328						
France											6	5
United States	1,083	1,077	2,785	1,632	1,575	1,043	8,843	6,383	97,399	59,184	164,532	99,810
Total	1,087	1,087	3,025	1,895	2,528	1,665	8,845	6,388	97,730	59,561	167,099	102,908
BEANS—(Bush.)												
Great Britain	36	117	9	21	25	41	310	666	67,418	83,687	44,008	64,384
Australia							12		726	1,126	188	288
British East Indies									645	737	57	50
British West Indies											18	29
Hong Kong	865	391	894	445	564	295	1,014	649	984	501	2,391	1,214
Newfoundland									3	6	132	238
Austria Hungary							2,102	3,022	9,592	12,970	17,404	27,263
China	1,210	626	899	478	1,015	578	2,302	1,209	2,590	1,403	1,387	964
France	27	71	5	26	13	73	114	522	236	467	11,132	15,839
French Africa									117	343		
Germany			2	8	1	2						
Greece									184	246		
Holland					13	38	9	30	19	57	10	63

STATEMENT showing the Quantity and Value of the Undermentioned Articles Entered for Consumption in Canada, &c.—*Continued.*

COUNTRIES.	1905.		1906.		1907.		1908.		1909.		1910.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
BEANS—*Con.*		$		$		$		$		$		$
Italy	2	1	313	496	183	372	452	805	92	101	202	286
Japan	1,431	1,600	1,363	1,430	1,171	1,187	2,555	2,665	3,985	3,620	4,644	4,664
St. Pierre	.....	.....	4	11	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Switzerland	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	15	15
Turkey	100	148	5	10	21	14	35	30	24	17	16	20
United States	13,978	28,216	23,612	42,245	21,086	38,404	16,668	40,392	21,427	46,605	23,157	55,806
Total	17,649	31,170	27,106	45,170	24,092	41,004	25,561	49,990	108,042	151,886	104,761	171,123
BUCKWHEAT (Bush.)												
Japan	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,048	3,100	4	6	582	590	1,163	1,037
United States	102	83	99	120	418	466	243	236	107	113	444	426
Total	102	83	99	120	3,467	3,566	247	242	689	703	1,707	1,463
OATS (bush.)												
Great Britain	674	469	1,618	1,309	612	655	74,703	53,197	395,755	275,472	15,578	13,559
Australia	8	6	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Zealand	337	195	680	396	.....	.....	.....	.....	310	192	.....	.....
China	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	2	.....	.....	.....	.....
France	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	6	5
United States	507,767	175,362	44,000	20,351	5,957	2,645	38,231	16,549	58,628	29,277	23,361	13,833
Total	508,786	176,032	46,298	22,056	6,569	3,200	112,935	69,748	454,693	304,941	38,945	27,287
PEASE (bush.)												
Great Britain	281	756	.....	.....	205	656	180	451	738	2,620	3,562	9,615
Hong Kong	3	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	544	388
Newfoundland	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	6
China	8	4	8	4	64	31	126	83	113	57	107	49
Denmark	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	109	333	.....	.....

France	2	12	434	206	2	6	808	3,232	315	993	257	469
Germany	1	3			121	372	114	194	50	134		
Holland									167	167	73	440
Italy							92	68	37	72	9	20
Japan	10	9	40	39			457	460	637	545	88	71
Russia									586	650		
St. Pierre			4	13								
Sweden							75	193				
Turkey	101	114	324	286	129	158	4	4	148	111	152	186
United States	3,921	6,864	4,245	8,532	5,167	10,814	5,048	10,410	8,694	24,518	12,875	35,406
Total	4,327	7,765	5,055	9,080	5,961	12,040	6,904	15,095	11,594	30,210	17,670	46,650
RYE (bush.)												
United States	1,229	1,068	24,072	15,068	35,045	24,879	52,316	43,892	31,952	26,644	1,306	1,399
WHEAT—(Bush.)												
Great Britain					8	10			37	59	281	445
Turkey			18	17	24	22					25	28
United States	92,406	77,597	64,909	49,724	24,723	17,703	90,255	76,053	46,329	40,951	54,964	55,139
Total	92,406	77,597	64,927	49,741	24,755	17,735	90,255	76,053	46,366	41,010	55,270	55,612
HAY—(Tons)												
United States	8,665	145,618	7,014	99,215	6,416	111,935	11,538	229,036	8,061	125,299	7,680	141,956
FLAXSEED—(BUSH.)	Free in 1905, 1906 and 1907.											
Great Britain	114,246	122,185	40	90			14	23	5	9	158	482
Belgium	464	648	184	274								
Holland			257	652	316	729	105	281	273	695	2,380	4,857
Germany					37	77						
United States	61,081	88,752	1,373,611	1,646,173	2,720,205	3,350,584	426,516	526,310	392	622	1,806	4,124
Total	175,791	211,585	1,374,092	1,647,194	2,720,558	3,351,390	426,635	526,514	670	1,326	4,344	9,503
APPLES, GREEN—(Brls.)												
Australia	178	929	39	270			183	944	202	3,118		
Spain							2	11				
United States	23,168	77,429	20,033	89,288	43,111	137,209	37,099	182,148	56,561	222,732	59,071	261,792
Total	23,346	78,358	20,072	89,558	43,111	137,209	37,284	183,103	56,763	225,850	59,071	261,792

STATEMENT showing the Quantity and Value of the Undermentioned Articles Entered for Consumption in Canada, &c.—*Concluded.*

COUNTRIES.	1905.		1906.		1907 (9 months).		1908.		1909.		1910.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Vrlue.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
VEGETABLES, ALL KINDS EXCEPT POTATOES ($)		$		$		$		$		$		$
Great Britain		73,777		55,148		38,703		103,665		81,879		109,172
Australia		4,803		2,353		94		6,143		9,301		7,407
B. W. Indies		1,585		454		227		770		2,054		2,958
B. E. Indies		304						164				
Hong Kong		6,040		6,485		5,357		5,289		5,021		10,917
Fiji Islands						68						
Newfoundland						60						
New Zealand				668						713		3,979
Austria Hungary				149		99		455		1,633		378
Belgium		3,491		3,125		1,384		4,175		4,626		10,063
China		15,432		13,253		9,880		16,080		12,181		6,644
Cuba										18		
Arabia								9				
Egypt		4,303		124				75				183
France		35,825		58,302		55,522		67,589		76,532		93,155
Dutch E. Indies								25				
Germany		2,711		2,886		828		2,357		2,253		730
Hawaii				39						64		529
Holland		7				2,566		359		132		587
Italy		798		982		416		5,779		10,818		15,255
Japan		9,943		8,626		11,153		25,782		25,905		32,377
Mexico										306		
Norway				465								
Portugal		6						75				23
Rumania												221
Russia						31		20				77
St. Pierre				8				19		22		19
Spain		2,634		6,346		9,063		9,673		2,726		5,064
Turkey		49		50		18		47		66		183
United States		576,056		503,388		309,526		653,344		650,997		821,236
Total		737,764		662,851		444,995		901,894		887,247		1,121,157

The next is a statement showing the exports of products from several countries as taken from their official reports.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds), Might I appeal to the right hon. the Prime Minister? These are official documents from the Department. It would take fully two hours to read these other statements.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am not talking to hon. gentlemen opposite; I am appealing to the Prime Minister. I never make an unreasonable appeal, and I think this is a reasonable one. I am prepared to stay, but the Prime Minister and I are both about 70 years of age, and we ought to get to bed by 12 o'clock, and I think that with the permission of the House these statements, which are official from the department, might be put in 'Hansard.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that on the motion of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), the hon. member for Grenville might have made the same speech and put in the same papers. He seemed to accuse the government of preventing them from being printed in 'Hansard.' The government had nothing at all to do with it. No order was given by the government to the 'Hansard' reporters; we have no power to give orders to the 'Hansard' reporters, and the hon. gentleman was in error in blaming the government because the papers were not accepted by 'Hansard,' That is no fault of ours. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection. It is the rule of the House that nothing should go into 'Hansard' that is not read except with the permission of the House itself. For my part I have no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If the House has no objection, they might go in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. Then these documents were accepted by the House. There was no objection made when the hon. member for Grenville brought the matter up, and we want to know now who gave the tip not to put them in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It did not come from me or so far as I know from any member of the government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may say to the Prime Minister that when I made my remarks I referred to this statement and read some of it, but I said that it would take considerable time to read it all, and that if the House would permit me I would hand it in. There was not the slightest objection raised. Then I got a note from 'Hansard' that it was against the rules of the House to print it. But I felt that when there was no objection raised I was entitled to put it in, the same as the Finance Minister did with his budget the other day.

Mr. FIELDING. I assure my hon. friend that the other day nothing appeared in 'Hansard' beyond what I read.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may be wrong there, but he has handed in statements such as I have stated.

Mr. FIELDING. Really not such long documents as the hon. gentleman has read. I am not offering any objection, but there is no comparison between the statements he is reading and the short statistical statements that I have made.

Mr. LENNOX. If there is any reason for handing them in, it is because they are long, not because they are short.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I appeal to the Prime Minister. These documents are very important, and I want them put on 'Hansard' because I want the members to see them. I suppose there are a dozen members wanting to see them. I have only the one copy, and the only way I can get the documents before them is to have them printed in 'Hansard.' I submit that it is hardly fair to compel me to read them when the House never objected to other documents being handed in.

Mr. HUGHES. I take this position, Mr. Speaker, that these papers are already accepted by this House, and are or should be in 'Hansard.' What minister or what member of this House has dared to interfere with 'Hansard'? When these papers were presented by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), were accepted by the House and were sent into 'Hansard,' I want to know who tipped the wink to 'Hansard' not to publish these papers. I claim that the papers are already before 'Hansard' and the House has no jurisdiction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The order of the House is well known, and I think it should be observed——

Mr. HUGHES. It was observed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—that nothing should go into 'Hansard except what is spoken. We do not want to come to the American system of having a speech handed over to 'Hansard' without being read. The Minister of Finance and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who is the financial critic on the opposition side, have been allowed, on different occasions, to put in tables of figures. I was not present in the House when the hon.

member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) spoke a moment ago, but I have understood that the figures had been allowed to be taken in. If that be so there is nothing more to be said. But I must say to my hon. friend that if I had been here I think I would have taken exception to the publication of these statements being allowed. The Minister of Finance has to speak officially for the government, and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has to speak officially for the opposition, and they may be allowed to take some liberties of that kind, with the rule of the House, but I do not think this privilege should be allowed to any one member of the House. I understand the matter has been allowed before, and I do not object, for my part, as a member of the government and leader of the House.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not think that any one member of the House has any more right to put in official documents than any other member. There is no one representing me in this House excepting myself, on this side of the House at any rate. Here is an official document from the government that I cannot get printed in any other way than by putting it in 'Hansard,' yet the Prime Minister says there are certain gentlemen, one on that side, and only one, and one on this side, and only one, who are allowed to put in official documents without reading them.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that at this very session others have put their documents in. I may instance the member from Brantford.

Mr. FIELDING. And objection has been taken on the other side to their going in.

Mr. BLAIN. I am pointing out that it is not confined to the Minister of Finance, or to the hon. member for North Toronto.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There has been a misapprehension. I think the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) was under the impression that his figures had been accepted, and so far let it go. I know it has been done; we have allowed others to put in figures; I think my hon. friend from North Simcoe did it, but it is a practice that should be discouraged and not encouraged, I think every one will agree in that.

Mr. BARKER. The question is not about what the practice is. I understand that it was understood those papers should go in. Gentlemen on this side of the House will accept the right hon. gentleman's statement if he will make it, that there has been no attempt to stop the publication of these figures. If the right hon. gentleman says there has not, we are quite content.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are all official figures, there is no objection at all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is no doubt it was agreed by the House that the statement should have gone in. If any objection had been raised at the time, I would have gone on and read the tables, but there was no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have these other two, and I shall put them all in at the same time. The others are official documents prepared by the Minister of Trade and Commerce or his department. They contain very valuable information, and I would like to put them on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carried.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I shall read them as fast as I can.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not necessary.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the Prime Minister would consent I would be very glad.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Life is short and we want to prorogue.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I asked the Minister of Trade and Congress to prepare me a statement showing the exports from the several countries, of animals, fruit, grain, hay, meat products, &c., products of the farm, and he has given me that statement and also the exports of butter, cheese, eggs and grain. They are very interesting to every member of this House, and for that reason I would like to have them printed.

EXPORTS OF DANISH PRODUCE FROM DENMARK. YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pund.	Kroner.	Lbs.	$
Butter	178,438,500	180,301,000	196,639,227	48,320,668
Cheese	237,060	60,000	261,240	16,080
	Score.		Doz.	
Eggs	19,206,987	26,121,000	32,011,645	7,000,428
	Pund.		Lbs.	
Meats :—				
Bacon and hams	189,972,700	104,626,000	209,349,915	28,039,768
Other meats	68,006,600	14,508,000	74,998,373	3,888,144
			284,348,288	

Note—Krone=26·8 cents.
Pund =1·102 lbs.
Score —20.

EXPORTS OF JAPANESE PRODUCE FROM JAPAN. YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Butter	(These items are not separately stated in the Japanese Trade Returns.)
Cheese	
Eggs	
Meats	
Poultry	
Hams	
Bacon	
Pork	

Note:—Yen=49.8 cents.
Kin=1.3228 lbs.

EXPORTS OF AUSTRALIAN PRODUCE FROM AUSTRALIA, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Lbs.	£.	Lbs.	$
Butter	55,644 925	2,399,693	55,644,925	11,678,506
Cheese	193,204	5,337	193,204	25,973
	Doz.		Doz.	
Eggs	10,359	706	10,359	3,436
	Lbs.		Lbs.	
Meats poultry & game:—				
Bacon and hams	396,342	18,682	396,342	90,919
Fresh and smoked	3,103	92	3,403	448
Preserved by cold process:—				
Beef	71,142,295	733,210	71,142,295	3,568,288
Game	30,230	371	30,230	1,806
Mutton and lamb	116,915,639	1,231,035	116,915,639	5,991,036
Pork	394,559	9,318	394,559	45,348
	Pairs.		Pairs.	
Poultry	5,828	3,127	5,828	15,218
Rabbits and hares	9,181,312	423,679	9,181,312	2,061,904
	Lbs.		Lbs.	
Other meats	1,151,811	18,520	1,151,811	90,131
Potted and concentrated		80,526		391,893
Preserved in tins, &c	23,301,198	420,847	23,301,198	2,048,122
	Cwt.			
N. E. I., salted &c	3,940	5,717	441,280	27,822

Note:—£=4.86 dollars.
Cwt.=112 lbs.

Mr. REID (Grenville)

EXPORTS OF NEW ZEALAND PRODUCE FROM NEW ZEALAND, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.		Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
			£		$
Butter	Cwt.	321,108	1,639,380	35,964,096	7,978,316
Cheese	"	400,607	1,105,390	44,867,984	5,379,564
Eggs	Doz.	4,838	346	4,838	1,684
Meats—					
Frozen—					
Beef	Cwt.	486,424	565,418	54,479,488	2,751,701
Kidneys	"	6,466	10,631	724,192	51,737
Lamb	"	1,039,540	1,817,026	116,428,480	8,842,859
Mutton	"	897,601	1,070,606	100,531,312	5,210,383
Mutton (joints)	"	51,484	63,169	5,766,208	307,423
Poultry	Pairs.	92	23	92	112
Pork	Cwt.	1,223	3,517	136,976	17,116
Veal	"	984	911	110,208	4,434
Rabbits in the skin	"	84,782	63,983	9,495,584	311,384
Hares in the skin	"	313	218	35,056	1,061
Other meats frozen	"	3,787	5,614	424,144	27,321
Salted—					
Beef	Cwt.	13,682	19,665	1,532,384	95,702
Pork	"	5	13	560	63
Potted and preserved	"	58,450	132,032	6,546,400	642,556
Extract	"	489	7,622	54,770	37,093
Unenumerated	"	100	229	11,200	1,115

Note.—£ = 4·86 dollars.
Cwt. = 112 lbs.

EXPORTS OF RUSSIAN PRODUCE FROM RUSSIA, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1908.

Butter	3,123,256	45,708,509	112,437,216	23,539,882
Cheese	27,254	178,126	981,144	91,735
	M.		Doz.	
Eggs	2,588,518	54,851,243	215,709,833	28,248,390
	Poods.		Lbs.	
Meats—				
Fresh	200,352	1,163,461	7,212,672	599,182
Salted or cured	116,581	960,696	4,196,917	494,758
Extracts and soups	374	5,034	13,464	2,593
Poultry and game	589,678	4,488,438	21,228,408	2,311,546

Note—Rouble=51.5 cents.
Pood=36 pounds.

EXPORTS OF ARGENTINE, PRODUCE FROM ARGENTINE, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Kilogs.	Pesos.	Lbs.	$
Butter	3,992,724	1,597,089	8,799,964	1,541,191
Cheese				
Eggs				
Meats—				
Frozen—				
Beef	209,135,489	20,943,549	461,595,818	20,210,525
Mutton	66,495,157	5,319,612	146,555,326	5,133,426
Chilled—				
Beef	1,221,978	122,198	2,693,240	117,921
Other meats	9,987,792	649,206	22,013,094	626,484
Jerked beef	11,622,465	1,325,053	25,615,913	1,278,676
Concentrated beef essence	629,117	188,735	1,386,573	182,129
Preserved meats	6,390,124	639,013	14,083,833	616,648
Preserved tongues	1,201,486	360,444	2,648,075	347,828
Extract of meat	1,351,494	2,702,988	2,978,693	2,608,383

Note.—Peso = 96.5 cents.
Kilog = 2.204 lbs.

EXPORTS OF SWEDISH PRODUCE FROM SWEDEN, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1908.

	Kilogs.	Kroner.	Lbs.	$
Butter	18,157,629	37,223,139	40,019,414	9,975,801
Cheese	2,096	2,253	4,620	604
	No.		Doz.	
Eggs	38,837,492	2,174,900	3,236,457	582,873
	Kilogs.		Lbs.	
Meats:—				
Bacon and hams	2,783,772	2,503,865	6,135,433	692,476
Other meats	718,133	443,245	1,582,765	118,790

Note:—Kroner=26.8 cents; Kilog.=2.204 lbs.

EXPORTS OF NORWEGIAN PRODUCE FROM NORWAY.—YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Butter	1,563,170	3,126,300	3,445,227	837,848
Cheese	120,182	132,200	264,881	35,430
Eggs	2,961	3,800	6,526	1,018
Meats:—				
Bacon and hams	1,513	1,200	3,335	322
Other meats	173,025	112,500	381,347	30,150

Note:—Kroner=26.8 cents.
Kilog=2.204 lbs.

Mr. REID (Grenville)

EXPORTS OF ARGENTINE PRODUCE FROM ARGENTINA, YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1909.

Articles Exported,	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	Pesos.	No.	$
Animals—				
Cattle	132,450	4,087,820	132,450	3,944,746
Horses	4,765	286,450	4,765	276,424
Sheep	88,636	265,908	88,636	256,601
Swine	33	990	33	956
	Kilogs.		Lbs.	
Fruits—				
Apples, fresh (not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
" dried " "	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other " " "	.....	.....	.....	.....
Grain—				
Barley	18,546,164	393,981	40,875,737	380,192
Beans	.....	.....	.....	.....
Buckwheat	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oats	421,352,000	10,115,161	928,659,808	9,761,130
Pease	946,748	37,870	2,086,633	36,545
Rye	67,850	848	149,541	818
Wheat	2,514,130,000	106,038,940	5,541,142,520	102,327,577
Flax seed	887,220,000	43,713,356	1,955,432,886	42,183,391
Hay (not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Meat Products:—				
Erozen:—				
Beef	209,435,489	20,943,549	461,595,818	20,210,525
Mutton	66,495,157	5,319,612	146,555,326	5,133,426
Chilled:				
Beef	1,221,978	122,198	2,693,240	117,921
Other	9,987,792	649,206	22,013,094	626,484
Jerked beef	11,622,465	1,325,053	25,615,913	1,278,676
Concentrated beef essence	629,117	188,735	1,386,573	182,129
Preserved meats	6,390,124	639,013	14,083,833	616,648
" tongues	1.201,486	360,444	2,648,075	347,828
Extract of meat	1,351,494	2,702,988	2,978,693	2,608.383
Lard	11,499	2,300	25,344	2,220
Straw (Not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Vegetables, fresh	.....	.....	.....	.....
Potatoes	3,116,642	62,333	6.869,079	60,151

Note—Peso=96.5 cts.
Kilog=2.204 lbs.

EXPORTS OF AUSTRALIAN PRODUCE FROM AUSTRALIA, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

ARTICLES EXPORTED.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalents.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	£	No.	$
Animals—				
Cattle	975	9,586	975	46,652
Horses	7,801	172,112	7,801	837,610
Sheep	5,315	20,243	5,315	98,516
Swine	229	460	229	2,239
	Lbs.		Lbs.	
Fruits—				
Apples, fresh	29,716,400	179,976	29,716,400	875,883
" dried (Not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other dried fruit	1,013,006	11,826	1,013,006	57,553
Grain—				
Barley	9,447,300	28,774	9,447,300	140,033
Beans (and Pease)	355,200	1,748	355,200	8,506
Buckwheat (Not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oats	12,022,500	30,867	12,022,500	150,219
Pease (Included with Beans)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rye (Not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wheat	1,892,969,900	6,628,683	1,892,969,900	32,259,591
Flax seed (Not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hay (and Chaff)	5,768,784	9,510	5,768,784	46,282
Meat Products—				
Bacon and hams	396,342	18,682	396,342	90,919
Fresh and smoked	3,403	92	3,403	448
Preserved by cold process	.....	.....	.....	.....
Beef	71,142,295	733,210	71,142,295	3,568,288
Game	30,230	371	30,230	1,806
Mutton and lamb	116,915,639	1,231,035	116,915,639	5,991,036
Pork	394,559	9,318	394,559	45,348
	Pairs		Pairs	
Poultry	5,828	3,127	5,828	15,218
Rabbits and hares	9,181,312	423,679	9,181,312	2,061,904
	Lbs.		Lbs.	
Other meats	1,151,811	18,520	1,151,811	90,130
Potted and concentrated	.....	80,526	.....	391,893
Preserved in tins &c	23,301,198	420,847	23,301,198	2,048,122
N.E.I. salted &c	441,280	5,717	441,280	27,822
Lard and refined animal fats	1,617,442	28,876	1,617,442	140,528
Straw—(Not separately stated).				
Vegetables, fresh—				
Potatoes	5,833,184	16,370	5,833,184	79,667
Onions	5,668,432	18,667	5,668,432	90,846
Other	.....	1,756	.....	8,545

Note:—£=$4.86.

Mr. REID (Grenville)

EXPORTS OF AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN PRODUCE FROM AUSTRIA-HUNGARY, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	Kronen.	No.	$
Animals—				
Cattle	147,965	60,355,335	147,965	12,252,133
Horses	57,003	49,207,450	57,003	9,989,112
Sheep (and goats)	36,736	1,196,089	36,736	242,806
Swine	7,454	375,180	7,454	76,164
Fruits—	Kilogs.		Lbs.	
Apples, fresh	Not separately stated			
Apples, dried	" "			
Other, dried	" "			
Grain—				
Barley	194,084,500	36,590,382	427,762,238	7,427,847
Beans	101,489,800	24,966,491	223,183,519	5,068,197
Buckwheat	16,700	2,672	36,806	542
Oats	552,500	99,450	1,217,710	20,188
Pease	420,300	105,075	962,341	21,330
Rye	79,200	17,424	174,556	3,537
Wheat	295,900	93,209	652,163	18,921
Flax seed	1,939,800	581,940	4,275,319	118,133
Hay	26,977,800	2,428,002	59,459,071	492,884
Meat Products—				
Beef, fresh	902,200	1,759,290	1,988,449	357,135
Pork, fresh	196,900	295,350	433,967	59,956
Other fresh meat	658,100	2,138,825	1,450,452	434,181
Ham	956,000	2,151,000	2,107,024	436,653
Bacon	68,100	91,254	150,092	18,524
Lard	31,000	45,570	68,324	9,250
Straw	8,527,500	511,650	18,794,610	103,864
Vegetables, fresh—				
Onions and garlic	5,521,500	552,150	12,169,386	12,086
Potatoes	26,968,600	2,696,860	59,438,794	547,462
Other	.....	6,622,151	.....	1,344,296

Note:—Krone=20·3 cents. Kilog=2·204 lbs.

EXPORTS OF BRITISH INDIAN PRODUCE FROM BRITISH INDIA.—YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 1910.

Articles Exported.	Year 1910.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	Rupees.	No.	$
Animals :—				
Cattle (Not separately stated)				
Horses	218	69,000	218	22,356
Sheep (Not separately stated)				
Swine " " "				
Fruits :—				
Apples, fresh (Not separately stated)				
" dried " " "				
Other " " " "				
Grain :—	Cwt.		Lbs.	
Barley	448,885	1,838,860	50,275,120	595,791
Beans ("pulse")	1,528,997	7,141,943	171,247,664	2,313,990
Buckwheat (Not separately stated.)				
Oats	16,007	71,218	1,792,784	23,075
Peas (Included with beans.)				
Rye (Not separately stated.)				
Wheat	21,011,484	127,090,884	2,353,286,208	41,177,446
Flax seed	4,677,197	39,253,017	523,846,064	12,717,978
Hay (Not separately stated.)				
Meat Products :—				
Beef (Not separately stated.)				
Mutton " "				
Pork " "				
Bacon " "				
Hams " "				
	Lbs.			
Lard	36,278	10,794	36,278	3,497
Straw (Not separately stated.)				
Vegetables fresh		1,872,293		606,623

Note :—Rupee=32.4 cts.
Cwt =112 lbs.

Mr. REID (Grenville)

EXPORTS OF DANISH PRODUCE FROM DENMARK, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	Kroner.	No.	$
Animals—				
Cattle	124,903	27,024,000	124,903	7,242,432
Horses	22,653	15,000,000	22,653	4,020,000
Sheep (and goats)	511	20,000	511	5,360
Swine	43	4,000	43	1,072
	Pund.		Lbs.	
Fruits—				
Apples, fresh (not separately stated).				
" dried " " "				
Other " " " "				
Grain—				
Barley	60,274,100	3,978,000	66,422,058	1,066,104
Beans (and Pease)	117,680	10,000	129,683	2,680
Buckwheat	400	30	441	8
Oats	2,570,600	160,000	2,832,801	42,280
Pease (included with beans)				
Rye	1,178,100	76,000	1,298,266	20,368
Wheat	11,613,000	929,000	12,797,526	248,972
Flax Seed	5,200	600	5,730	161
Hay				
Meat products—				
Bacon and ham	189,972,700	104,626,000	209,349,915	28,039,768
Other meats	68,056,600	14,508,000	74,998,373	3,888,144
Lard	7,003,300	3,290,000	7,717,637	881,720
Straw				
	Tonder.		Bush.	
Vegetables, fresh—				
Potatoes	59,518	238,000	226,168	63,784

Note.—Kroner = 26.8 cts. Pund = 1.102 lbs. Tonder = 3.8 bush.

EXPORTS OF JAPANESE PRODUCE FROM JAPAN, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalents.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Kin.	Yen.	Lbs.	$
Animals—				
Cattle (not separately stated)				
Horses " "				
Sheep " "				
Swine " "				
Fruits—				
Apples	4,155,395	358,826	5,485,121	178,695
" dried (not separately stated)				
Other dried fruits (not separately stated)				
Grain—				
Barley	159 635	7,355	210,718	3,683
Beans (and Pease)	4,526,201	255,782	5,974,585	127,379
Buckwheat				
Oats	921,461	25,879	1,216,328	12,888
Pease (Included with Beans)				
Rye (Not separately stated)				
Wheat	33,362	1,485	44,038	740
Flax seed (Not separately stated)				
Hay (Not separately stated)				
Meat Products:—				
Beef (Not separately stated)				
Mutton " "				
Pork " "				
Bacon " "				
Hams " "				
Lard (Tallow and Grease)	57,144	7,686	75,430	3,828
Straw (Not separately stated)				
Vegetables fresh				
Onions	17,209,716	476,971	22,716,825	237,532
Potatoes	20,497,557	447,418	27 056,775	222,814

Note—Yen=49.8 cts. Kin=1.3228 lbs.

Mr. REID Grenville)

EXPORTS OF NEW ZEALAND PRODUCE FROM NEW ZEALAND, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	£	No.	$
Animals—				
Cattle	209	3,453	299	16,805
Horses	1,602	55,611	1,602	270,640
Sheep	6,987	13,233	6,987	64,400
Swine	630	1,588	630	7,728
Fruits—				
Apples (not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
" dried " "	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other dried fruits	204	6	204	29
Grain—	Bush.		Bush.	
Barley	209,437	31,656	209,437	154,059
Beans (and Pease)	181,517	39,903	181,517	194,195
Buckwheat (not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oats	5,133,473	453,314	5,133,473	2,206,128
Pease (included with Beans)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rye	6,811	950	6,811	4,623
Wheat	1,419,217	305,902	1,419,217	1,488,723
	Lbs.		Lbs.	
Flax seed	3,400	25	3,400	122
Hay and straw	69,440	136	69,440	662
Meat products—				
Frozen meats—				
Beef	54,479,488	565,418	54,479,488	2,751,702
Kidneys	724,192	10,631	724,192	51,739
Lamb	116.428,480	1,817,026	116,428,480	8,842,859
Mutton	106,297,520	1,133,775	106,297,520	5,517,706
Poultry	.....	23	.....	112
Pork	136,976	3,517	136,976	17,116
Veal	110,508	911	110,208	4,434
Rabbits in the skin	9,495,584	63,983	4,495,584	311,384
Hares in the skin	35,056	218	35,056	1,062
Other meats, frozen	424,144	5,614	424,144	27,321
Salted meats—				
Beef	1,532,384	19,665	1,532,384	95,702
Pork	560	13	560	63
Potted and preserved meat	6,546,400	132,032	6,546,400	642,556
Extract of meat	54,770	7,622	54,770	47,093
Unenumerated meats	11,200	229	11,200	1.115
Lard	175,952	1,939	175,952	9,436
Straw (included with hay).				
Vegetables, fresh—				
Potatoes	1,330,560	2,871	1,330,560	13,972
Onions	4,280,640	10,387	4,380,640	50,550
Other	.....	.....	.....	.....

Note.—£=$4.86.

EXPORTS OF NORWEGIAN PRODUCE FROM NORWAY, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1909.

Articles Exported.	Year 1909.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	Kroner.	No.	$
Animals—				
Cattle	16	2,900	16	777
Horses	202	101,000	202	27,068
Sheep	44	800	44	214
Swine	217	3,300	217	884
Fruits—	Kilogs.			
Apples, fresh				
" dried				
Other "				
Grain—				
Barley	13,240	1,500	29,181	402
Beans, not separately stated				
Buckwheat " "				
Oats	310,870	34,200	685,167	9,166
Pease, not separately stated				
Rye	1,510	200	3,328	54
Wheat				
Flax seed				
Hay				
Meat Products :—				
Bacon and hams	1,513	1,200	3,335	322
Other meats	173,025	112,500	381,347	30,150
Lard	715	800	1,576	214
Straw				
Vegetables, fresh :—				
Potatoes	306,290	15,300	675,063	4,001

Note.—Kroner = 26.8 cents. Kilog = 2.204 lbs.

Mr. REID (Grenville)

EXPORTS OF RUSSIAN PRODUCE FROM RUSSIA, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1908.

Articles Exported.	Year 1908.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	Roubles.	No.	$
Animals—				
Cattle (including sheep and swine)	97,715	3,625,884	97,715	1,867,330
Horses	82,407	8,365,642	82,407	4,308,306
Sheep (included with cattle)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Swine (included with cattle)	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Poods.		Lbs.	
Fruits—				
Apples, fresh (not separately stated)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Apples, dried " "	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other, dried " "	.....	.....	.....	.....
Grain:—				
Barley	116,389,345	132,667,974	4,190,016,420	68,324,004
Beans	11,312,249	10,500,886	407,240,964	5,407,954
Buckwheat	1,487,783	1,557,936	53,560,188	802,337
Oats	29,373,599	24,526,138	1,057,449,564	12,630,961
Peaze	7,071,925	7,165,195	254,589,300	3,690,075
Rye	24,910,881	25,999,192	896,791,716	13,389,584
Wheat	89,802,712	113,064,152	3,232,897,632	58,228,037
Flax seed	9,382,589	13,914,585	337,773,204	7,166,011
Hay	402,288	139,790	14,482,368	71,991
Meats, products:—				
Fresh	200,352	1,163,461	7,212,672	599,182
Salted or cured	116,581	960,696	4,196,916	494,758
Extracts and soups	374	5,034	13,464	2,593
Poultry and game	589,678	4,488,438	21,228,408	2,311,546
Lard	.....	.....	.....	.....
Straw	170,700	33,561	6,145,200	17,283
Vegetables, fresh:—				
Potatoes	3,586,949	1,003,569	129,130,164	516,838

Note—Rouble=51·5 cents.
Pood=36 Lbs.

EXPORTS OF SWEDISH PRODUCE FROM SWEDEN, YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1908.

Articles Exported.	Year 1908.		Canadian Equivalent.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	Kroner.	No.	$
Animals—				
Cattle	9,767	2,052,840	9,767	550,161
Horses	3,991	1,916,000	3,991	513,488
Sheep	1,753	69,485	1,753	18,561
Swine	301	16,750	301	4,489
Fruits—	Kilogs.		Lbs.	
Apples, fresh	7,893	3,157	17,396	846
" dried	10	8	22	2
Other, dried	25	25	55	7
Grain—				
Barley	59,194	8,879	130,464	2,380
Beans	472	61	1,040	15
Buckwheat (not separately stated)				
Oats	8,959,180	1,030,306	19,746,033	276,122
Pease	119,712	19,752	263,845	5,293
Rye	68,086	9,872	140,062	2,646
Wheat	86,343	14,678	190,300	3,934
Flax seed	391,978	82,315	863,920	22,060
Hay	983,278	51,130	2,167,145	13,703
Meat products				
Bacon and hams	2,783,772	2,583,865	6,135,433	692,476
Other meats	718,133	443,245	1,582,765	118,790
Lard (not separately stated)				
Straw (not separately stated)				
Vegetables, fresh—				
Potatoes	242,448	12,122	434,355	3,249

Note—Kroner = 26·8 cents.
Kilog = 2·204 lbs.

Mr. REID (Grenville)

Mr. PATERSON. I think, perhaps it would be just as well to put a little appendix to the statement that will appear at length. I have no objection to it, in fact I am rather pleased it has gone in. I was going to ask the hon. member what his object is in putting this in.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman is pleased that they have gone in we need not waste time in discussing it.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman attaches importance to it. What I want to point out is that he has placed on 'Hansard' these tables that have taken a very long time to read. His object, I believe, is that this committee may come to an understanding as to the wisdom of this arrangement that has been made. Therefore, it is valuable for that reason. He stated very positively that my colleague and myself went it blind in Washington, we had no figures, and did not know where we were. He said that time and again, and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said it last night. You have been listening for an hour or two to figures that he says are absolutely necessary to get at a proper understanding of this matter. My colleague (Mr. Fielding), and myself, had this in our possession all the time, all the information for all the years, and yet we are told we have gone it blind. We had it, we had it all. More than that, let me remind these gentlemen who complain that we did not have it, that on the day this session opened, I believe before the address was presented to His Excellency, every one of these hon. gentlemen opposite had these figures in his possession.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where?

Mr. PATERSON. In your desk.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No.

Mr. PATERSON. But here they are, they were taken out of this blue-book which I hold in my hand, taken out of this exactly.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is only one year?

Mr. PATERSON. One year, yes, but we had a knowledge of all the years when we were in Washington. That was the very information these gentlemen have asked for, that they have been cavilling for: they had it on their desks all the time.

Mr. BARKER. No.

Mr. PATERSON. The reason I want to put in this appendix is that this goes to the hon. gentleman's constituents with his remarks.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then why did it take several days to prepare it?

Mr. PATERSON. That is what I am coming to. When this goes to the hon. gentleman's constituents with his remarks, and they read my remarks they will understand that five years ago he had the returns for 1905, which were printed at great expense, and of which three copies were given to him. In 1906, as soon as parliament opened, he had three copies given to him. So in 1907, so in 1908, so in 1909, so in 1910. What I want to bring to the attention of those who read his remarks, especially his own constituents, is the fact that he had these figures in his possession. They will say: you have had these figures for five years to study for yourself; when we sent you to parliament, we did not send you there to sit dumb, and do nothing but play around, why did not you look these things up? They have been printed for you, and given to you. I want to say that in the hearing of the constituents of all the hon. gentlemen who are opposite.

Mr. HUGHES. That voice will nearly reach them.

Mr. PATERSON. That voice has been played on just the same as the biscuits have. I wish it was loud enough to reach the ears of all, that they might understand the utter absurdity of the position these hon. gentlemen take and that their constituents who send them here—and these hon. gentlemen are paid just as much as a minister of the Crown is paid as a member of parliament and just as much bound to do work in parliament as is a minister of the Crown——might see that these hon. gentlemen have absolutely neglected their duty and have confessed ignorance with reference to figures that have been given them year by year. I would like the constituents of these hon. gentlemen to ask them how they think they are earning their money. As to this information you have been clamouring for, you have had it here; you had it all the time. And we had it when we were in Washington making this bargain. Suppose that you had been there, what would you have done?

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. PATERSON. I have a right to speak——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has a right to state his point of order.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) has been making reflections upon you, Sir, accusing you of ignorance——

Mr. TALBOT. Is that the point of order?

Mr. HUGHES. If the hon. minister is not referring to you, Sir, but to the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), he should speak of him as the hon. member for Grenville and not address him directly as 'you.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken, and I think it is well that it should be taken. The habit has grown up of addressing members directly in the second person which is wrong. A member of parliament should be referred to in the third person, and the Speaker or Chairman addressed.

Mr. PATERSON. I was not aware that I had, perhaps, in the warmth of debate, overlooked that point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) will understand that, in speaking as I did, I had reference to a habit that has grown up rather than to his individual infraction of the rule.

Mr. PATERSON. It is one of the wisest rules that a deliberative assembly can adopt, for it tends to avoid anything like personal feeling. I was not aware that I had made the mistake, but, having made it, I am sorry. I was pointing out that hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, are sent to understand and discuss public questions. Under the rules of the House they are provided with information of which it is supposed they will make use. But when we find hon. gentlemen with that information in their possession, some of it in their possession for years, and yet saying that they cannot discuss a public question intelligently because they have not the information, what are we to think? I was going to say that those hon. gentlemen might remember another rule of the House —also a good one. I would remind them that a minister of the Crown is also a member of parliament. He is no better, and professes to be no better, or of any higher standing, than any other member. But he is of equal standing with those in this House who oppose him. It is the duty of a minister, when asked a question, to give a courteous answer; that is becoming in a deliberative assembly of gentlemen. But it must not be lost sight of that it is equally incumbent upon every member of the House, in propounding questions to a minister, to propound them as to one who has equal rights with themselves and is equally entitled to courtesy. I think that this is something that ought to be declared. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) —I am sorry he is not in his place—rose to speak. I had occasion to speak to my colleague who sits near me—only two chairs between him and me. I only whispered to my colleague, and I do not think the hon. member for East Grey heard me. But he interposed and was quite cross about it. If we were lacking in any courtesy, I regret it. But I would like to impress on the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite the fact that if there are any members of this House who seem to me to forget themselves oftener than others, they are gentlemen on the other side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. Let me ask, in all fairness, was there ever any speaker in this House more interrupted than was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to-day? Over and over again two or three members on the other side were on their feet at once, asking questions, breaking in in the middle of a sentence, interrupting almost constantly. Will these hon. gentlemen tell me that any member on that side ever received such treatment from any member of the government?

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask a question. Were not these interruptions made with the consent of the Finance Minister?

Mr. PATERSON. He gave his consent, it is true. But I know my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) does not think it was just the proper proceeding to interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) as he was interrupted this afternoon. Often, he had the second question before the first was answered. Now, as to going to Washington——

Mr. LENNOX. Might I, without interrupting the minister too much, ask a question on the point he raises. Does not he think that there is some difference between members on this side talking to each other while a minister of the Crown is speaking, and a minister who is being addressed carrying on conversation with some member in his neighbourhood? It was to that, as I understood, that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) took objection. He was, of course, formally speaking, addressing the Chair, but he was directing his remarks to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), I think, and he felt sensitive because the Minister of Customs was addressing the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). In the same way—if the minister (Mr. Paterson) will not think I am interrupting too long—perhaps we are more entitled to some indulgence in the way of asking questions, of the ministers of the Crown than we would necessarily show to other members. For we naturally look to ministers of the Crown to give us information. I do not think the ministers ought to think that it is done offensively, I think it is done in perfect good faith; and the Minister of Finance, I thought, enjoyed it very much, it helped him very much in his speech.

Mr. PATERSON. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman said. Only there are times, maybe I am a little hasty, when questions are put in a manner and with a tone that seem to carry the idea that a member of the House has a right to adopt a more arrogant, I will not say, insolent, tone in addressing a minister than necessary. I am not finding any fault. But

when hon. gentlemen opposite have said that my colleague and myself went down to Washington, that we went down blind, that we did not know what we wanted, that Taft had the whole thing planned right out, that he gave it to us, and we had to sign the document—of course it was a very silly thing to say, remembering what other hon. gentlemen have said that Taft was able to get everything he wanted, and others have said that he wanted to get reciprocity in manufactured articles and was denied. Now, let us look at the bargain we did make. Here is the answer that is given. We had all those figures that were given here to-night.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Can the minister state now that all the figures I put in to-night have been before the members of this House for the last five years? Is that right?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have put on the 'Hansard' statements showing the exports from the twelve favoured nations as taken from the official blue-books of those nations, and I never had them submitted to me by this government or any other government. They are not on the records in the Library, they are not sent to us each year, there is not a single place in the city of Ottawa where you can get these records except the Trade and Commerce Department of Ottawa. When the Minister of Customs makes the statement that for the last five years I have had all these figures before me, it is a statement that he cannot possibly justify, because it is absolutely untrue.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not very courteous either. My statement was with reference to the figures that he read and that were put on the 'Hansard.'

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am speaking of the official documents I presented here to-night.

Mr. PATERSON. I make the statement with reference to the figures the hon. gentleman took so much time in reading, that he had these. I knew that he did not get them from the Trade and Commerce Department, I have not seen them, and he did not read them. But I say with reference to what he was basing his argument upon that he had all these, and we had them all the time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They were not compiled as I gave them to-night. We never had that statement compiled as I gave it to-night. We never had that statement compiled until I read it to-night, and the department he presides over never had them on file, because his officials told me they were never compiled.

Mr. PATERSON. What I say is that the hon. gentleman would expect it to be part of his duty to compile these.

Mr. PRICE. Why should that be so? It is the duty of the minister to give us these.

Mr. PATERSON. What are the blue-books placed in the hands of members for except for their information?

Mr. BARKER. Did the Minister of Customs compile the figures for the five years, or did he go to Washington without doing so?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I did not compile them.

Mr. BARKER. You did not know then?

Mr. PATERSON. Did we not have the blue-books with us? Certainly we did. But we are charged with going down there blind, that Taft handed this out to us and we signed it. Another gentleman says that we were carried away; two or three of them say: You did not have the figures with you and you dare not deny it. Another gentleman says that we did not know what talc was. Because I was making an allusion to the fact that in its highly finished state it was used for an adornment of the person, he thought we did not know that it was used in manufactures. But it is not necessary to contradict that. We had men here who were interested in the business, they came to us and explained it to us, they gave it to us in writing, we took it up at Washington with full knowledge of what the rate of duty was, and with that knowledge we had the duty cast off, and we had an important industry established in one of the eastern counties of Ontario that I believe will employ hundreds of men, according to the statements that we have from these gentlemen. Then we are met with the charge: You have given away the natural resources of Canada to the Yankee.

Mr. PRICE. May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. PATERSON. No, sit down. We are charged with giving away the natural resources of Canada. Why, according to what they are telling us, these natural resources would lay there for centuries so far as Canada is concerned, producing no wealth, and forming no active asset of the wealth of this country, unless we had got the duty removed. Yet these gentlemen say: You went down blind, you did not know what you were talking about. Others say: You did not get what you wanted, but you took what you could get. Then again you say that the president got everything from us that he wanted to get, yet they themselves

admit that President Taft was anxious to get reciprocity in manufactured articles, and he did not get it. But let us take some of these items. Is it not funny that hon. gentlemen are seeking so much information? Has not the hon. member for North Toronto denounced this? Has not my hon. friend standing up (Mr. Macdonell) denounced this agreement? Now he says he did not understand it, now he wants information to make up his mind. We cannot pronounce intelligently on this agreement, they say, and yet they did pronounce against it, and pronounced positively that it was an injury to this country. That is the positioin they are in. Why didn't they wait until we got the information?

Mr. MACDONELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? The hon. gentleman, I think unwittingly, has said that at least in regard to one industry, namely, talc, the government held secret conferences with certain persons who were about to establish that industry, from which persons information regarding the talc industry was obtained, and with that knowledge so obtained in that private manner, behind closed doors, the hon. gentleman goes to Washington, and in the light of that private information of which the public knew nothing, that transaction with regard to talc was made. May I ask the hon. gentleman was that course pursued with regard to each and every other item or industry that is affected by this pact? Was the pact formed by secret conferences behind closed doors with private information got in that way and acted upon without public knowledge?

Mr. PATERSON. Every one that wished to make representations to the government in reference to the articles that he had knowledge of, and in which he was interested was at liberty to come and make such representations in the very same, open manner in which these gentlemen came, and in every case they were heard and their arguments considered.

Mr. PRICE. May I ask the minister——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman refuses the privilege of asking a question.

Mr. PATERSON. And more than that we were in correspondence with people who were not down there. People were writing to us down there.

Mr. PRICE. Have you laid that correspondence on the table?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. PRICE. Why not?

Mr. PATERSON. Because it was private correspondence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman understand that these gentlemen were writing to us, giving us the details of their business, and are such communications to be laid on the table of the House? You have the result in this agreement.

Mr. BARKER. We want to know all about it.

Mr. PATERSON. About the details?

Mr. BARKER. Yes, everything.

Mr. PATERSON. I will tell you one thing; I will tell you what the malt interests told us. They said what they wanted and they said that if the duty were so and so it would be ruinous to them. What did we do with the malt business?

Mr. BOYCE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, no. What did we do with the malt business, if you want a common sample of it? They had a duty on malt and they said that they wanted their interest guarded. What was done? We left our malt duty on just as it was in the tariff. The American duty was about two and a half times as high as ours and we had the American government reduce their duty to our duty. So, it was with respect to other questions when they came up. We knew this, yet, these hon. gentlemen say that we do not know anything about it, that we went it blind. They have the information now; let us see all that would happen if these eggs and cheese and butter should be allowed in. Of eggs 750,456 dozen came into this country. This is going to ruin the farmers! If you multiply the dozens by twelve that gives you 9,000,000 of eggs. Thus, every man, woman and child in this country will get an egg and an eighth a year. You asked for information! I am giving it to you and you will not believe it. We have heard about butter; 389,462 pounds of butter came into this Dominion not only from these twelve countries, but from all countries. I reduce it into ounces and I find that 6,231,392 ounces of butter came into this country—three-quarters of an ounce of butter, for every man, woman and child in this country in a year! Now that you have that information, do you think it will help you to make up your mind whether you are in favour of this agreement or not? But here is another thing. The cheese industry is going to be ruined! 662,568 pounds of cheese coming into this country! This man Fielding went down there and had President Taft gold brick him!

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Reduced to ounces it represents a little over 10,000,000. That is worse than the butter, because it is an ounce and a quarter for every man, woman and child in this country in a year.

Mr. PRICE. How many pounds are coming in when reciprocity agreement goes through?

Mr. PATERSON. That is what you will have to make up now with the information you are getting. We got this out of the same blue-books that the hon. gentleman had all the time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Give us biscuits too.

Mr. PATERSON. I agree with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Price), said, when he candidly admitted that as a lumberman this arrangement was in his favour but he was not sent here to represent his own interests. He took the right view of it. No gentleman ever hears me discussing my own business. I do not think it is very good taste to do so.

Mr. HUGHES. Do they not taste well?

Mr. PATERSON. Sometimes some hon. gentlemen want to give the impression that, somehow or other, from my being in the ministry and having something to do with framing the tariff, the duty on that article was by that means raised higher than it was under the previous government. Well now, I am not saying anything about it and I do not want to say anything about it, but if hon. gentlemen entertain that idea they are entertaining an absolutely fallacious one, an untrue one, because the fact is that the duty on that article has been reduced. It was reduced when we inaugurated our own policy and it is further reduced and largely reduced under this agreement. But, I do not want to talk of my own business. I do not know that it is right. I heard my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), and while I sympathize with him if he thinks he is hurt I think it would be better taste for a man to leave the advocacy of business in his own interest to some one who is not connected with it. Therefore you never hear me talk about my own business at all. I find myself maligned. I find statements made in a public manner that give that idea to the people; in fact, it has been absolutely stated in the public prints and I have not taken the trouble to deny it. If it is any fun to hon. gentlemen opposite, if it is a mark of superior wit and wisdom that was manifested by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—I do not think it elevated his position in the House to undertake to picture me sitting on a biscuit box or something—but if it amuses hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sure that I do not begrudge them the merriment it gives them. I do not think I have said as much as this in my life. Of course, I am not connected and I have not been connected in any active way with any business since I took office under my leader.

Mr. HUGHES. Just a sleeping partner.

Mr. PATERSON. I have a little money invested. It has to be invested in something, but as to drawing salary or getting any remuneration, I have never done that. If that company is fortunate enough to have any dividends I hope to share in them the same as you gentlemen do. I do not suppose that you wish me to take what little money I have and wrap it up in a handkerchief. I make this statement in the presence of gentlemen. I shall find out whether they are gentlemen or not, I shall find out which of them makes a suggestion of this kind which carries with it the inference that Paterson is in there in his own interest. I agree with the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Price), that no man should come here to forward his own interests. He is sent here to exercise his best judgment in the interest of the country. I have told you simply how we conducted these proceedings in Washington and how we arrived at our conclusion. When we were at Washington we knew that last year there were 662,568 pounds of cheese imported into Canada but we knew we exported 180,000,000 lbs. of cheese and we took it for granted that in view of this we could hold our own in cheese with the United States. As to potatoes, it is true that while 513,735 bushels were imported last year from all sources, we exported 1,923,595 bushels.

An hon. MEMBER. Where to.

Mr. PATERSON. We exported 780,632 bushels to the United States, which is 150,000 bushels more than we imported. The Minister of Finance told you that he did not think it necessary to have statistics on all these things, but we knew about the exports and imports of lumber just as hon. gentlemen opposite could know if they took the trouble to open the blue-books. The hon. gentleman who interrupted me so often knows something about the business, and we knew it too. We knew there was a duty of $1.25 on lumber going into the United States, and we believed from the information we had that it would be a good thing for the lumber interests of this country if without putting a duty on lumber here we could get the Americans to take their duty off lumber, and so far as I am concerned I made up my mind that if we got the Americans to do that I would agree to it, statistics or no statistics.

Mr. PRICE. Did the hon. gentleman ever consider that the new Congress might possibly make lumber free?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What difference does that make?

Mr. PRICE. It makes all the difference in the world to the lumberman.

Mr. PATERSON. If the Democrats should make lumber free, and this agreement goes through——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Though it is rather late in the day I think I should interfere. The hon. member (Mr. Paterson) was allowed to address the House in answer to some remarks made by the hon. member for Grenville in reference to statistics and figures. The hon. member is now addressing the House on the question of reciprocity which is not before the House in any form at present. The question before the Chair is simply: Shall the House go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the discussion should be confined to what that question allows. The question as to the information to be brought before the House arising out of the motion was discussed very broadly, and the amendment to the motion has been voted down. On the motion now before the Chair it is not permissible to discuss matters that are to be discussed in committee, or matters that are before the House in some other form.

Mr. PATERSON. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and in explanation I may say that I was endeavouring to point out that the statistical information has been before hon. members for years, and that now it is before the committee. However, I will not pursue the question further.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask a question?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the question applies to this——

Mr. HUGHES. It is absolutely relevant. I was waiting for him to get through with his irrelevant talk in order that I might put the question. He has been telling us that all the information is within our reach, but I would like to ask him where, in any Canadian official record a member of this House can obtain the following information: The price and cost of production in Canada of the articles referred to in the reciprocity treaty; the price and cost of production of these articles in the United States, and in the dozen other favoured nations who come in under this arrangement. I have some of this information, but I have not been able to get it from any Canadian records. The minister cannot show where we have received that data, or had any opportunity of getting it.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I do not think you can get all you ask for there. You will find in a publication of the Department of Labour, a partial answer to that. When the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) was speaking last night, making a practical speech, and giving the figures of quantities of oxen, sheep, grains, &c., I asked him where he got those figures. I said that I did not know of any place of getting them that could be depended upon except the census, which was taken only once in ten years. He said they had some way of getting that information interim.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That was the United States book.

Mr. PATERSON. It was the United States book, but it must have been compiled from some source. When you estimate the total crop, you will be able to form an idea, but I do not think you can get the absolute figures, nor do I know that you can get them from any other country.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). May I ask the Prime Minister if it is not now time to adjourn?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The way to adjourn is to carry this motion and go into Committee of Ways and Means, and adjourn afterwards.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, there are one or two matters to which I wish to call the attention of the House, arising out of the long and irrelevant dissertation of the Minister of Customs. He has read the opposition a lecture on courtesy, but has absolutely ignored the manner in which the members on his own side of the House have conducted themselves, and he himself, during the whole time he was speaking, was out of order, and was so ruled by you, Mr. Speaker. I do not rise for the purpose of endeavouring in any way to retaliate on the Minister of Customs, although he did not accord to me the courtesy which I might have expected from him. I rose to ask a question quite relevant to his remarks, and he answered me by shouting at the top of his voice: 'No.' The hon. gentleman has given the House a great deal of information and insight into the transactions that took place in the negotiations at Washington. Some curious things have been stated by the Minister of Customs, who seems to be suffering from a state of mental aberation to-night.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the expression 'mental aberation' is out of order.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I will say that this is perhaps in the minister's normal condition of mind, or absence of mind. I cheerfully concur in your ruling. But the hon. gentleman has let some feline animals out of the bag to-night. He has diametrically contradicted the Minister of Finance, and this House has to judge which statement is true, that of the Minister of Finance or that of the Minister of Customs. The Minister of Customs says there was a lot of information which they had before them which was not in the blue-books at all. That this is absolutely true is shown by the statements of exports of favoured nations to different countries of products which are the subjects of that treaty. That information was before them; it is not before this House. He stated that he had corresponded with a number of firms whose business was affected, or was likely to be affected by the pact under consideration. That correspondence was before him; it is not before this House. And yet what did the Minister of Finance say on his responsibility as a minister in this House, when asked for that information on March 9? He said: 'Whatever information has been available in reference to the reciprocity matter has already been placed before this House.' That statement will be found in 'Hansard' at page 4931. What does the Minister of Customs say to that? These hon. gentlemen, when lecturing the House on courtesy and manners, are demonstrating that they are wanting at any rate in accuracy in their statements, because the Minister of Customs, in the long dissertation to which he treated us, told us of a lot of information which no hon. member yet knows anything about; and yet the Minister of Finance states, in answer to the leader of the opposition, that whatever information they had was already before the House. But the Minister of Finance went further.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is the hon. member quoting from a previous debate in this House?

Mr. BOYCE. I am speaking of a question which appears on the records of this House at page 493.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not at liberty to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. BOYCE. I will say this, then, that the Minister of Finance has attempted to show this House that all the efforts of the opposition to-day to obtain information from the government upon which this agreement was based were entirely unavailing, as the information has already been in the hands of the members for a long period of time. The Minister of Customs says that whatever information was available has been brought down to the House. The Minister of Customs says, practically, there are mountains of information which we have and which we do not propose to disclose. Which is true? Therefore, in conclusion, I desire to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and before he starts out at a late hour and after a protracted debate to bully the opposition, who are pursuing the proper course in asking for information to which they are entitled, he should make sure that he is right himself.

Mr. PATERSON. May I be forgiven.

Mr. EDWARDS. I wish to ask the Minister of Customs a question. As I understand from the minister the statements as to exports from these various countries which will be included under this arrangement if it goes through, inasmuch as they will have the right to send their goods into this country on the same terms as the United States, are obtainable only from the Department of Trade and Commerce, that is that department has certain documents which they obtained from these various countries which are not available to all members of the House as they are to the Department of Trade and Commerce and to the cabinet. But in addition to that we have a statement here to-night from the Minister of Customs that he was provided while at Washington with certain private correspondence in relation to the matters which they were discussing bearing on this arrangement. Thus the Minister of Customs has admitted that he and his friends on that side of the House were in possession of information not available to members on this side of the House, and I put it to you, in all fairness, if the members of this House were supposed to arrive at an honest conclusion in regard to this matter should not the members on this side have had all the information that was available to the members on the other side of the House? Why should the Minister of Customs and his colleague, the Minister of Finance, and others on that side of the House have in their possession correspondence which was denied to us? That does not seem to be treating all sides fairly. I do not think we have had the information which we should have had; I do not think there has been a disposition on the part of the government to give us that information. When this matter first came up it was difficult to get the information from the Finance Minister that these twelve favoured nations would come in on the same terms as the United States; it was only after great effort that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), fairly drew that information out of the Finance Minister. The Minister of Agriculture has

referred to the farmers and has said that we should be willing to let the farmers say what they want. But the farmers have been telling this government for years that they want a lower duty on agricultural implements. That has been the demand of the farmers from end to end of this country. There was no disposition on the part of the government to accede to that request. The Minister of Agriculture is willing to accept an expression of opinion from the farmers when it suits him, but not to accept an expression of their opinion made in much stronger terms when it does not suit him because the manufacturers have to be protected. To-night he has more confidence in the judgment of the farmers than he had some years ago. In 1909 he charged the farmers of Canada with being a slipshod, lazy and indifferent class of people. His remarks will be found at page 2029 of 'Hansard.' These are the same gentlemen on whose intelligence the minister to-day says we should rely. To what extent will he rely on their intelligence? Just to the extent it suits his purpose in carrying this agreement through, but no further. The manufacturers must be protected, the manufacturers who were represented in this country from end to end.

Mr. NESBITT. I rise to a point or order. The hon. gentleman has been discussing the agreement for the last five minutes.

Mr. BOYCE. Why not?

Mr. NESBITT. Because it is out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A discussion of the reciprocity agreement which is now before the Committee of Ways and Means is not in order at the present time. If the hon. gentleman is applying his remarks to that, he is out of order.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thought I was in order in referring to remarks of the Minister of Agriculture to-night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That would be referring to remarks made on the amendment, which has been disposed of.

Mr. EDWARDS. I wish to ask the Minister of Customs a question. In considering this matter, we have to take into consideration not only the United States and Canada, but these 12 favoured nations. In doing so we should consider the exports of these countries, the prices of articles in them and what it costs to transport these articles in to this country in case they come into competition with us. The minister says he was in possession of certain facts when he was at Washington negotiating this treaty. Did they have a compilation of the exports of these several countries which, if this agreement is ratified, will come into competition with this country? Did they have before them a compilation of the exports of these countries, the prices in them and the cost of exportation of the goods of these countries to Canada?

Mr. PATERSON. No, we certainly did not have that. We did not think it was necessary to have that; we do not think it is necessary yet. We had with us in the documents which are now before the House and which are being published in 'Hansard,' what concerns us, that is the shipments of these countries to Canada and the exports of Canada to them. That shows the trade with these countries. For instance, in considering the exports of Argentine, you consider what our trade with Argentine has been. From Argentine, I think, the imports were about $2,100,000. Of that $2,000,000 was hides. As to these other countries, we have no trade with them that amounted to anything that would interfere in any way with our industry.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has made the very frank admission that he had not these figures before entering into the consideration of this matter. I think he will not dispute my statement when I say that, in considering how this country would be affected by the ratification of this agreement, the cost of production of things in other countries that come in competition with what is produced by our people should be taken into account, and also the cost of transportation to this country. It is all right to give the exports of these countries, but it is also necessary for us to know what it costs to produce these things. Take, for instance, the wheat of Argentine. It has been said that the wages in that country are 64 cents a day. Surely this fact is something to be taken into account when we are considering a change of trade relations that would throw the farmer of Canada into competition with the farmers of that country. If the Minister of Customs had not—and we must accept his statement that he had not—these facts before him, I do not see how this House can arrive at any conclusion with regard to this matter, a sensible, logical conclusion as to how this arrangement would affect this country, without having these facts before us.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I wish to ask a question which, perhaps, will help us to arrive at a determination in this business. So far as the hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is concerned, he has indulged in a great deal of nonsense—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish)—to which nobody could give serious consideration. But I would like to put a question to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). He is a gentleman whom we all recognize as an authority on all questions that pertain to agriculture. Coming from an agricultural constituency, as I do, and being slightly in the dark—not so very much, because I have heard the question discussed on both sides—I am always open to hear something from the hon. member for Peel. The question I wish to ask is: Can the hon. member for Peel give us some wise remarks on something that pertains to something agricultural?

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 1.05 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY April 7, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

WATER CARRIAGE OF GOODS.

Mr. BRODEUR moved:

That the Committee on Marine and Fisheries in view of the complaints made concerning the clause 10 of the Water Carriage of Goods Act, be empowered to investigate those complaints, send for persons and papers and report from time to time.

He said: This motion is made at the suggestion of the Committee of Marine and Fisheries. Last year a clause was inserted in the Water Carriage of Goods Act providing that ship owners in the case of wood goods would not be liable for the measurement of those goods but simply for the quantity of goods put on the bill of lading. This appears to have created a very great disturbance in the trade if we are to judge from complaints which have reached us. However, as this Bill was not before the committee it was impossible for them to investigate the matter. I understand there is a very strong delegation in Ottawa to be heard by the government and also by the committee, and this is to give to the committee the right to hear those persons.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the motion is a very proper motion. My attention has been called to some complaints against the section the minister has mentioned, section 10, and if I am not mistaken, the legislature of the province of New Brunswick has passed a resolution on the subject calling attention to the fact that certain shipping interests in that province are very injuriously affected by the clause as it stands now.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 165) respecting a Patent of the Goldschmidt Thermit Company.—Mr. Rivet.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Rutan.

Bill (No. 167) to incorporate the Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

Bill (No. 168) to incorporate the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 169) to incorporate the Canada West Loan Corporation.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon (Nipissing).

Bill (No. 171) to incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—Mr. Rutan.

Bill (No. 172) respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 173) for the relief of Robert William Logan.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 174) to incorporate the Casualty Company of Canada.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 175) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour of Toronto.—Mr. Macdonell.

ANGLO-JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the orders of the day are taken up, I wish to refer to a question asked yesterday and to my mind the answer was not clear. I noticed a statement that the Anglo-Japanese treaty had been ratified, and I wished to inquire whether there was any correspondence between the Canadian government and the imperial government with reference to the advisability of not including Canada in the favoured-nation clause of that treaty. The answer to my question was:

The question of whether or not Canada will desire to adhere to this treaty or to make an independent treaty, is now under consideration.

Now, that does not give any information at all. I took it for granted that there probably had been some correspondence between the Canadian government and the imperial government with reference to this treaty before it was made, and that the Canadian government had expressed the desire either to be included or excluded. Then I asked as to the favoured-nation clause, and the answer was:

We have not yet a copy of the treaty, and whether it includes the favoured-nation clause or not we are not informed. We should have a copy, no doubt, in due course, and then the question will have to be considered whether Canada should seek to adhere to the treaty or make a special treaty.

I desire to get information in view of the reciprocity pact that is before us, and because it has come out that we are affected already by the trade of twelve or thirteen other countries who will take advantage of the favoured nation clause. I thought it was desirable that we should not in future be under the favoured-nation clause, in any new treaties made, and I thought there would probably have been some correspondence before now on that subject with the imperial government, advising them not to include Canada in the favoured-nation clause.

Mr. FIELDING. We have been advised by the imperial government that they were negotiating a treaty with Japan, and we have been asked whether it is our desire to be included in a joint treaty, or whether we should remain separate. Our reply was that we did not wish at present to be included, but so soon as the British treaty was concluded we would be very glad to have a copy, and then we would consider what action Canada ought to take. I do not recollect that there was any special correspondence on that particular item of favoured nations. All that has happened is that we have been informed that this treaty was under negotiation. We expressed a willingness to consider the matter, but we preferred the British government should complete their treaty, and then we would determine upon the part Canada should take. That is where Canada stands at the present moment.

Mr. FOSTER. I should judge from something I have seen in late telegrams, that some little change has been made by the British government in her method of arranging such treaties, namely, to allow the overseas dominions, or any one of them who wished, either to accede to a treaty or to get out of the treaty by a year's notice, without this having any effect upon the treaty as a whole. That would be a very desirable thing, I think. Very often a whole treaty would go by the board if any part of it were denounced; the general consideration overrides the special one. If, however, the self-governing dominions were brought into the negotiations, and the treaty were so framed that they could give notice of its denunciation without affecting the treaty as a whole, it would seem that would be a special favour.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The whole view of the treaty referred to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is answered by the fact that this government is not included in the Japanese treaty now negotiated by Great Britain.

DESIGN FOR A CANADIAN POSTAGE STAMP.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether it is a fact that the imperial authorities submitted to him a design of a stamp to be used this year, and that he has told His Excellency that he does not consider it appropriate, and intends to get an entirely Canadian design of a stamp for the present year?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have made no such declaration. It is true that I received a design, but I have passed no judgment on it yet. I am much surprised that such information has reached my hon. friend.

THE FARMERS' DELEGATION.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that some time ago an order of the House was granted for copies of the proceedings on the occasion of the visit of the farmers' delegation to this House on the 16th of December last. Very few copies seem to have been printed. I have had requests from eighteen delegates in my constituency for copies, and I have been unable to supply them because of the insufficiency of the number printed. I think we should have a larger number printed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand there are copies available. I do not know how many have been printed, but if my hon. friend applies, he can get copies at the present time.

COAL STRIKE IN THE WEST.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to inquire from the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) if he has any late news concerning the strike in the Crowsnest Pass, and how matters are proceeding there.

Mr. KING. In reply to my hon. friend, perhaps I could not do better than to indicate just what has been done by the government since the cessation of operations at the mines in southern British Columbia and Alberta. When my hon. friend asked about this question previously, I read to him then a message that had been sent by myself to the miners interested in the dispute, and I had not at that time received a reply from them. The reply came just on the eve of the cessation of operations, and as it sets forth the position of the miners, perhaps I could not do better than to read it to the House. It is dated Michel, March 30:

Our agreement provides that we meet at least thirty days prior and in some cases

more, to the expiration of our agreement, and having complied with this we believe that we have thoroughly complied with the spirit of the Act.

My inquiry was whether they intended to cease operations without first having an investigation under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

The operators have not shown any disposition to renew the agreement along any lines that would be fair to ourselves, but have placed themselves in such a position that they could continue the present conditions of affairs until such time as they could force from us the concessions they desire. We are not of the opinion that our action can be construed as being a breach of the Act, and would like to draw attention to the fact that we have at all times complied with the law and have no intention of doing otherwise.

(Signed) W. B. POWELL,
President.
C. STUBBS,
Vice-President.
A. J. CARTER,
Secy-Treasure.
District 18 U.M.W. of A.

When that wire was received, I communicated with Mr. McNiven, who is the officer of the department at present in southern British Columbia, and asked him to endeavour to have each of the parties, in view of their liability under the Act, refer their differences to a board in accordance with the provisions of that measure. He did that, but was met at the outset with the circumstance that the international executive in Indianapolis was considering the alleged strike and that they might pass upon it in a manner which would end the matter summarily. Consequently, Mr. McNiven was unable to get any direct statement from either of the parties as to what they would do until word had come from Indianapolis as to the position which would be taken by the international executive. It seemed to me prudent under those circumstances to send a communication to the international executive informing them that the government was informed that they had under consideration this situation in southern Alberta and British Columbia, and ask what their attitude would be with regard to any strike which might be contrary to the laws of this country. The reply that was received from the international executive was in the following words:

Indianapolis, Ind.,
April 5, 1911.

F. A. Acland,
Deputy Minister Labour,
Ottawa.

Question of negotiating wage contracts is a prerogative of Canadian miners district organization. We believe in a strict compliance with the laws of Canada at all times. Are advised that the miners of Canada have not in any sense violated the Industrial Disputes Act. We believe in the trades agreement method of settling industrial disputes and in a rigid observance of all wage agreements.

By order of the executive.

JOHN P. WHITE,
President.
EDWIN PERRY,
Secretary.

The position thus taken by both the miners in British Columbia, and southern Alberta, and by the international executive is that the present cessation of operations does not constitute a strike under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. Whether they are right or wrong in that position is a matter which can be decided by procedure under the Act. The Act in this respect has been tested on different occasions. I mentioned the other day in reply to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that a company in which he was interested in Alberta locked out its men while a board was carrying on an investigation, and that the men proceeded under the Act to enforce the penalty against the company for so doing, and recovered the penalty provided by the law. If, in the present case, the miners are wrong in the contention which they are making, it is open to the operators, if they are affected by the suspension of operations, to seek redress in the same manner.

However, that is only one part of the case. The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act was intended for two puroses, one, to enable the parties to an industrial dispute to find a more satisfactory way of settling their difficulties than by resort to a strike or lock-out, and the other, to enable the public to ascertain who is in the right, and who is in the wrong with regard to a situation which affects itself. The parties apparently have not chosen to take advantage of the Act to adjust their difference. They may have their own motives for that, but, on the other hand, there is the other purpose of the law, as to permitting the public to know the true inwardness of the situation. Accordingly, when it becomes apparent that the parties were not going to submit their differences to a board of investigation, I thought it desirable to communicate with the officer whom we have in British Columbia, and have him see each of the parties, and point out to them that it was open to either employers or the men to ask for an investigation under the provisions of the Act. I shall read to the House the message that was sent because it has an important bearing on the present situation:

Ottawa, April 3, 1911.

J. E. McNiven,
Fernie, B.C.

Section 5 of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act provides that: 'Whenever any

dispute exists between an employer and any of his employees, and the parties thereto are unable to adjust it, either of the parties to the dispute may make application to the minister for the appointment of a board of conciliation and investigation, to which the dispute may be referred under the provisions of this Act.'

A dispute of the kind referred to in this section exists at the present time in southern British Columbia and Alberta. It is open, therefore, to either of the parties to make application for a board. The Act has been framed with a view of enabling the public to intelligently appreciate the right or wrong of actions of parties to a dispute likely to affect public interest, and with matters as they now stand, either party refusing to make application places itself before the public in a position of appearing to be unwilling to have the public made fully aware of its real position.

Please show this wire to the representatives of each of the parties to the present dispute, and point out that it would appear to be in the public interest, not less than in the interests of the parties, that all circumstances connected with the present dispute should be fully investigated and disclosed; also, in order that responsibility may be definitely fixed and that the government may have the information on which to base such further action as may be necessary, please ascertain whether, with the representations herein contained, each of the parties definitely state that they are unwilling to make application for board.

Please wire information as soon as possible to obtain same.

(Sgd.) W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
Minister of Labour.

That wire was presented by Mr. McNiven to each of the parties, and on account of their meeting in different localities it took him a day or two to see both employers and men. I received from him a communication this morning in which he states that:

Neither party will state positively that they will not apply.

He has been endeavouring to get each or either of them to make application for a board of investigation, but up to the present time neither of them will apply, and neither of them has stated definitely that they will not apply. That brings up a situation never contemplated when this legislation was introduced some years ago, namely, that a difference could exist between two parties in which neither would ask to have public opinion brought to bear in support of its contentions. It would appear from the attitude of the parties at the present moment that each side is interested in some way in not having the full facts brought to light. It is hardly conceivable that if there is nothing back of this difference but some arbitrary action on the part of one side or the other that the side which is being injuriously affected would hesitate to ask for an investigation so that the public might be fully informed as to who was in the right and who was in the wrong.

Mr. GOODEVE. Might it not be that it is because both parties have lost confidence in the utility of the Act that they have refused to apply?

Mr. KING. They have had no reason to lose confidence because they have not taken advantage of the provisions of the Act, and, in so far as the Act is concerned, as I mentioned in the House the other day, there have been something like one hundred applications, and in ninety out of the hundred the Act has been the means of averting anything in the nature of industrial strife. When my hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) interrupted me I was trying to make it clear that there must be, from the attitude of the parties at the present moment, reason to believe that each of them, for some reason best known to themselves, do not desire to have the public fully informed of the true inwardness of the situation. The purpose of the Industrial Disputes Act was to see that the public was informed in a matter which materially affects itself. I purpose, therefore, communicating with the parties again to-day, and stating that unless they see their way one or the other, to immediately make application for a board under the Act, the government will proceed with an investigation of its own to find out who is in the right, and who is in the wrong in the present difficulty. The significance of that action may be understood when I point out that if either party makes application for a board they have the opportunity of naming their own representatives on the board. If the operators to-day ask for a board of investigation under this Act then, following the provisions of the Act, they are entitled to have a representative on that board. Similarly, the miners are entitled to have a representative if they ask for an investigation, but the government, under the Act, as it is framed, cannot take the initiative in the appointing of the board, without an application from one side or the other, and consequently we have to wait to see whether either side will make application.

The policy of the government being one of conciliation and one of endeavour to terminate the difficulties it has seemed wise to proceed slowly and deliberately and to give each of the parties full opportunity to have their case presented to the public on their own initiative. There is one other feature that is of importance. Mr. Ashworth, the manager of the Crowsnest Coal Company, which is the largest company concerned, resigned a few days ago and Mr. W. R. Wilson, former general manager, has been appointed and is expected to arrive in Fernie to-morrow. In view of the fact that a new manager is

taking charge of the Crowsnest Pass Company in the present situation, it would seem only reasonable that he should be given an opportunity, along with the other operators to see whether he can settle the difficulties or apply for a board of investigation. I think if he and the other operators and the miners are given until Monday night next to either settle this dispute or to send in an application for a board under this Act, the government will be allowing them sufficient time to consider all the bearings of the situation. But if no request comes in by Monday night next, I think the House will support the government if it takes action to investigate this dispute without consulting either of the parties as to the personnel of the individual, or body, which may make the inquiry. They have that opportunity before them at the present time, and if they see their way to ask for a board and strengthen their position before the public in so doing, they will get a board and have an opportunity of naming a member on it. But if they do not, and if each side persists in the attitude it is taking at present of appearing to desire to burk investigation, they will have to take the consequences whatever they may be of a pretty searching investigation into the whole situation.

Mr. RHODES. Now that this subject has arisen, I would like to ask the minister a few questions. Boiled down the remarks of the Minister of Labour mean that this industrial disputes investigation Act is meant for the entertainment of the public, or to use the words of the Minister of Labour, for the information of the public. One could fancy that this was a sort of dispute or combat between the men on one hand, and the companies on the other, and that this Act had been designed only to provide the public with information with respect to the dispute. But the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), when he was Minister of Labour, was frank enough to state that this Act was designed not for the benefit of either the company or the men, but to protect the public. The present Minister of Labour seems to recede from that position.

Mr. KING. Not at all.

Mr. RHODES. In view of the fact that the men take the stand that as they have been working under contract with the company the Act is not applicable to them, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if he believes that position is tenable, and if he purposes permitting that position to be taken in other cases under similar conditions?

Mr. KING. I would point out that the present situation in British Columbia is a very, very critical one indeed, and I feel that we cannot discuss it too carefully in this House. For me to express an opinion as to whether the miners are right in the construction they put upon the Act or whether the operators are right in the stand they are taking would be to precipitate into the present situation an element which I think would add embarrassment to it. The law is there; it is open to any one who thinks the miners are taking a wrong position to apply to the courts for an interpretation, and any opinion expressed by me would not serve either as a ground for an action or as a bar to an action which might be brought under this Act. The courts are there to enforce the law, and the statute speaks for itself.

Mr. RHODES. Does the Minister of Labour recede from the position taken two years ago by the present Postmaster General when he was Minister of Labour: That this Act was designed for the benefit of the public?

Mr. KING. Certainly not. The position that is being taken by the government today in insisting that there shall be investigation whether the parties wish it or not is the strongest evidence of the fact that the government is determined to allow the public to get at the inwardness of the whole situation and to get at it thoroughly and speedily.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. RHODES. I want to put one more question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion is out of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to put a question, and it is this: If the statute is designed for the protection of the public, can it be possible that the government has no idea of what this statute means, because that is practically the position the Minister of Labour takes. He says the public can judge for themselves, and that the government, whose duty it is to administer the law, have really no idea of what the law means.

FISHERY LEASES—MR. MARKEY.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish to inform the Prime Minister that I have obtained from the Clerk of the House a copy of the document which I asked for yesterday, but it has not yet been supplied to the Library. I want to ask the Prime Minister the exact situation at present with regard to the Markey lease. I have looked over the journals, and I find that Mr. Markey was at that time willing to give up his lease. In one instance he states that he has ex-

pended a certain amount of money, and he asks to have that refunded, and he is willing that the lease be cancelled. In another part of his evidence he admits that the government can cancel his lease without paying him anything if they think it is not being operated in the public interest. Did the government at that time notify Mr. Markey that they were going to cancel the lease, and have they cancelled it, and is it only a question of settling the amount due him, or, is Mr. Markey still operating, and if so, will we be liable for any more than the former amount claimed in case it should go to the courts?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has put me several questions, one of which is whether Mr. Markey is still operating, and that I can answer at once. I do not think he has ever been operating at all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Exactly, and consequently not entitled to any damages.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As to the other questions, I shall have to look into the matter, and if the hon. gentleman repeats his question on Monday I shall give an answer.

PENSIONS.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). May I ask when the government intends moving the House into Supply to discuss the item dealing with pensions. This question of mine is due to the fact that last night I was waited upon by one of the veterans of the 1885 rebellion, who told me that he had not as yet received his pension, although he has been accustomed to receiving it on or about the 1st of April each year. He was anxious to know when this vote would be passed, because some time ago he had arranged to meet certain obligations at the present time.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to send me the name of the person privately I will be happy to investigate and let him know what the difficulty is, if there be any.

MANITOBA AND SOUTHEASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior, if, without an order, he would be kind enough to bring down an order in council dated May 6, 1907, with reference to certain lands of the Manitoba and Southeastern railway.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. REID (Grenville)

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words owing to some remarks offered to the House yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture. I do not know whether I am perfectly in order to go into the question at any length; but the question that was in his mind was that of reciprocity and how the members on this side of the House were liable to vote. I will read what he said, if it is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is a personal explanation or a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to a past debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no intention of referring to a past debate. I just wish to say to the Minister of Agriculture that none of us on this side of the House are afraid to let the country know where we stand in this matter. His remarks to which I take exception are as follows:

> And, Sir, on the main motion itself there are men over there who are afraid to vote yea, and then again there are men over there who are afraid to vote nay, and they will take every step they possibly can to put themselves on record on some little side issue, so as to avoid voting on the main motion. But I want to warn them that before this session ends they will have to vote on the main motion, and put themselves on record, and go before their constituents and answer for their vote.

The Minister of Agriculture referred to members on this side of the House. I had not put myself on record. There were some gentlemen of his own party in what we call the segregated area, who also had not put themselves on record, and I would like to know whether he was referring to me or to the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey). If that hon. gentleman is as willing, at any time, to voice his views on this matter, before the House, as I am, I would like to hear him get up and follow me were he present. I rise now for reasons that I have no control over, because I have to go away to-night, and I do not desire for one moment that even the Minister of Agriculture should think that I am afraid to put myself on record. In his remarks the other day he appealed to the farmers for their support in regard to reciprocity. I wonder if he appeals to them because of the estimate he put upon them some time ago, when he referred to them as slip-shod, indifferent, lazy, and unintelligent, and for these reasons expects them to support him in this matter of reciprocity. If this is his reason, I can readily understand why he expects the farmers to support him; but I can assure him that he is far from the mark if he believes for one moment that the farmers as a class can be designated in that way. As a farmer myself I resent it as strongly as it is pos-

sible to resent anything. I can tell the Minister of Agriculture, and you, Mr. Speaker, and this House, why the farmers have begun to think that something drastic has to be done to alleviate their disabilities, and I can say it in a very short word—the absolute inefficiency of the Minister of Agriculture of this country for the last 14 or 15 years. He has never advanced agriculture in any new way, has never initiated anything off his own bat; he has followed the footsteps of his predecessors in office. Like a car running down hill without a motorman or conductor, the Department of Agriculture has run on its way. The electricity had absolutely given out and something drastic had to be done. The farmers in the west have realized that. They do not know the conditions that prevail here in Ottawa; they do not know that we have a minister who is absolutely inefficient, who has been allowing ministers of other departments to take the hard-earned money of the farmers that has been paid in duties and deflects it in other directions. They do not know that as we know it here, and for that reason they are looking for some move to be made that will alleviate their condition. They have thought that our verbose Minister of Agriculture has been attending to their interests, because if words will convince any one, surely the words which emanate from him are enough to convince not only the people of Canada, but the people of the whole continent. The west to-day is in a state of evolution. We have too much land out there; we are too rich in land; we are short in population. The result is that the farmers have got into a condition of being skimmers of the land to a certain extent; they have not been going into mixed farming as have the people of the older provinces, and they realize that something is wanting to advance their interests. In the past they have been at the mercy of the railway companies, and of the beef ring, and they have been praying for different markets—for some motive power to take from their shoulders the disabilities under which they have been suffering. To-day the conditions are beginning to change there; we are beginning to get a population. The farmers are beginning to realize that the local governments—I refer particularly to the government of Manitoba—have seen that something is necessary with regard to the beef industry, and are doing their best to establish union stockyards and public abattoirs and free markets where the farmers of the west can get better prices for their products in their own province, or in their own Dominion. I think that in a year or two a solution of that problem will be found satisfactory to the farmers of the west. The Minister of Agriculture in his remarks yesterday practically dared us from the west to vote against the reciprocity agreement—I took it to myself, as I had not troubled the House on this matter, wishing to leave the debate to men very much better able to voice the sentiments of the people of Canada than I was. He practically called us cowards, though he did not use the term, saying that we would not come out and declare ourselves either for or against the agreement; but he held out a threat that he would compel us to do so before the end of this debate. We need no compulsion, Mr. Speaker; we are quite ready. I am perfectly willing to tell the House that I am against this agreement first, last and all the time. I say that, not merely as a member of the Conservative party, but speaking as a farmer, representing the farmers, and desirous all the time to vote in their best interests.

We hear it stated in this House that this proposed reciprocity agreement is giving the farmers what they want, and what they asked for when they came down here on the 16th of December. I deny that absolutely. The farmers desire a great many things, and this interchange of farm products is, in their opinion, a secondary thing altogether.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It has been brought to the front perhaps since then by a certain element who pose as representing the farmers. I refer to these men, Roderick MacKenzie and Henders, who stand high in the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba. They say that reciprocity is what the farmers want. Well, they are farmers of a kind I admit, but if any man in this House who knows anything about agriculture should happen to go down to their farm, he would not think they were farmers at all. These men pose as the representatives of the farmers, but in my opinion they are the agents, paid or otherwise, of the Grit party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In all their lives, I do not believe that either of them ever voted Tory. Previous to the election of 1903, both these men came to the Manitoba government, as representing the grain growers of that province, and said: We want you to do certain things with regard to the charter of the grain exchange. Previous to the end of the session, the Manitoba government said to them: We shall make arrangements to have a convention of all the interests which are entitled to be heard with regard to this matter, and we shall have you represent the agricultural grain growers, and when that convention arrives at a solution, we shall put that into law in the most effective way possible. That was the solemn pledge given by the government of Manitoba to

these men who were representing the grain growers. The farmers of Manitoba believed Mr. Roblin, the Prime Minister of the government, but what did these two gentlemen, Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. Henders do? They stumped whatever parts of Manitoba they could get into, to try and persuade the people that Mr. Roblin was not sincere, and that they ought not to put any faith in him. But what was the result? The people of Manitoba believed Mr. Roblin. The convention that he called together was held. The farmers, with the help of Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. Henders and other officials, made a draft of what they wanted, and Mr. Roblin, when returned to power, passed legislation according to that draft. Surely those men, Grits though they were, ought to have acknowledged that Mr. Roblin and his government were sincere.

Then another election came on and the question of internal elevators was before the people. That whole question was brought up by the grain growers, and again they had an interview with the government. Mr. Roblin gave them a pledge. He said: Put us back into power and we will take hold of the elevator system as you suggest, if the farmers want us to do it. What happened again in that campaign? These same two gentlemen, Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. Henders, did everything to defeat the government. They said that the government were not sincere. But what happened after Mr. Roblin was returned? His government again fulfilled its pledges. Why, those men MacKenzie and Henders, are Grits first, last and all the time, and it would not be possible for them to do anything else but vote Grit, regardless altogether of what the country owed the Tories, they were born that way, and cannot help themselves.

When I began I was referring to what the farmers of Manitoba, as represented by the grain growers on the 16th of December last, asked for. They asked for various things, but among these reciprocity in farm products was a very minor detail. One of the things they asked for was government ownership of the terminal elevators. That is a question which had already been before the House. My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) had brought it up in the hope of inducing this government to take the matter up, and meet the desires of the western farmers. The case of the farmers could not have been better argued than it was by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), and I supported him both by voice and vote. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), however, voted against this resolution, and so did the government majority behind him. The question is one very pertinent to reciprocity, and which has been engaging the attention of the farmers of the west for years. What we desire is government ownership or provincial ownership of the internal elevators, and also the government ownership of terminal elevators, and one strong reason for this is our desire that our western wheat should not be mixed, but should go to the old country as it leaves Manitoba and the other western provinces. We desire to have our wheat shipped unmixed so that it may have the same high grade when it reaches the markets of the world as it had when it left the starting point. But supposing this reciprocity pact goes through, what will be the effect? It will mean that our wheat will be deflected down into the south; and instead of our keeping control of it, and keeping the grade distinct, it will reach the markets of the world in a condition most unfavourable to the producers, in point of price as well as quality, and will be no longer an advertisement of what we can grow. I wish to quote from the remarks of Mr. H. W. Richardson, who spoke in this House when the deputation addressed the Prime Minister as follows:

> I noticed a statement in a newspaper some time ago that it might be good policy to adopt the Minnesota law. Gentlemen, I think our trouble is all from Minnesota. All the wrinkles, all the knowledge gained in thirty-five or forty years of elevator terminals there has been brought to Canada and used in Canada. We were doing much better before the Minnesota people came in. Do not let us go there to look for help. Surely, we are able to help ourselves.

That was with regard to the very point I was adducing, that they mixed the wheat, spoiled the grades and injured our markets. Reciprocity will lead to that system, and for that reason I am against it. The First Minister himself, in speaking to the farmers, said:

> When the grain is delivered at Buffalo, we have no control over it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is what we all say on this side, that is why we do not want to have it delivered at Buffalo.

> We hand it over to the control of our American friends. It was stated by Captain Richardson that the Minnesota operator has transferred his usefulness—or want of usefulness—to Port Arthur.

Surely the Prime Minister will not vote for reciprocity after I quote what he himself said. He said:

> But when we can carry our grain in Canada to Montreal, and load it on the ship at Montreal, and see that it leaves the port as it left Winnipeg, we shall have solved the problem.

His own words are one great reason why I am going to vote against reciprocity. I

want to support the farmers in their contention, because I know their contention is good in that particular regard, and I know the First Minister also thinks so, because he has said so, no matter how he votes when the hour comes.

The farmers also brought up the matter of the duties on farm implements, a subject which has been of great interest to them since the inception of farming in the west. I have dozens and dozens of resolutions, as the Prime Minister has, and almost every one of them is to the effect that the petitioners desire free trade in agricultural implements.

Mr. KNOWLES. Do not the same resolutions ask the hon. gentleman to support the reciprocity agreement?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No. A few of those that I have received are those which have been sent out by Henders & MacKenzie, and they are all worded in the same way. I now simply read the first paragraph of these, and I know the rest of the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not know who framed the resolution. I would ask the hon. member if he is ready to go on 'Hansard' and have the 'Hansard' go before his constituents containing his statement that he has not received many such resolutions from his constituents, asking him to support the reciprocity agreement. I ask if he will make that statement here?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is a pity that my hon. friend is a lawyer and that I am only a farmer.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am a farmer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because I think our positions should have been reversed. I make the statement that this resolution had been framed by Mr. MacKenzie or Mr. Henders, or some one in Mr. MacKenzie's office.

Mr. KNOWLES. Quite possibly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because I have in my desk an identical copy with Mr. Henders' signature at the bottom of it. Perhaps my farmer-lawyer friend has his answer?

Mr. KNOWLES. The signature makes it all the better.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was referring to the high duty on agricultural implements. We on this side of the House, certainly I myself, have been strongly in favour of a reduction of duty on these. A gentleman who was my leader in the province of Manitoba, a man for whom I have the greatest possible regard, the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald, conducted a contest in the west on that subject, and his word was given to every man in the west that were he returned to power he would do everything in his power to put agricultural implements on the free list for the benefit of the farmers. In that he had my support. I believe in that. The Minister of Agriculture is not behind that movement, that is, if he supports the First Minister in the message he sent to the people of Woodstock the other day, through the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), that he was not going to tamper any further with the duty on agricultural implements. I am for the farmer, the Minister of Agriculture is not in that particular regard. I do not think the Prime Minister is in that regard either, if his sentiments, as voiced in this House, are correct. These are two things in which I am behind the farmers. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) brought up the question of public owned abattoirs a few days ago. Where was the Minister of Agriculture? Against everything the farmers wanted. The farmers came here and demanded that from the First Minister. The First Minister said he would take it into his serious consideration, but he voted against it, and he whipped all his followers into voting for it. The Conservatives in the House were all solid behind the farmers, and because we cannot see eye to eye with the First Minister with regard to giving the farmers of the States free access into our markets, are we going to be blamed too severely? I do not think so.

Two years ago a resolution was introduced by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) calling for the appointment of a representative of the farmers on the Railway Board. We on this side then showed that we were more desirous than the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture and all their followers to procure what the farmers wanted. I spoke in favour of it, I voted in favour of it. What did the Minister of Agriculture do? He voted against it, of course, and so did the First Minister and every follower he has in the chamber. They again defeated the wishes of the farmer. It is surprising to me that a man in the position of the Minister of Agriculture should get up here and taunt us, who have by our votes been supporting almost everything the farmers have asked for, that because we will not fall into line with him on this reciprocity pact we are afraid to voice our sentiments. Sir, there is certainly no fear in our hearts on that question. A few days ago the member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy), when supporting the policy of the government with regard to reciprocity, issued an invitation to any one of us from Manitoba who dared to vote against the government to go to Proven-

cher and run against him. Well, it sounded well, but when you know, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend from Provencher has the distribution of all the patronage in the province of Manitoba, and will have the saying when Manitoba is cut up, as it probably will be before the next election, and can, therefore, make himself perfectly safe, I say, Sir, that when you know this you can easily understand his bravery in challenging us to meet him. I wish to tell the Minister of Agriculture that if there is an election to be held, sooner or later, I will be pleased if he will come up to Dauphin with his little old reciprocity pact and fight me on the platform. I can tell him that, though I am not a prophet, he will go back to the woods where he belongs. I admit that I am making a somewhat strong statement, because I am at a disadvantage in fighting with the Minister of Agriculture. In the first place, he is a minister, and I am only a backbencher on the opposition side; he is an old parliamentarian, and I only a tyro in the art; he is one of the longest speakers perhaps in Canada, while I am rather retiring in that respect. He also has in his power the appointment of every officer in any campaign where he takes part, he has behind him the whole force of the government, and he poses in the farmers' ridings as the great agriculturalist of Canada. Nevertheless, I challenge him to come and meet me there, because I honestly believe that in a short time the farmers will come to realize the true inwardness of this reciprocity pact. At first, the farmers may not realize that the vote I am going to give against reciprocity is in their own interest, but before long they will realize it; they will understand that the vote I am going to give in this House will be in the best interest, not only of my constituents, but of Canada as a whole. After all, Mr. Speaker, if we choose to forget party, I believe it is in the heart of every man in this House that we would rather remain cubs of the old lion than help to add another star on the flag across the line.

JUDICIAL VACANCIES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. L. FRASER (Kings, P.E.I.). Before you leave the Chair, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the matter of the vacancies existing in the province of Prince Edward Island. I have already called this matter to his attention on a previous occasion. One vacancy exists in the Supreme Court bench, and another in the Senate. I said a few words on this matter on the 20th of January last, and I do not at this time intend to take up the time of the House by giving the history of those two vacancies, because it is well known to the Prime Minister. At that time he gave as an excuse that he was pressed with business, and had not time to attend to that small matter. Well, that statement was taken for what it was worth, perhaps a poor excuse is better than none. But I think the Prime Minister will be a great deal more busy in the future than he has been in the past, and if these vacancies are not filled very soon, then we may expect that they will remain open for at least another year. But there was one statement the Prime Minister made at that time which carried some assurance that these vacancies would be filled in a very short time, to use his own words. That was three months ago, and I regret to say that the Prime Minister has not kept his word. Although this government has a great unenviable reputation of carrying out all its promises promptly, I regret that this promise has never been carried out, and I trust the Prime Minister will at an early date see fit to fill these vacancies. It may be a matter of small moment to the Prime Minister, perhaps, that the vacancy in the Senate should remain unfilled. But he knows the state of our representation in that body to-day, he knows that at present we have only one Senator there when we should have four. It is a regrettable thing that two of them should be prevented from attending by sickness and old age. One of them, who is at present in this town, is one of the oldest Senators in Canada, and it is a matter of regret that he is unable to fulfil his duties in the Senate. The other, Senator Robinson, is sick at home, and is unable to come here. But the other vacancy has existed now nearly two years, and there is no sign of filling it. It may be a new way of reforming the Senate that this government has adopted. The reform of the Senate was one of the things promised some years ago, and it has been reformed during the last year to a very great extent, it has been reformed, as Mr. Dooley would say, 'Almost stiff.'

But, Mr. Speaker, the vacancy in which our people are most vitally concerned, is that on the Supreme Court Bench. These vacancies have occurred before. Now I wish to tell you the difference between the treatment accorded by other governments in the past. The records show that vacancies never have existed in that province on the Supreme Court Bench longer than ten days. There are only three judges there, and three of them are required to sit as a court of appeal. There have been cases on the docket waiting to be heard in the Court of Appeal in Equity since 1908. Three judges have to sit in Court of Appeal in Equity to hear these cases and during the last two years one of these judges has been sick. I do not attach any blame to the government for that, his resignation took place last fall, some time in October. That is quite a while

ago, yet no appointment has been made since, and I think there are seven cases waiting to be heard. The conditions are such that the people of that province, on both sides of politics, consider that this matter has now become a public scandal. I could quote from newspapers statements bearing out what I am now saying. For instance, a paper that is independent but which, at the present time, is supporting this government, in its editorial two or three days ago, spoke of it as a public scandal to allow party politics to interfere with appointments to the bench, and the administration of justice in the courts of law. Besides that, it is a pernicious precedent that this government is setting which will be handed down to future times. Governments coming after this will point back to this precedent. I would remind the Prime Minister that the evil that men do live after them. It is nothing more than a public scandal that these appointments are not made. I have had some letters and telegrams asking me to bring this up. I did not wish to trouble the Prime Minister during the last month or two, but on the 20th January I brought it to his attention, and at that time he gave me to understand that the appointments would be made in a very short time. That is nearly three months ago, and we do not seem to be any nearer to these appointments now than we were then.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I want to enter my protest with my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) who has just taken his seat. That hon. member has just stated that this government have been noted for promptly carrying out the promises that they had made. It is easy to see that he has not been in this House very long. One promise that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made in 1893 was to reform the Senate, but there has not been a single thing done so far as that is concerned except to put in a Liberal when a Conservative died. The Hon. Mr. Ferguson died two years ago, and the Prime Minister has been keeping that position dangling for political purposes in Prince Edward Island, and there has been no appointment. He is keeping that position vacant in order that it may have its effect when the campaign is on. The vacancy on the bench he is holding for the premier of Prince Edward Island. There is only one of a majority in Prince Edward Island, and the position is kept for the premier of the province when he is defeated at the next election. They are holding it so that they can land him safely in that position, and in the meantime the people of Prince Edward Island have to suffer. It is not fair to the people to have their cases held up in the courts. There is no doubt about the object of the Prime Minister in holding up vacancies. If I remember rightly he had a member sitting behind him with a letter from him in his pocket, promising him a judgeship down in Quebec if he would vote right. He was kicking at that time. He was given the position all right enough, and you can see now by the look of several hon. members on the other side of the House that they have received promises of positions to induce them to vote for reciprocity. They would not vote for the Prime Minister if it were not that he is able to tell them that they will be all right when the vote is over. In this case the Prime Minister told my hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Fraser) in January that the appointment would be made, and he offered the explanation that he had been busy for two years. All these appointments are recommended by some gentleman in Prince Edward Island, and he is going to carry out the promise. The Prime Minister knows just as well as he did two years ago who is going to get this position, and all he has to do is to pass an order in council, and it will be filled. But, the Prime Minister is playing the game of politics, and that is the reason that these positions are not filled. The people of Prince Edward Island surely know that, and if they want any more evidence of it, we can give them other cases of vacancies that are being held up in the same way. This is the game that the Prime Minister has played for the last twelve or fourteen years. Take, for instance, the position that was filled by the appointment of the late Speaker of the House; he was promised a judgeship, everybody knows that he was commencing to get sore and he had to have some promise made or else he would have voted with us on this reciprocity question to-day. But, the vacancy was made and he was put in there. There are many cases of the same kind. The right hon. gentleman must admit that he is dangling these positions that have been referred to here to-day in order to gain a political advantage. There is only one of a majority in the local House in Prince Edward Island and these positions are held up before several influential men, the senatorship more particularly—support this government, or the local government, and you will get the position. Any member who goes down and makes inquiry in Prince Edward Island will be told that there are from twelve to twenty of the leading men in the province who have all been promised by some one that they will get that senatorship if they return so many members at the next election. The judgeship is going to one man. We will see if the remarks which I am now making do not come true. Premier Haszard is going to get that judgeship if he can maintain his government until some one else is called to fill his position. Will the Prime Minister say that the premier of

Prince Edward Island will not get that position? I would like him to just say that. I believe that the Prime Minister has promised it to him, and that he will give it to him when he can let him out safely, and still try to hold the government. That has been going on for two years and in the meantime the people have been suffering. I want to enter my protest, and I hope that the Prime Minister will soon remedy the situation and give the people down there an opportunity of having their cases tried.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have no fault to find with my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Fraser) bringing this matter again to the attention of the House, and to my own. The remarks which he made were in excellent temper, and I repeat that in bringing this matter to the attention of the House he has done something that he has a right to do. I do not think, however, that the case has been improved by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) jumping into the question. The hon. member for Grenville has a lot of information; I do not know where he got it, but I had not heard of the circumstances to which he refers up to the present time. If I am to receive the information which he has laid before me it is that I have promised this senatorship to thirteen or fourteen different men. I am reminded of an annecdote of the late Sir John Macdonald. He was taunted, as I have been taunted, of making a promise of some office to thirteen different people. Well, said Sir John, it may be true, but none of them got it. I can only say that no one has got this position, and I am not conscious of making a promise even to one. I plead guilty to the fact that when my hon. friend, on the 20th of January last, called my attention to the long vacancies which have occurred in Prince Edward Island, and especially the vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court, I promised that the appointment would be made at an early date. I plead guilty also to the fact that I have not redeemed my promise. But, he was kind enough, generous enough and truthful enough to say at the same time that this government has been characterized by the prompt manner in which it has implemented its promises. It is the first time that I have heard justice done to this government from the opposition side of the House, and it was so extraordinary that I could not help but notice it. I am gratified to find that there is at least one Conservative member who can be just and fair to his opponents, and I thank my hon. friend for the acknowledgment he has made. But, I plead guilty that I did not fulfil the promise which I made when I told him that these vacancies would be filled in a short time. I might plead the fact that I have been busy, but that would not be a good excuse. A man cannot be so busy that he cannot fulfil the duties with which he is entrusted. But, we are going to have the Easter recess, we shall have more leisure and perhaps when we meet again we can talk over the matter further, and I will try to give satisfaction to my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman apparently did not recognize the tone of sarcasm in the voice of my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) when he spoke of the remarkable record of the government for fulfilling its promises, and it certainly has been a remarkable record in the respect that the government never does fulfil its promises. The Prime Minister has not given the slightest answer to the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fraser). Under our constitution the province of Prince Edward Island has the right to be represented in the Senate of Canada by four members. One of the Senators from that province died in August or September, 1909. The late Senator Ferguson was a man of high type, a most useful and admirable man in the public life of this country, and a man who had rendered splendid services to the Dominion and to his provinces. It is now April, 1911, nearly two years have passed since the death of Senator Ferguson, and during all that time Prince Edward Island has been deprived of one fourth of the representation to which, under the British North America Act it is entitled in the Senate of Canada. Is there any just excuse for such dereliction of duty on the part of the government; has the Prime Minister offered one word in extenuation of this extraordinary disregard of the rights of one of the provinces. Not one word has been offered by him in excuse for depriving Prince Edward Island of that voice in the Senate to which it is entitled. The neglect to fill a vacancy on the judicial bench of the province is not so great in point of time, but there are circumstances surrounding the matter which should have called upon the government for prompt action. During a considerable period before he tendered his resignation, Mr. Justice Hodgson had been unable to discharge his duties because of indisposition, his friends hoping that his health would be restored and that he would be able once more to take his place on the bench. Mr. Justice Hodgson was a very eminent man, a very able lawyer, and his services as a judge were very valuable to the people of his native province. On or about the 8th of October last, now six months ago, Mr. Justice Hodgson resigned. The whole judicial machinery of the province had been more or less out of gear during the period of his ill-health, and one would naturally suppose that the government would have deem-

ed it its plain duty to appoint his successor so soon as he resigned, in order that cases which have been standing for nearly three years upon the docket of the Supreme Court might be disposed of at the earliest possible moment. There are many good lawyers at the bar of Prince Edward Island who could discharge judicial duties with satisfaction to the bar and to the people of the province, but the government has left the vacancy unfilled for six months during which time there has been a practical denial of justice to every man whose case remains unheard. Is that a proper spectacle for the government to present to the people of Canada? Worse still, there is absolutely no reason for it except the reason of political expediency, and that reason has made itself manifest not only in Prince Edward Island, but in my own province of Nova Scotia, where for nearly a year there was a vacancy on the Supreme court bench and case after case remained unheard just because the government had declined to discharge its plain duty. I submit, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think I am going beyond what the occasion demands, that such delay in filling judicial offices for reasons of political expediency amounts to no more nor less than a trafficking in the appointments to the judicial bench of this country; it is absolutely nothing short of that. That may seem a harsh expression, but I am not afraid in the face of the Prime Minister of Canada and his government to characterize it in that way. To hold these judicial appointments back, to allow vacancies to remain on the bench of the courts of the various provinces for reasons of political expediency and nothing else, amounts to no more and no less than trafficking in judicial appointments for political purposes. I say, Sir, that there should not be one more hour's delay in filling this judicial appointment, and removing this disgrace to the administration of justice in Canada.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. E. N. RHODES (Cumberland). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to briefly refer to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. I submit—and if I am not right in this the Minister of Labour will correct me—that this Act has been invoked perhaps more in Nova Scotia than in any other province of the Dominion, and after some years of experience in that province there is a wholesale condemnation of that Act on the part of the miners who are the only men to whom the Act has been applied there. So strong is this condemnation that there has come to the members representing Nova Scotia a request from all of the united mine workers' lodges covering the whole field of the province of Nova Scotia, a demand that the Act be repealed in so far as it affects that province. In the province of British Columbia a like feeling towards this Act exists, and the United Mine Workers of America, which includes in its membership I believe all of the mine workers of British Columbia and Alberta, have the same opinion of this Act as their brethren in Nova Scotia, and ask that it be repealed. They believe that by reason of its operation it constitutes an oppression upon the working classes of this country; they believe that there is no beneficial feature in the Act to compensate the labouring man for the loss of these 30 days during which he is precluded from striking, and which interval enables the employer to fortify himself against a strike which is almost sure to follow after the Act has been brought into operation. Let me cite section 59 of the Act:

> Any employee who goes on strike contrary to the provisions of this Act shall be liable to a fine of not less than $10 nor more than $50 for each day or part of a day that such employee is on strike.

There are upwards of 10,000 men at present on strike in the coal fields of British Columbia and Alberta, and, applying the minimum fine to each of these men, we find that if this Act is operative, and they have gone on strike contrary to its provisions, they are liable to a penalty amounting to not less than one hundred thousand dollars a day, which is a somewhat extensive fine for labouring men to stand. It means practically that the miners are so strongly incensed against this Act that they are willing to risk incurring such a penalty rather than come under its provisions. In view of these facts I asked the Minister of Labour a short time ago what the department proposed to do with reference to the question raised by the miners of British Columbia, namely, that since the three-year contract under which the miners had been working had expired, they were not therefore employees, and did not come under the provisions of the Act. His reply virtually meant: the Act is on the statute-book, it is for the employer to invoke its provisions, and if it applies, the men will be liable to the penalty. I think the position the minister ought to take is this. This is paternal legislation; it has gone beyond any legislation that we have had before in this country; the government by this statute steps in between the employer and the employee, and says, you must not do certain things, you must work a certain period until you invoke the provisions of this Act, or you are liable to a penalty of not less than $10 or more than $50 a day for each man. Since this is paternal legislation, the Minister of Labour ought at least to have

the provisions of the Act made clear. There is a delicate position in the province of British Columbia at the present time, and there will be delicate positions all over this country if it is left uncertain whether this Act applies where the men in the employ of a given company are working under contract, and I would urge the minister, in the interests of labour and industrial conditions in this country, to have such amendments made in the Act as will make its provisions clear beyond peradventure.

Mr. KING. I am somewhat surprised at my hon. friend bringing up this matter in the form in which he has at this moment, inasmuch as the question of the interpretation of the Act one way or the other, is likely to form a serious part of the dispute, and I think it would be much more in the interest of industrial peace that that matter should be settled in the courts of British Columbia and Alberta, rather than be made a matter of party controversy in this House.

Mr. RHODES. If there is a question as to the interpretation of the Act, why not settle it with an amendment to the Act here and now, rather than involve the miners of British Columbia in needless expense over litigation?

Mr. KING. That is not the point. The question of the enforcement of the Industrial Disputes Act is the same as the question of the enforcement of any other statute or provision of the criminal law. I do not see any reason why the government should make an exception of this case and become public prosecutor when with regard to other offences against the criminal law they would not be prepared to take that course. I wish to make quite clear the position which the department desires to take on this matter. There is a larger work than the settlement of any single industrial dispute, and if the department is going to carry on that work successfully, it will be by maintaining as far as possible an attitude of strict neutrality between the parties, making efforts at conciliation as far as that may be possible, and not putting itself in the position of being coercive or adverse towards one side or the other. That seems to be the only reasonable and possible attitude which a government can take that hopes to do anything effective in the settlement of industrial disputes. My hon. friend knows that a labour controversy is a very different thing from an action which is in the nature of a violation of some criminal law.

Mr. RHODES. That is just what I have been saying.

Mr. KING. My hon. friend wants us to take the position of public prosecutor, and I am not prepared to do that.

Mr. RHODES. Not at all. I want you to make the Act clear, so that the men and the companies may not be ground between two legal millstones. Perhaps in that connection the minister will allow me to read what section 3 of the Act says: 'The Minister of Labour shall have the administration of this Act.

Mr. KING. I am not able to see in what particular the Act is not clear. In that respect I do not think the Act requires any amendment. But where I do differ from my hon. friend is in his saying that the men are out in British Columbia at the present time because of the feeling they have against this Act.

Mr. RHODES. I never said that.

Mr. KING. I must refer my hon. friend to his own remarks as they will appear tomorrow in 'Hansard.' He said that the feeling among the men was such that they were willing to bear the penalties of the Act provided rather than submit to its provisions.

Mr. RHODES. That does not mean that they are striking because they are opposed to the Act. Just the contrary: they are striking in spite of the Act.

Mr. KING. As I have read to the House the men in British Columbia state they do not think they are violating any provisions of the Act. I then took the matter up with the International Executive, which is a body with the power to sanction or to refrain from sanctioning any dispute, and the answer they have sent me is this:

> We believe in a strict compliance with the laws of Canada at all times, and are advised that the miners of Canada have not in any sense violated the Industrial Disputes Act.

Then they go on to mention their policy in the matter of trade agreements. The United Mine Workers made their position clear, that they believe in respecting the laws of the country, and believe that the miners have in no way violated them.

Mr. RHODES. They have put this question to the minister; what does he say? That is the whole point of my question.

Mr. KING. I have already answered that question.

Mr. RHODES. The hon. minister says he has his opinion, but he has not given it to the House.

Mr. KING. For the very good reason that where you have 8,000 or 10,000 miners fighting several corporations, the more

careful and restrained outside parties are in the language they use and the opinions they express, the better it will be in the long run for the situation. If I hesitate in expressing an opinion at this moment it is because I do not wish to precipitate into the discussion any opinion one way or the other. My hon. friend knows that if I said that I thought the miners were absolutely in the right, the operators would to-morrow say, what right has any member of the government to come out against us? and if I were to say that the miners were wrong it would only add to the intensity of the struggle and the bitterness of feeling against the operators and would lead to the charge that we were siding with the large corporations. I am sure that my hon. friend, if he were in the position which I happen for the moment to occupy, would see that the only course for the government to take in the public interest — and I am sure that is what my hon. friend desires—is to make its position perfectly clear and show that all it wants is justice between the two parties so that the one which is in the right shall be sustained. The only means to achieve that object is for the government to bring to light all the facts of the situation. That is the fundamental principle of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. I think every one will admit that if the facts can be brought to light so that public opinion may be enabled to pass judgment on them, that public opinion will be a strong factor in bringing about an adjustment of the difficulties. And the machinery of the Act has been devised in order to make it possible for the public to be intelligibly informed as to the right or wrong on either side, in the belief that such information will operate as a material and powerful factor in promoting a settlement. But such a situation as at present exists, one in which both parties to the controversy appear to be unwilling that the public should know their side of the case, was never contemplated. That, however, is the position at present in Alberta and British Columbia. The mine owners have every opportunity to ask for an investigation. They have been told by the officers of the government that they are at liberty to have the machinery of the Act set in motion and have their side of the case presented to the public with a representative of their own on the board. The men have been told the same thing but equally without result; and the only inference I can draw is that neither side wants the facts to come out, and that there is something back of the situation which is responsible for the parties taking that position.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister know what that is?

Mr. KING. No, but I am bound to find out. I am going to see that the facts are made public. If by Monday night of next week, the parties do not ask for an investigation, if they do not avail themselves of the provisions of the Act, the government will take speedy means of having a very searching inquiry into the whole situation so that the public will see who is right and who is wrong in the matter.

But my hon. friend seeks to make the point that this Industrial Investigation Disputes Act is not serving its purpose because it is condemned by miners in Nova Scotia. Well, I would point out to him that the laws of this parliament are enacted for the good of the people as a whole, irrespective of any particular class or group of men in the community; and if any particular group of men in the community were to take the position that because they choose to stand out against the public interest, every Act passed in the public interest should be repealed, I should oppose them to the very last ditch.

Mr. CROSBY. Does the minister say that the men who are standing out in Nova Scotia to-day are standing out against the public interest?

Mr. KING. I am not taking that stand at all.

Mr. CROSBY. You are now shifting your position.

Mr. KING. No, I am not. The men who are out in Nova Scotia to-day complied with the law. They did not go out until after an investigation had taken place. But that is not the point I am discussing. I am taking the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes), who says that the miners of Nova Scotia have condemned the Act in a wholesale fashion and therefore the Act should be repealed. At any rate the latter is the inference I draw from his words.

Mr. RHODES. I have no hesitation in answering my hon. friend. I would like to see this Act put into proper shape. I was simply giving expression to the opinion of the miners of Nova Scotia. What I do say is this, that the Act should either be repealed, in so far as it affects Nova Scotia, or it should be so amended as to make it an equitable measure as between the miners and the operators. Until you get the Act into that condition, it will not be satisfactory either to the public or the men themselves.

Mr. KING. I must differ with my hon. friend on that point. Because a certain group of men in Nova Scotia condemn the Act is no reason why it should be repealed or changed. Their views of course are

certainly entitled to every consideration, but so are the views of other men in the same locality and of other industries in other parts of the Dominion. In Nova Scotia there are, as my hon. friend well knows, two camps of organized labour. There are the Provincial Mine Workers Association and the United Mine Workers. The former have endorsed this Act just as strongly as the latter have condemned it.

Mr. CROSBY. But those who endorse it are only a small number.

Mr. KING. They are entitled to have their opinions respected as much as the others.

Mr. CROSBY. Only twenty per cent of the men in the mines of Cape Breton belonged to the Provincial Mine Workers' Association when they went out on strike.

Mr. KING. The question of numbers is apart from the question of principle altogether.

Mr. RHODES. The hon. minister has made a statement to which I take strong objection. He says that I know perfectly well there are two camps in Nova Scotia, and that one of them is in favour of the Act. But that one is very limited in number. The United Mine Workers', who constitute the great bulk of miners in Nova Scotia, are opposed to the Act. The Provincial Mine Workers' Association, which was the only association of employees prior to the incoming of the United Mine Workers' of America, met in Halifax in convention in August, 1908, and they expressed the same condemnation of the Act at that time as do now the United Mine Workers'; but there was a dispute in Cape Breton between the United Mine Workers' on the one hand, and the Provincial Mine Workers' Association on the other into which dispute politics entered; and because the United Mine Workers' took ground in opposition to the Act, the others took ground in its favour. But so far as the feeling of the mine workers in general is concerned, it is almost unanimous against the Act as I have said.

Mr. KING. I am afraid that politics are responsible for a good deal of the difficulty. But as against the opinion which my hon. friend has expressed condemnatory of the Act, I would quote opinions which have come from other labour organizations. This Act has been for some years the subject of discussion by the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, in which body are representatives of all the labour organizations; and on each occasion that congress has strongly endorsed this legislation. This congress represents a number of labour unions throughout the Dominion. There is also another association, the Canadian Federation of Labour composed largely of labour unions in the province of Quebec. Not only have these unions endorsed this legislation, but they have asked that it be extended beyond its present scope. At present it is restricted to public utilities, and the Canadian Federation of Labour has asked that it be extended to the boot and shoe industry, and other industries. Again I might quote the views of the railway men. Last year some amendments were made to the Act to meet certain objections of the railway men. At that time I read to the House a communication I had received from representatives of all the railway brotherhoods in this country, and every one of them endorsed the legislation with these amendments added to it. If a census were taken I am quite convinced that, while there might be a few miners in different parts of this country who have never from the outset supported the Act, the overwhelming majority of workingmen in this country strongly endorse it. But I would say to my hon. friend that there are other interests as well as the one particular group to which he is referring, and parliament has to consider every interest. Speaking on behalf of labour I would say with the responsibility I feel in that connection, that I think workingmen do not ask to be especially considered in the matter of any legislation, what they want is the public good, and anything that is contrary to the public good, simply because it appeals to them particularly, I do not think they are pressing for. If my hon. friend looks over the results of this legislation, he will see that it has saved the workingmen of this country several hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars; it has saved to the employers hundreds of thousands of dollars in loss of profits, and has saved the community a great deal of confusion and industrial strife.

Mr. RHODES. I cannot assent to that.

Mr. KING. I will mention one instance, which is well known to many members. Last September in Toronto every one was afraid that the street railway service was going to be held up completely. The exhibition was coming on, and the dispute attracted great attention. Had it not been for this Act there would have been a serious strike at that time.

Mr. BLAIN. How does my hon. friend know?

Mr. KING. Because it was with the greatest possible effort that the parties were restrained, even with this legislation. They had prepared for a strike, and it was only at the very last moment that the board, in virtue of its conciliatory action, were able to get the parties together and bring about an agreement.

Mr. BLAIN. The people up there do not think that.

Mr. KING. I think they do, if my hon. friend understood their views. There has been a case in the last two or three days. We do not hear as much of the disputes that are settled as of the few exceptions where settlements are not effected. Within the last week a strike was threatened on the Canadian Pacific railway, affecting something like 4,000 maintenance-of-way men. A board investigated the matter, went into it very fully, but were unable to agree. The representatives of the men and the chairman filed a majority report, the company's representative filed a minority report, and for a time it seemed as though the company might not accept the award. Had it not been accepted, in all probability the Canadian Pacific railway system would have been tied up with a strike. However, the company took the position taken in regard to most of these boards and said: In the interest of industrial peace we think we should accept the report of the board. I have received from the president of the maintenance of way men, a strong letter, expressing the greatest gratification in regard to that legislation, and saying that they had been able to get fair conditions of employment without having to go out on strike and inconvenience the public. There have been several other cases, and certainly if the Act is to be judged by what it has accomplished on behalf of the public it is entitled to the strongest endorsation.

Mr. RHODES. That is not true in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KING. That may all be. If my hon. friend has anything better to suggest, if he can think of any measure which, on the whole, will help to further industrial peace more effectively than this measure, and will present it to the House, I can promise him that it will receive favourable consideration on this side of the House. I must confess that I think it is impossible for parliament to frame a measure that will absolutely prevent industrial strife. The most that can be hoped for is that some legislation will be passed that will aid in preventing strikes. In no country has an Act been passed that has absolutely stopped strikes. They have tried in New Zealand and Australia, but if you compare the figures it will be seen that the Canadian Act has saved more industrial strikes than theirs. No other country in the world has framed a measure, which, on the whole, has served both labour and capital and the public as well, as the Industrial Disputes Act has served this Dominion, and the best evidence of that is that in other countries they are beginning to copy this legislation, for the simple reason that they feel that while they cannot hope to prevent industrial strikes altogether this act has tended to reduce them in large measure. I would appeal to my hon. friend, particularly when a situation like that in Alberta and British Columbia arises, to co-operate with the government in our endeavour, with what machinery we have, to do the best we can to terminate a situation which, if continued, may prove a very serious injury to the country. We cannot put an end to industrial strife, but we have done a great deal towards reducing it, and if any suggestion can be made whereby the legislation now existing can be made more effective, I can promise my hon. friend I will be only too happy to do all I can to put it on the statute-book. In the absence of anything better I ask from him support to such legislation as has been already framed.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that in New Zealand the compulsory Act is much more effective than any other Act in force, and that taking into account the number of people employed in industrial lines, there have been fewer strikes there than in any other part of the world?

Mr. KING. I have gone pretty carefully into the legislation in New Zealand. From the reports of that government and from special reports we have had from our trade commissioner on the workings of their legislation, there is no question as to the difference between the two measures, if allowance is made for the difference in population of the two countries. Our measure has been infinitely better in suppressing strikes and saving industrial waste. I shall be glad to show my hon. friend a comparative statement. An unbiassed study of the effect of the two measures will show strongly the superiority of the Canadian legislation.

Mr. RHODES. Is the minister not aware that I suggested to his predecessor in office, the present Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) four or five amendments to the Lemieux Act within one month of the time I first entered this parliament, three years ago?

Mr. KING. I regret to say I do not remember my hon. friend having done so. I may have known of it, but if so, it has escaped my memory. I do not recollect his ever having done it. If he submitted any to me, I should be glad to consider them.

Mr. RHODES. You will find them in 'Hansard.'

Mr. BLAIN. I have been listening with great interest to my hon. friend the Minister of Labour. I was anxious to find out what the trouble was in the west, and to

find out whether his legislation, on which he compliments himself so much this afternoon, would reach the trouble. My hon. friend has an important department in this government. I do not wish to say anything at this time that would interfere with a settlement of the trouble in the west, and I do not think any member on either side of the House would wish to do so. We are all anxious to give our support to the hon. gentleman in helping to bring about a settlement of the conflict in western Canada. After all, I think we all feel that what is needed on this occasion is some legislation that will meet cases of this kind.

Mr. KING. Suggest it.

Mr. BLAIN. We have a Labour Department now, a full fledged minister, and we have a 'Labour Gazette' published, and in face of a difficulty of this kind, the best my hon. friend can offer is that he has an Act which will not reach the case. Now he asks me to make a suggestion. Well, I would suppose that a suggestion would come better from the minister himself, who is devoting all his attention to this matter. He is always complimenting himself upon the splendid service he is giving to the labour question in Canada. He knows that is the chief text, in the House and out of the House, and if he was to take that out of his speech this afternoon, there would not be very much left. The other day I asked him whether he was in favour of free labour or organized labour, and his answer was: I stand in the happy position between the two, I am neither in favour of free labour nor am I in favour of organized labour.

Mr. KING. May I ask the hon. gentleman one question? Will he please state to the House which of the two he is in favour of?

Mr. BLAIN. I am debating this question.

Mr. KING. Well, I am asking the question. If the hon. member expects me to give an answer to that question, let him first answer it himself, and I will give him my answer in direct terms.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked the question across the floor of the House a few days ago whether himself and his department were in favour of free labour or organized labour, and his answer was, that he was neither in favour of the one nor the other, in other words, that he had no views on this question at all.

Mr. KING. Assuming that is my answer, what answer does my hon. friend give?

Mr. BLAIN. My complaint is that we have an organized Labour Department of this government, that my hon. friend, with a full staff of officers, and a journal at his disposal, sent all over the country, receiving suggestions on the labour question from every part of Canada, has not yet decided on any policy with regard to this great question. When we ask whether he is in favour of free labour or organized labour, he is not able to answer. Every man knows, no one better than my hon. friend, the Minister of Labour, that, brushing everything aside, every time this question comes up in the House or in the country, whether it be in Nova Scotia, or British Columbia, or Toronto, every man knows full well that in nine cases out of ten the question is whether organized labour shall be recognized or not. That is the great problem that my hon. friend has to meet, and I say he is trifling with it——

Mr. KING. I do not think my hon. friend would be justified in saying that, because I regard the whole question as much too serious.

Mr. BLAIN. I know my hon. friend has taken it seriously. But our complaint is that when a difficulty arises such as we have had in Nova Scotia for many months, his Act does not measure up to it. Now we have a very serious difficulty in western Canada. I agree with my hon. friend it is not a matter that should be trifled with, it is a very important question, and one that was threatening the public for many weeks before the strike took place. I think our past experience clearly shows that we do not require more legislation, but some one who will enforce the legislation we have at the present time. I repeat, however, that the question is whether it is right that Canada should throw its influence upon the side of free labour or upon the side of organized labour. I do not profess to know anything about the question in comparison with what my hon. friend knows, who has travelled in other countries in search of information, who has taken a part in the legislation that has been passed in this House, and who indeed has occupied a foremost position in the supposed settlement that took place between the strikers and the Grand Trunk Railway Company a few months ago. He talked this afternoon about the Canadian Pacific railway. Every time a conflict takes place, or is settled, he points to that and says: Only for this Act in my department having been applied, no man can tell what the conflict would have been, how great the losses would have been. We had a conflict of that kind in the case of the Grand Trunk strike. Every day we read reports in the newspapers that possibly this strike would extend to the Canadian Pacific railway, and that great disasters would befall the interests of this country. I suppose my hon. friend takes

credit for his Act, and will say that because he stepped in, the strike did not reach the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. KING I may say to my hon. friend that the dispute between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and its men was referred under the Act, and the settlement that was made was based on the award given by the board.

Mr. BLAIN. I know all that, everybody knows it. In my opinion, and I think my opinion will be endorsed by the people of this country, if the Labour Department is to be of any service to Canada it must have a policy upon the labour question, it must decide either that it is right for the people of Canada, in their commercial interests, to have organized labour, or that we should have free labour. That is the position after all. I say that if my hon. friend wishes to do something in the interest of the people of Canada, he and his department should have some fixed policy.

Mr. KING. I wish to clear this question up with my hon. friend. He says we should have a policy either for organized labour or for free labour. Does he mean to say that he regards organized labour as other than free? Because if he does, that is a new point of view, and one that will not be appreciated by the working men.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is trifling, he is not serious.

Mr. KING. He is serious. My hon. friend says that the government should have a policy as between organized labour and free labour. I ask him if organized labour is not just as free as any other labour in the country?

Mr. BLAIN. Did anybody suggest putting hobbles around labour because it was organized?

Mr. KING. The workingmen will make their own interpretation.

Mr. BLAIN. I will risk the workingmen. The workingmen have a good many things in their minds about my hon. friend —if he wants to stir that up. The people of this country understand very well the position my hon. friend took in the Grand Trunk strike. My hon. friend is complimenting himself now and again with respect to the important part that he and the Minister of Militia took in the settlement of the question. They came together. The point that overshadowed every other point, in so far as the men were concerned, in that strike, was as to whether or not these men should be taken back by the Grand Trunk Railway Company and reinstated in their positions. That point, more important than all the others, was left out of the agreement altogether, and my hon. friend the Minister of Labour was a party to leaving it out.

Mr. KING. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain), but when he makes a statement of that kind he must know, if he has looked at the facts——

Mr. BLAIN. Is it not correct?

Mr. KING. No, it is not correct, and when the hon. gentleman says that I am a party to something being left out of the agreement and tries to imply that through some action of mine an injustice was done to a certain class of men, am I to sit here and allow his remarks to pass unchallenged? If he will state in any particular that I did anything in connection with the Grand Trunk strike other than what was in the best interests of the parties I will be very glad to hear him.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not the question at all. I make the statement that the one important point in connection with the strike on the Grand Trunk a few months ago was as to whether or not the men should be reinstated in their former positions. My hon. friend was a party to the agreement that was signed. My hon. friend surely will not deny that?

Mr. KING. The agreement was made between the two parties to the controversy.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that.

Mr. KING. Then why does my hon. friend say I was a party to the agreement?

Mr. BLAIN. If my hon. friend does not know I think I can inform him. My hon. friend knows very well that the important point I am referring to was left out. How was it left out? Was it put in the agreement in the interest of the men? Not at all. The agreement does not contain any such statement. How was the question to be settled?—settled just in the way that the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Militia said it should be settled. It was left out entirely.

Mr. KING. The hon. member is absolutely wrong when he makes that statement.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not wrong.

Mr. KING. Absolutely wrong. There was no understanding that either the Minister of Militia or myself should have anything further to do with the controversy one way or the other after the agreement was signed between the parties. There was an understanding as to the meaning of the words 'as soon as possible.'

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. KING. The Grand Trunk Railway Company did not wish to give definite meaning to those words.

Mr. BLAIN. Who was to interpret the meaning of those words?

Mr. KING. No one was to interpret the meaning. The meaning was to be put beyond any possibility of misinterpretation. The Grand Trunk was forced to give a definite meaning to these words and the meaning they gave to them was three months. The Minister of Militia and myself undertook to see that if ever a question should be raised as to the meaning of these words, 'as soon as possible', the interpretation should be given to them that was at that time placed upon them. Although the Grand Trunk did not put it in writing, they gave these words the meaning of three months. That is the position we took, and that is the position I am prepared to take now and prepared to take always.

Mr. BLAIN. Why did not my hon. friend have that embodied in the agreement?

Mr. KING. I will explain to my hon. friend. Possibly if he were more familiar with industrial matters he would not ask this question. In the endeavour to settle a big controversy of this kind the parties naturally have their feelings somewhat aroused, and the Grand Trunk did not wish it to appear before the public that they had been obliged to name a definite time. The men said: All right, if you want to save your face, we do not care about that; we will allow you to put in whatever words you please, present any face you like to the public, but what we want to know is what you mean by the words 'as soon as possible,' and if you tell us what you mean and tell us in the presence of Sir Frederick Borden and Mr. King, we will be perfectly satisfied. The men would not regard the agreement as final until some definite meaning was put upon the words 'as soon as possible.' First they tried to get 'immediately' inserted, but that was out of the question; then the question of one month was talked about and finally three months was accepted. I do not remember just who made the suggestion, but the suggestion was made three months. They thought that if the Grand Trunk was sincere in saying that they were going to take these men back as soon as possible, three months was quite sufficient. The men said: You may put in 'as soon as possible,' but give Sir Frederick Borden and Mr. King that assurance in our presence, and let them stand as vouchers for the fact that the words 'as soon as possible' will mean three months. If the Grand Trunk had put back the men in the form in which they expected, and in the form in which I expected, the public to this day would never have known that these words 'as soon as possible' meant three months.

Mr. KING.

Mr. BLAIN. How did my hon. friend expect the men would be put back?

Mr. KING. I expected they would be put back pretty quickly.

Mr. BLAIN. In their former positions?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. Why did not my hon. friend have that embodied in the agreement?

Mr. KING. I was not drawing the agreement. The agreement was being drawn between the parties. This was a matter of negotiation between the Grand Trunk and certain men who represented the organizations and brotherhoods. They were here from their headquarters in the United States. The negotiation of the agreement occupied the greater part of a day between the Grand Trunk Company and these men and neither the Minister of Militia nor myself suggested one syllable in the agreement. We had not any suggestion to make. the whole matter was discussed by the parties themselves. We were brought into it by that suggestion to which I have just referred and that only. We did not have anything to do with the terms of the agreement. It was not our agreement.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, my hon. friend is always complimenting himself and his department on the fact that they settled the strike and now, when we are discussing it in the House, he declares that they had nothing to do with the settlement.

Mr. KING. No, I do not declare that.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, that is what it must mean.

Mr. KING. It is an entirely different thing to say that I was not a party to the agreement and that I did nothing to bring about the settlement. What I have stated is that the Grand Trunk and the men would never have come to sufficiently close quarters to permit of an agreement being drawn but for the pressure which was brought to bear upon them through the government. They never would have got that far, but for that they would not have had an agreement to the extent to which the agreement went.

Mr. BLAIN. It is only a question of opinion as to that.

Mr. KING. I am quite content that it should remain such.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has not stated one thing but what he stated on the floor of this House some weeks ago when the matter was up for discussion. He is a little roused because I say that the men who were connected with the strike have their own opinion of the Labour Depart-

ment. A few weeks ago I was on the train and a gentleman said to me: What about that matter between the employees of the Grand Trunk and the company? I said: That matter was settled by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Militia, and he replied: We have no faith in those gentlemen. We were disappointed. I am only giving my hon. friend a statement of one man but a very important man. He was not reinstated and he is not in the employ of the company at the present time thus losing his superannuation. However, I am not going to discuss that. I think the Minister of Labour and his department should have a fixed policy as to whether it is in the best interests of the country, of manufacturing concerns and of the people of Canada generally that these men should be banded together in organizations such as they have in some instances now, or whether it would be better in the interest of the public that there should be no organized labour. That after all is the point. Every once in a while we hear of a conflict between employer and employee and in the main, while the parties agree as to wages, the difficulty comes in as to whether the employers will or will not recognize the union. If the Labour Department had a fixed policy on that point; if they said to the people of Canada, whether in their opinion it was better to have free labour or organized labour the people of the country could be guided. But the Minister of Labour will not pronounce himself.

Mr. KING. I entertain the view that organized labour is free labour, and I could not frame a policy which distinguishes between the two.

Mr. BLAIN. That is only a quibble, and no one understands it better than the Minister of Labour. The minister thinks it better to say that the government stands in the position of happy indifference between the two, and so long as the government adopts that attitude they will never be able to settle such disputes as we have in western Canada at present. As soon as the minister and the government have a fixed policy as to whether they are in favour of organized labour or unorganized labour the people of Canada will then decide whether or not the view of the government should receive their support. I shall continue to repeat in this House my view that the department organized for the express purpose of settling these industrial conflicts, should have some fixed policy to submit to the people with regard to them. The records of the department will show that in most cases the conflict is as to whether the employer shall or shall not recognize organized labour, and so long as the minister and the government refuse to adopt a fixed policy on that question so long will there be trouble, between capital and labour.

Mr. SPROULE. In to-day's paper I read:

Prince Rupert, B.C., August 7.—A mob of strikers and a force of police clashed here yesterday and a sanguinary fight followed. Pistols, stones and clubs were freely used, and the rioters were finally subdued. One of the strikers was killed by the police and many were injured on both sides. The situation is serious, and it is feared that further conflicts will follow. Forty arrests have been made.

Has the Industrial Disputes Act been applied to settle this strike? Can the Minister of Labour give any information with regard to it?

Mr. SPEAKER. As the minister has already spoken I trust he will limit his remarks strictly to an answer to the question.

Mr. SPROULE. Personally I am in favour of allowing considerable latitude to a minister when the House requires information.

Mr. SPEAKER. I quite agree with the hon. member in that, but I deem it my duty occasionally to call attention to the fact that an hon. member has no right to speak more than once. The Minister of Labour has spoken quite a number of times, and I thought it advisable to suggest that his remarks be limited to an answer to the question so that further discussion may not arise in regard to it.

Mr. HENDERSON. With the consent of the House, I think the Minister of Labour should answer this question. We will all be pleased to hear what he has to say in reference to a matter of such importance.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not think the Minister of Labour has any desire to answer the question.

Mr. KING. I am entirely ready to answer the question. The substance of the report which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has just read came to the attention of the government to-day for the first time, and the government has taken steps to get full particulars. I judge from the item that the event was something in the nature of a riot which came up suddenly, but I cannot speak with authority on the matter until I get further information.

Mr. GOODEVE. I take exception to the statement of the Minister of Labour that a condition had arisen in the Crowsnest coal strike that was not contemplated by the framers of the Act, in that both parties to this dispute fear a public investigation and appear to have something they desire to keep hidden. I do not think that statement should be allowed to go unchallenged,

particularly as the minister made it much more forcible by coupling that statement with the threat that if after a specified number of days neither party applies to the department for the application of the Act, the government would see that a proper investigation was made. I do not think the inference drawn by the minister is a fair one. I am inclined to believe the view taken by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) is the correct one, namely, that both employers and employed have lost confidence in the Act. Over and over again not only the men, but the employers have stated that in the disputes which have taken place in British Columbia, at all events, they would have done much better had there been no such legislation, I cannot help but believe that the reason why neither party to this dispute has asked for the application of that Act, is on account of that feeling. This is too serious a question to make political capital out of, and I have no desire to do so or to criticise unduly the efforts of the Department of Labour to effect a settlement, but I do say that the minister above all others should be careful not to make use of such an expression as I have called attention to. I think it is an unfair statement, I do not think there is any basis for it, in fact, all the evidence points the other way. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) has called my attention to 'Hansard,' volume 1, 1909, page 660 in which the four amendments to the Act to which he referred are set forth. The first of these amendments suggested by him is that the third arbitrator should be appointed by a judge and not by the department. The unions asked for this particular amendment on the ground that it was desirable that this matter should be absolutely taken out of politics, and I think both sides of the House will agree in the statement made by the minister to-day that there should be no politics in a question of this kind. It was on that ground that I believe the miners of Nova Scotia asked for that particular amendment. The second amendment was that those who had been appointed to settle disputes should be compelled to visit the various works so that they might be made familiar with the conditions which they were endeavouring to settle. It seems to me that was a reasonable amendment. The third was that the fees of the witnesses should be increased. I understand that that has been acted upon.

Mr. KING. I think the allowance to the members of the board has increased, but the witness fees are to be such as prevail in the local courts.

Mr. GOODEVE. The fourth amendment was that they desired to be placed in the same category as a party in a civil case, so that one party could invoke the aid of the Act, and if the second party refused to appear the decision should be in favour of the party appearing. I am not discussing these amendments; I am only calling attention to the fact that they were placed before the House by the hon. member for Cumberland as he stated this afternoon.

Mr. CROSBY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest against the manner in which the Minister of Labour treated the remark of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) about free labour and organized labour. The Minister of Labour is not here for that purpose; he is here for the purpose of advising and giving information on labour matters. He knew that when the hon. member for Peel spoke of free labour, he meant labour free from organization; and yet the minister said, 'I call all labour free labour.' The Minister of Labour claimed that the Labour Department had settled a great many strikes. He takes the credit of having settled every little complication that takes place anywhere in Canada. If so he must surely be responsible for what he has not settled throughout the Dominion, and that amounts to a great deal to-day. We have never had a worse condition among the labouring classes in eastern Canada than we have had since the Lemieux Act came into operation. We have a condition of things in the county of Cumberland that is a disgrace to the Labour Department. After nearly two years of trouble and destitution, a great many workmen there are still out of work, and my hon. friend does not say a word about that. He does not want to take the onus of that trouble; but if any dispute anywhere in Canada has been settled, he takes the credit. We had labour disputes in Canada before the Lemieux Act came into operation and before the Labour Department was established, and many of them were settled satisfactorily by arbitration. I am in favour of the Labour Department, but I want it to be of some benefit to the country. We have never had such strikes or labour troubles in eastern Canada as we have had within the last two years, since the hon. member took the position of Minister of Labour. What has he to say about the condition that prevails at Springhill, or about the condition in the county of Cape Breton, where the dispute has never been settled, but where the men were compelled by coercion to go back to work after suffering great trouble and distress. He does not say that the Labour Department is responsible for that. The Minister of Labour cannot show a case in which the Lemieux Act has been of any advantage to warrant it remaining on the

statute-book. The Minister of Labour says that he is willing to hear suggestions from the hon. member from Cumberland or from any other member for the improvement of the Act or for the better settlement of labour disputes. I have no doubt that the hon. minister has that desire; but if he has, how can he show it better than by putting into effect the suggestions of the hon. member for Cumberland and others who have an intimate knowledge of labour conditions? After the experience we have had in the province of Nova Scotia, that Act cannot be considered by any means to be a perfect Act. We all desire to have a workable Act, and the number of boards that have sat on the Springhill dispute and other disputes that have occurred in Nova Scotia, without bringing about a settlement, must convince us that some amendments to the Act are necessary to bring about a better condition of things than exists to-day.

This Conciliation Act is not acceptable either by the working classes or their employers. Neither side is satisfied with it. What we want is a law which will give justice to all. But the present Act neither protects the workingman nor does it give special advantages to the employer. Under it both stand apart, and there is no way of bringing them together. Its term 'Conciliation Act' is a misnomer. There is no conciliation in it. There is nothing in it to bring about a settlement such as the public generally desire because the public do not desire that our men should be locked out, and the condition of things in Springhill and Cape Breton is nothing else. As my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has said: the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) is an adept at throwing bouquets at himself and eulogizing himself or what he has done; but as a matter of fact there are conditions both in eastern and western Canada which are discreditable to the Labour Department and the minister himself. No effort has been made by the minister or his department to bring about a settlement of the Springhill strike. The only thing which keeps the men out there is their membership of the United Mine Workers' Association, and it is time that the minister should interfere and insist that these men have a perfect right to belong to any chartered organization or any organization which is not a menace to the general public. It is up to the minister to see that these people are taken back and allowed to earn their living, for they have suffered a great deal for the last twenty or twenty-four months.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

WESTERN ALBERTA RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 135) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.

On section 10,

Mr. SPROULE. I have often thought in connection with clauses like this, giving power to put up telephone and telegraph lines, even with the safeguard which is introduced in this case that they must first have the consent of the municipality, that we ought to go further and provide that this shall not be a perpetual right. As long as that company was the user, I would regard it as proper for them to have, and to enjoy that right. But it sometimes happens that a company may amalgamate with another, or sell out a portion of the line, and substitute something else. For instance, a telegraph system may become a telephone system, and still continue to have and enjoy the right of keeping up their poles and their lines, and even of selling out to some one else, and still enjoy that right. I think there ought to be something in these Acts that would make the right null and void once they dispose of it for some other purpose, or because it was not any longer needed to keep up the service for which they obtained the right in the first instance. We have an example of that in our locality at the present time. A telegraph company, many miles in length erected poles between thirty and forty years ago, they used them for many years, and then amalgamated with another company, and now the other company do not require to use them. They have put up a telephone service, but they have sold it to one individual, still keeping their poles standing on the highways with their wires up. Sometimes accidents happen as the result of these poles, which cause the municipalities considerable money in damages to a man who ran against a telegraph pole, and was injured. Yet the municipality have not the right to compel them either to take down these poles, or to take down the wires, or do away with the poles, notwithstanding that the company do not require them themselves, and they are lying idle. I think there ought to be some provision in this Act that the right would revert to the municipality once the original owner had failed to continue to use it.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is considerable in what my hon. friend says. A good many of our roads and streets have been marred, as well as rendered dangerous at times by the numerous telegraph poles and wires. It strikes me it would be a difficult clause to work into an Act of this kind. These rights were given in some cases without the consent of the municipality, a municipality under the old Act did not have anything to say about it. I know in some towns under old charters telegraph companies have the right to go along through shade trees, but in the new Act that has been changed, so that the municipality must give its consent by by-law, and can make any terms it likes in that by-law to govern points that may arise.

Mr. SPROULE. In this case it does not provide 'upon such terms as the municipality may agree upon;' it says they may give their consent by by-law, but without specifying any terms.

Mr. GRAHAM. Could not they make that a portion of their consent, if they give their consent by by-law?

Mr. SPROULE. We would have the same condition that was brought out under the old Bell Telephone Company years ago. The special charter carries with it the right to cross a municipality, and that was construed to mean that a municipality that a municipality must give its consent. Yet the Act containing the right to cross, I think, would be held by the courts to compel the municipality to allow the company to cross. That was the question brought up with the old Bell Telephone Company, and I think it would be in this instance. I do not see where there could be any difficulty in putting in a clause providing that as soon as the company ceases to use the line, they shall take down their wires, and cut down their poles, and let the people have the full use and benefit of the highways as originally.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 159) to change the name of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the British Columbia and White River Railway Company—Mr. Congdon.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 161) to incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.—Mr. Fowke.

Bill (No. 162) respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 163) for the relief of Mary Jane Beatty.—Mr. Congdon.

HUDSON BAY MORTGAGE CORPORATION.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. Knowles.

On the motion that the Bill be referred to the Banking and Commerce committee;

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not understand the rule, but I do not think it is necessary to refer it to the Banking and Commerce committee. The amendments are very trivial. They are taking away from us certain rights, and we have agreed to the amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that it is the request of the government that this Bill be referred back to the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. The amendments proposed are very important; you could not do otherwise.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. E. L. CASH (Mackenzie). Mr. Chairman, in rising to take part in the debate on the question of tariff relations between Canada and the United States, I do so with full confidence that the agreement now pending before the House will be passed as proposed. I lived in the United States for about 25 years and know very well the sentiment of the people in the western part of that country, and it is that the tariff there has become a great burden, that it conduces to the formation of trusts and combines and that it should be very much reduced. I have heard tariff matters discussed here in the House and throughout Canada, and it pleases me very much to know that our people appreciate fully that the tariff is a tax. It is a fact that in collecting this tax it has been very easy to deceive the people as to the amount they are paying. The ordinary man, when he wants to purchase an article, goes to the place where he can buy it cheapest. He does not realize the amount he is paying in the shape of duty when he pays for what he purchases and he does not know the amount that is added to the cost of the article on account of the tariff. The peo-

ple, however, are awakening to the idea that they are very heavily taxed, and also to a realizatien of the fact that a large amount that they are paying on account of the tariff does not go into the coffers of the government, but into the hands of the manufacturer. I do not propose to go into the details with regard to this subject, but I would just say that a farmer who purchases an engine or something of the kind in the United States, and has to pay therefor, we will say, $1,000 in cash, and in addition probably $250 or $300 by way of duty, realizes fully that he is being taxed. He also realizes that he is being taxed when he finds out that in trying to purchase the same piece of machinery in Canada he has to pay the full price that he would have to pay in the United States with the duty added, and in this case he knows that the duty, instead of going into the hands of the government, goes into the hands of the manufacture.

It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to know that the Liberal party are true to the principles of Liberalism, and that their policy has been along the same lines since they came into power. When they came into power they were put up against the National Policy which was then in full swing. The National Policy was conceived not in the interest of Canada, but in the interest of the Tory party. It was conceived with the idea of having the manufacturers come to the assistance of the Conservatives in order to help them to get into power. I have here a quotation from a speech which Sir John A. Macdonald made in Hamilton, in which this aspect of the National Policy is fully brought out. During the speech he was asked what protection he was prepared to give the manufacturers, and his accommodating answer was:

> I cannot tell what protection you require. But let each manufacturer tell us what he wants and we will try to give him what he needs.

This shows very plainly the object of Sir John Macdonald in promulgating the National Policy. I submit, that the changes made by the Liberal government in the tariff have always been made in the right direction and that the government while desirous to aid every industry in Canada and to injure none, is at the same time making an honest effort to protect the consumers from unduly enhanced prices. The present government, in lowering the tariff has aimed at not injuring these industries and at the same time it has given the people who consume manufactured products a chance to obtain them at a fair price. We are aware that the United States has about reached its limit of production. At one time they were large exporters of farm products, but the prospect now is that in a few years it will be necessary for that country to import farm products instead of exporting them. This, I consider, was the main object the United States had in view in coming to Canada with the reciprocity proposals we now have before us. I think it ill becomes our manufacturers who are in the minority in this country, but who have grown rich out of the earnings of the majority, to object to those who have to purchase their high priced products, obtaining in turn a fair price for their products. I do not wish to go into the general question of reciprocity in detail but I might for a few minutes dwell on it from the point of view in which it affects my constituency. Before doing so, as there was a great demand last evening from our friends opposite for information, I wish to place on record a comparison of the prices of grain in Winnipeg and Minneapolis, as well as some other points in Dakota, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. If I am permitted to do as the hon, member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), did last night I will place it on 'Hansard' without reading it. It is information which was presented to the American Congress by the Hon. Mr. Hanna, congressman for North Dakota, who was opposed to this arrangement and made a speech against it. In this statement, I would particularly wish to call attention to the comparison of the prices at Portal and North Portal; North Portal being on the Canadian side and Portal being on the American side, and the price of wheat in North Portal was 75 cents, and in Portal it was 86 cents. I would like an opportunity of placing this on 'Hansard,' as I think it would be interesting to the House and to the people of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a word with reference to this practice because it is capable of leading to great abuse if it is allowed. I speak with a little hesitancy because I am told that last night an hon. member was permitted to place on 'Hansard' a paper something like this. That is exactly how the custom grew up in the House of Representatives at Washington some years ago and which resulted in loading up the Congressional record with a great many papers. A few figures at the beginning were read, there was no opportunity to verify whether they came from official or reliable sources or not, and they were printed and afterwards regarded as official. I have always thought ministers of the Crown might be allowed considerable latitude in placing these tables on record, for instance the Minister of Finance in his budget speech, but I never thought it would be a good plan to allow

private members of the House the same privilege to any great extent. Sometimes you may have a short paper handed to 'Hansard' and at other times it may be very lengthy, and judging by the paper the hon. gentleman has in his hand it seems to be of considerable length.

Mr CASH. It is only one page of the Congressional Record.

Mr. SPROULE. What figures are they?

Mr. CASH. They are figures quoted in a speech by Congressman Hanna, of Dakota, and furnished by the collector of customs at Pembina. It is interesting information. If the House prefers I should read it I shall do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Personally I prefer the paper should be read because of the great evil that may be the outcome of this practice.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is said that if a man lives long enough he will be on every side of every question. Last night considerable time of the House was occupied by the member from Grenville reading a long statement.

Mr. LAKE. These were official figures.

Mr. GRAHAM. They were figures compiled for the hon. member for Grenville, but half of them or more were figures taken from statistics of other countries.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know?

Mr. GRAHAM. Because the member for Grenville stated so and I am prepared to take his word. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), that the practice is a very bad one, but in this debate many figures are being introduced and statistics are taken from different sources, and now that we have started it I do not know that we had better discontinue it so far as the reciprocity question is concerned. I admit that the practice could be very much abused. I believe that in the United States a whole volume of Henry George was placed on the Congressional Record in this way.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the very point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax), I think the rule decided on so far in this debate is that after a member reads for an hour and a quarter he can have the balance of the documents placed on 'Hansard.' After the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cash), has read for an hour and a quarter I shall be quite content that the remainder be published in 'Hansard.'

Mr. CASH. What is your ruling, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Chairman is not empowered to give any ruling in this matter other than to mention that the custom is that 'Hansard' will report merely what is read or spoken, and without the unanimous consent of the House I think 'Hansard' would not feel itself justified in printing anything that had not been read. The expression of feeling is rather antagonistic to granting the hon. member the privilege he asks for.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The practice has been established for this week of allowing these documents to be printed without being read, and I should think it might continue for the last day of the week, and that we might commence another practice next week.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member had better read the document; it will be a precedent.

Mr. CASH. Then, I will read it. It is contained in a speech of the Hon. Louis B Hanna, of North Dakota, in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 14, 1911:

> Official figures show what protection does—Differences in prices of grain shown by official figures—Figures furnished by Collector of Customs at Pembina—Towns compared are located in same territory.

Now that the Canadian reciprocity treaty is an issue before the people of the nation and especially to the business and farming interests of the Northwest, by reason of the fact that by the terms of the proposed agreement between the United States and Canada, grains are put on the free list. A comparative table of actual conditions as to prices on three of the great staples—wheat, flax, and barley—is of interest. The following figures speak for themselves, and were furnished by the collector of customs at Pembina for the use of our congressional delegation at Washington. The tables are quite interesting, and show the prices in the United States and in Canada, the first being this side of the boundary and the second in Manitoba, and in most every instance with less than a mile separating the stations. It would seem as if there might be considerable force in the action of the North Dakota legislative assembly in their action in protesting against the removal of the duty on our farm products.

WHEAT.

Prices paid for week ending December 31, 1910:

United States—		Canada—	
Pembina	89-91	Emerson	79-81
Neche	91	Gretna	81
Hannah	90	Haskett	78-79
Walhalla	89-91	Snowflake	77
Sarles	89½	Crystal City	76
Hansboro	90	Cartwright	77-79
St. John	90	Boissevain	80
Antler	91	Lyleton	78
Portal	86	North Portal	75
Kermit	88	Estevan	74
Souris	93	Waskada	77

Prices paid January 10, 1911:

United States—		Canada—	
Pembina	97	Emerson	82
Neche	96	Gretna	81
Walhalla	97	Haskett	82

BARLEY.

Prices paid January 9, 10, and 11, 1911:

United States—		Canada—	
Pembina	67	Emmerson	42
Neche	68, 66, 67	Gretna	37, 38, 38
Hannah	64	Crystal City	38, 38, 38
Sarles	64, 65, 65	Cartwright	36, 36, 36
Hansboro	67, 65, 66	Boissevain	40, 40, 40
St. John	68, 66, 67	Lyleton	40, 40, 40
Antler	66, 64, 65	North Portal	35, 35, 35
Portal	63, 63, 63		
Kermit	55, 55, 55		

FLAX.

Prices paid January 9, 10, and 11, 1911:

United States—		Canada—	
Pembina	2.32	Emerson	1.93, 1.93, 1.93
Neche	2.32, 2.26, 2.26	Gretna	2.26, 2.26, 2.26
Walhalla	2.35, 2.25, 2.32	Haskett	2.03, 2.03, 2.08
Hannah	2.42, 2.42, 2.42	Crystal City	2.10, 2.10, 2.07
Sarles	2.34, 2.31, 2.31	Cartwright	2.00, 2.00, 2.00
Hansboro	2.31, 2.24, 2.31	Boissevain	2.14, 2.12, 2.17
St. John	2.32, 2.35, 2.32	Lyleton	2.23, 2.17, 2.22
Antler	2.30, 2.23, 2.30	North Portal	1.89, 1.89, 1.89
Portal	2.33, 2.33, 2.33		
Kermit	2.39, 2.23, 2.23		

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Are the grades of the different grains given?

Mr. CASH. Nothing is said about grades, but the towns compared are in the same territory.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If there are no grades mentioned, you cannot tell the difference in value.

Mr. CASH. Now, I will give you a comparison of closing prices at Winnipeg and Minneapolis on the same dates, with the difference in prices:

COMPARISON OF CLOSING PRICES AT WINNIPEG AND MINNEAPOLIS.

Date.	Winnipeg closing price.	Minneapolis closing price.	Over or under.
1909.			
July 10	131⅞	130⅝	1¼
July 17	121⅜	131⅞	½
July 24	125	126¼	1¼
July 31	119	132	13
Aug. 9	112	128	16
Aug. 14	110	143	33
Aug. 21	111	132½	21½
Aug. 28	97	99⅝	2⅝
Sept. 4	97	99¼	2¼

COMPARISON OF CLOSING PRICES AT WINNIPEG AND MINNEAPOLIS—*Con*

Date.	Winnipeg closing price.	Minneapolis closing price.	Over or under.
Sept. 11	98 1/8	99 1/4	1 1/8
Sept. 18	98	98 5/8	5/8
Sept. 25	94 5/8	100 1/8	5 1/2
Oct. 2	95 5/8	100 1/8	5 1/2
Oct. 9	97 1/8	101 1/8	4
Oct. 16	98 1/2	105 1/2	7
Oct. 23	96 1/2	104 7/8	8 3/8
Oct. 30	97 5/8	105 1/8	7 1/2
Nov. 6	97	102 3/4	5 3/4
Nov. 13	97 5/8	106 1/4	8 5/8
Nov. 20	98 1/8	105 5/8	7 1/4
Nov. 27	99 3/4	105 3/4	6
Dec. 4	95	106 1/8	11 1/8
Dec. 11	96 3/4	112 3/4	16
Dec. 18	102 3/4	114 7/8	12 1/8
Dec. 25	(2)	....	...
1910.			
Jan. 1	(2)	....	...
Jan. 8	105	115 5/8	10 5/8
Jan. 15	103 1/2	113 1/8	9 7/8
Jan. 22	103 5/8	114 3/8	10 3/4
Jan. 29	103 3/4	113 3/4	10
Feb. 5	101 1/2	110 3/4	9 1/4
Feb. 12	102	(2)	...
Feb. 19	102 3/4	115	12 1/4
Feb. 26	103	114 5/8	11 5/8
Mar. 5	102 3/4	112 7/8	10 1/8
Mar. 12	104 1/4	114 1/2	10 1/4
Mar. 19	105 1/4	113 7/8	8 5/8
Mar. 26	105 1/8	115 3/4	10 5/8
Apr. 2	105 3/8	114 3/4	9 3/8
Apr. 9	104 3/4	113 1/4	8 1/2
Apr. 16	101 5/8	108 3/8	6 3/4
Apr. 23	101 1/4	111	9 3/4
Apr. 30	98 1/2	109 1/8	10 5/8
May 7	(2)	113 3/4	...
May 14	98 1/2	112 1/8	13 5/8
May 21	94 1/4	109 5/8	15 3/8
May 28	88 1/2	104 1/4	15 3/4
June 4	88 3/4	105 7/8	17 1/8
June 11	89 1/2	105	15 1/2
June 18	91 1/2	106 5/8	15 1/8
June 25	95 3/4	112	16 1/4
July 2	(2)	(2)	...
July 9	108	120 1/4	12 1/4
July 16	116 1/2	130	12 1/2
July 23	116 1/2	126	9 1/2
July 30	108 1/4	120 1/2	12 1/4
Aug. 6	108 1/4	120 1/2	12 1/4
Aug. 13	111 1/4	114 1/2	1 1/4
Aug. 20	106 5/8	110 1/2	3 7/8
Aug. 27	108 3/4	112 7/8	4 1/8
Sept. 3	105 1/2	112 3/4	7 1/4
Sept. 10	102	111 1/8	9 1/8
Sept. 14	100	111 1/4	11 1/4
Sept. 24	101	112 1/8	11 1/8
Oct. 1	98 3/8	109 3/4	11 3/8
Oct. 9	99	111 7/8	12 7/8
Oct. 15	97	107 3/4	10 3/4
Oct. 22	94 3/4	104 1/4	9 1/2
Oct. 29	91 3/4	102 3/4	11
Nov. 5	90 1/2	101 7/8	11 3/8
Nov. 12	91 5/8	103 5/8	12
Nov. 19	94 3/8	104 7/8	10 1/2
Nov. 26	92 1/2	102 1/4	9 3/4
Dec. 3	91	104 7/8	13 7/8
Dec. 10	89 1/2	101 3/4	12 1/4
Dec. 17	90 1/4	101 5/8	11 3/8
Dec. 24	(2)	103 1/2	...
Dec. 31	91 1/4	103 7/8	12 5/8

Mr. CASH.

COMPARISON OF CLOSING PRICES AT WINNIPEG AND MINNEAPOLIS—*Con.*

Date.	Winnipeg closing price.	Minneapolis closing price.	Over or under.
1911.			
Jan. 7	93 1/2	108 1/8	14 5/8
Jan. 14	95 1/2	108 1/4	12 3/8
Jan. 21	94 1/4	104 3/8	10 1/8
Jan. 28	94 1/2	103 5/8	9 1/8

[1] The day cited in each case is Saturday.

[2] Holiday.

Average, a fraction over 10½ cents, Minneapolis and Winnipeg price.

My particular object in reading this statement was to have hon. members opposite in particular understand why we in the west are so much in favour of reciprocity. The free interchange of natural products is a matter which affects us very materially. If I had the reports I would have been pleased to show you the prices of cattle in Montreal and Chicago or Montreal and Toronto, so that you might see what advantage it would be to us to have free access to the American market.

I now propose to take up the question which affects more particularly my own constituency, and in order to do so effectively, I find it necessary to give you a very brief history of the Mackenzie district. The total area of the district is 5,300,000 acres, at least 75 per cent of which is suitable for grain cultivation, giving a total tract suitable for growing grain of some 4,000,000 acres. In my constituency the chief interest is the growing of grain. The town of Yorkton, the commercial capital of my district, and also, I may say, of the northeast part of Saskatchewan, has a total elevator capacity of 320,000 bushels, and ranks second only to the town of Indian Head in that respect. Indian Head exceeds Yorkton in elevator capacity by some 7,000 bushels.

In the year 1909 we had areas under grain as follows:

	Acres.
Oats	225,150
Wheat	89,900
Barley	32,600

I have not the figures for 1910, but those of 1909 will serve for the purpose of my argument. We raise abundant crops of these grains in Mackenzie, and I think I am safe in allowing for the yields of the different grains per acre. For oats, 50 bushels; for wheat, 25 bushels; for barley, 40 bushels, which from the acreage figures I have given for 1909 would show results as follows: Oats, 11,255,000 bushels; wheat, 2, 247,500 bushels; barley, 1,304,000 bushels; total, 14,806,500 bushels.

These are large figures, but consider the possible expansion. The four million acres I claim as capable of grain production, if producing to the full and in the same proportion, would produce totals as follows: Oats, 128,000,000 bushels; wheat, 26,000,000 bushels; barley, 16,000,000 bushels; total, 170,000,000 bushels for my constituency alone.

I, as representing Mackenzie, ask, how can our grain production be increased in accordance with the figures I have given, which are for oats and wheat, ten-fold, and for barley, thirteen-fold.

In other words, how can my constituency be encouraged to reach its reasonable maximum of production in its best products?

The subject of wheat and the favourable effect of this agreement in stimulating its production on the prairie has been dealt with by my hon. friend from Humboldt and other speakers. I want to say a word about oats and barley. Large portions of the Canadian west are peculiarly adapted for the growth of these cereals. The true prairie perhaps produces the finest wheat, but the park country, where the prairie alternates with clumps of trees, with its rich soil, seems peculiarly adapted for the growth of oats and barley. With the high quality of those grains produced in our northern climate, an advantage, let it be remembered, that can be claimed for nearly all our agricultural products, and for the same reason can there be any doubt that a constant and increasing demand in the American market of 92,000,000 people, is a certainty. A few days ago the announcement was made that the highest award, being a trophy of the value of $1,500, had been awarded at the National Corn Exposition at Columbus, Ohio, to a grain-grower, a Barr colonist from near Lloydminster, Saskatchewan, in competition with the world, for oats grown on his own land. This is no surprise to western people. We know that in quality and yield of oats we lead, and I can assert confidently that these prize oats from Lloydminster can be duplicated in my own constituency by many of our farmers, and in almost any year. Last year at the exhibition in connection with the Dry Farming Congress at Spokane, the province of Alberta swept all the highest awards, including those for oats and barley, in competition with exhibits from all over the United States, and as in the case of the Lloydminster oats, I assert that what the Alberta exhibit did last year in oats and barley can be done by many farmers in my own constituency.

I would just remark, in speaking of the average quantity of grain per acre raised in my constituency, and of what are the possibilities there in that connection, that while we have a great many very good farmers there, we also have a considerable number from central Europe and other points who are rather inferior, who are not well up in our methods of cultivation. This necessarily pulls down to some extent the average, but even with this drawback, our average, according to the 'Free Press' report, was 65 bushels of oats per acre.

What is the use of opponents of this agreement talking to the farmers of Mackenzie about the beauties of interprovincial trade? If we western farmers look to see our production of oats and barley increased by shipping to other provinces, we find we are up against the long railway haul and the following figures of production in these grains for the eastern provinces and which are the figures for 1910, given me by the Census and Statistical Bureau:

OATS AND BARLEY PRODUCTION FOR 1910 OF CERTAIN PROVINCES.

	Oats. Bushels.	Barley. Bushels.
Ontario	128,917,000	20,727,000
Quebec	48,927,000	2,547,000
New Brunswick	6,351,000	73,000
Nova Scotia	5,723,000	264,000
Prince Edward Island	6,778,000	159,600
Totals	196,696,000	23,770,600

Flax is another production of the Canadian west which is capable of enormous expansion in production. In my own constituency the production is at present very small, perhaps 2,000 or 2,500 acres under flax last year, and production, say, 50,000 bushels. Owing to a short crop in the United States in 1910, high prices were received for our western flax, the price ranging from $2 to $2.40 per bushel. The total product of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1910 was 3,802,000 bushels, of which 90 per cent was raised in my province, Saskatchewan.

The export of flax to the United States in the first eight months of the fiscal year 1910-11 was $2,321,000, and this against a duty of 25 cents per bushel.

Flax is easily first among our exports of grain products to the United States. From the Trade and Navigation returns for the eight months referred to, I have taken the following figures for the purpose of comparison.

Exported to the United States for the first eight months of the fiscal year 1910-11:

Flax	$2,321,000
Barley	25,246
Beans	32,540
Oats	15,565
Pease	132,562
Rye	541
Wheat	81,395
Split pease	24,622
Hay	614,041
Potatoes	18,195

It is not necessary to take time to follow the same line of argument with respect to cattle and their products.

The natural feed of the western prairies produces the very finest cattle and the enlarged market is certain to enormously stimulate production. I have claimed 75 per cent of the area of my constituency to be suitable for grain production, and that this is a conservative estimate, but in respect of area suitable for the growth of cattle no deduction is necessary, for the land is all good for such purpose and the feed of the very best.

The argument I have endeavoured to make for my own constituency applies with equal force to every constituency in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and to the great undeveloped districts north of the present settled areas in those provinces.

The area surveyed at this date, that is the known area of agricultural lands (for the surveys are only carried on as settlement demands and where the land is suitable for settlement), is 150,000,000 acres. To this can be added for the area in the north, yet unsurveyed, but suitable for agriculture, at least 40,000,000 acres. Total, 190,000,000 acres. Reducing this by one half would surely leave a residue of land upon which it would be safe to make some calculations for the future. Ninety-five million acres, if devoted exclusively to oats and yielding 40 bushels to the acre, would produce 3,840,000,000 bushels; or if exclusively to wheat at 25 bushels to the acre, 2,375,000,000 bushels; or in barley at 30 bushels to the acre, 2,850,000,000 bushels.

I would not attempt to claim that any of these enormous totals will ever be reached in any one grain, but the figures can be very much scaled down and still show imposing totals, totals which force the conclusion that the development of grain production is the necessary policy for our true progress.

The representative from the west can, therefore, feel no doubt that new and rapidly growing markets are both desirable and necessary if his part of the Dominion is going to prosper as it should and in voting for this measure he is but doing his duty to his constituency and to his part of Canada.

Now, if this measure means far greater prosperity for my constituents and for the western prairies generally, is that inconsistent with the welfare of Canada? Are we not by our increase of prosperity going to become better buyers and consume far more goods? and certainly in my constituency we will be content to confine our attention to agriculture and let the manufacturer of eastern Canada have the full share he can show he is entitled to in supplying our needs.

I prefer to stand on the argument I have made for my own constituency and for the part of Canada in which I live and leave to others from the other provinces the discussion of the effect on their particular interests. I may be permitted, however, to refer to two items affecting the eastern provinces, and especially the maritime provinces, viz., hay and potatoes. In 1910 there was produced in the eastern provinces as follows:

PRODUCTION OF HAY AND POTATOES IN CERTAIN PROVINCES IN THE YEAR 1910.

Provinces.	Hay. Tons.	Potatoes. Bushels.
Ontario..	6,749,000	26,163,000
Quebec..	5,502,000	21 271,000
New Brunswick..	1,261,000	7,486,000
Nova Scotia..	1,284,000	6,432,000
Prince Edward Island..	495,000	4,915,000
Totals..	15,291,000	66,267,000

In potatoes I find that there were exported to Cuba in the first eight months of the present fiscal year a total of $387,692 worth, while to the whole of the United States was exported in the same period, as I have already pointed out, only $12,195 worth. Surely the remission of 25 cents per bushel duty will give the eastern farmer a more advantageous market for his potatoes than carrying them all the way to Cuba.

In the matter of hay it is well known hay was being carried by rail last fall from Quebec all the way to Vancouver, and I am told that a freight charge of $15 was paid. This is interprovincial trade and perhaps is so far satisfactory, but when we find that last year we exported $614,041 worth of hay to the United States from Canada, and that against a duty of $4 per ton, and that hay is now to be made free, I think the eastern farmer can be excused if he looks forward with satisfaction to greatly increased production in hay as the result of the opening of near-by markets.

There is still another feature of the case that I would like to refer to, and that is the importation into Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan of horses. The number of horses entered for consumption into the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1910, was as follows:

	No.	Value.
Manitoba..	575	$ 54,970
Alberta..	1,297	89 846
Saskatchewan..	3,486	113,632

Also the importation into British Columbia of fruits. The quantity and value of the undermentioned fruit and vegetables entered for consumption in the province of British Columbia during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1910, was as follows:

Fruits and Vegetables.	Unit of Quantity.	Quality.	Value.
Apples, green..	..Brls.	28,103	$138,599
Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries, &c..	..Lbs.	332 656	34,365
Cherries..	..Lbs.	113 689	13,805
Cranberries..	..Bush.	2,183	6,331
Currants..	..Lbs.	25	2
Grapes..	..Lbs.	532,536	31,808
Peaches..	..Lbs.	706,460	31,571
Plums..	..Bush.	7,803	22,374
Quinces, apricots, pears..	Lbs.	657,086	28 223
Nectarines..		.....	$ 132
All other green fruits, N.O.P., ...		.....	.....

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend permit me a question? Has he any figures showing the number of horses going west from Ontario?

Mr. CASH. I have not, such a trade would be interprovincial, and I am figuring on the trade between the United States and the prairie provinces. There are many horses going from Ontario to the west, but as a rule they are not the best horses, they are often decrepid in some shape or other, some wind trouble, or something of that kind. I think the greater number of our horses come from the United States, and these also are not the best horses. Our best horses I think are raised in the province.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that an estimate has been given that last year there were 20,000 horses went from Ontario to western Canada.

Mr. CASH (reading):

Vegetables, viz.	Unit of Quantity.	Quantity	Value.
Melons..	..No.	160,736	$ 13,493
Potatoes..	..Bush.	58,094	44,202
Potatoes, sweet & yams.	Bush.	7,389	6,846
Tomatoes, fresh..	Bush.	3,389	8,864
Vegetables, N.O.P.. .. $		.....	110,938
			$491,493

Now while the importation of these articles may affect a few individuals, who are raising horses, or raising fruit, yet the number affected in this way is so small compared with those who will be benefited, and who will rejoice at the idea of having horses and fruit free, that I think the positive benefit secured by the multitude far exceeds the injury which is anticipated by the horse raiser or the fruit grower. Now then let us take a simultaneous conspectus of the whole situation. Great Britain has a revenue of over one billion two hundred million dollars ($1,200,000,000), and has placed a serious and unreasonable embargo upon one of our most important industries. I refer to our cattle. Canada, on the other hand, has granted to Great Britain a preference in her tariff, and I think we can let the matter rest there, as showing what Canada is willing to do for Great Britain. Now let me give the United States production in 1909, and I call attention to this, because it emphasizes what I said in the early part of my remarks, as to the ultimate end of production for export in the United States:

UNITED STATES PRODUCTION IN 1909.

	Bushels.
Wheat..	713,286 923
Oats..	923,984,609
Barley..	173,210,916

This means 8 bushels wheat per head, 10 bushels oats per head, and 2 bushels barley per head.

CANADA PRODUCED IN 1909.

	Bushels.
Wheat..	166,752,540
Oats..	353 451 648
Barley..	55,377,626

This means 21 bushels wheat per head, 44 bushels oats per head, and 7 bushels barley per head.

Now should we not take advantage of the offer in these negotiations with our neighbours to the south, and develop our natural resources to their utmost, thus increasing our value to them and their value to us from a strictly business view point? We still retain the idea that we have an advantage on our side, that our system of government is more desirable; that our laws are better and better administered; that our stamp of manhood and of citizenship is of a little higher order. I see no reason, therefore, why we should not trade with these people, when it is evidently to the advantage of both to do so, or with any other country on fair terms, helping them and benefiting ourselves, but continuing to be as in the past:

'Daughter in my mother's house, but, Mistress in my own.'

Mr. C. JAMESON (Digby). The importance of these resolutions before the House cannot be overestimated by any person. I think there is a very general feeling throughout Canada that we would like to see better trade relations with every nation under the sun. But while we take that view, we also take the view that any trade relations which are established for Canada should constitute a good bargain for this country. Now, the outstanding features of the agreement between Canada and the United States, which the government is asking us to endorse, is that, while it takes the form of legislation, and while it claims the merits of legislation, which in the light of better information can be amended yet as a matter of fact these resolutions are like the laws of the Medes and Persians that alter not, because they must be adopted in their present form, and in no other form can they be adopted. I think the arrangement which

has been made involves the payment of too high a price for the advantages which are to accrue to this country, and it is making the farmers and fishermen, the producers generally, pay that price. Now, I was somewhat interested to hear a remark which the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) just made. Referring to the manufacturers he said they were complaining of this agreement, and he does not see why they should complain. He went on to say that the National Policy was conceived by the Tory party for the benefit of the manufacturers, and that Sir John A. Macdonald once said to the manufacturers: Let us know what you want, and we will give you what you need. The hon. member seemed to think that was rather a bad policy, but I think that if the policy of the Conservative party at that time was not to give the manufacturers what they wanted, but what they needed, it was a very good policy, indeed. It was a statesmanlike policy, and it was a policy which, from that day down to the people of this country.

But why are the manufacturers complaining to-day? Some one says: We are not touching them, why are they complaining? The reason is obvious. The manufacturers knew very well, as sensible business men, that they cannot prosper unless the farmers and fishermen prosper, and they know that this arrangement which the government has made and proposes to force through this House, is going to injure the farmers and fishermen, and consequently it is going to injure the manufacturers. Now, what is the policy of the present administration with regard to the manufacturers? We all remember seeing within the last few days a very important declaration made by the right hon. the Prime Minister with regard to the manufacturers. Telegraphing to one of his friends in the city of Toronto, he said: We have not hurt the manufacturers, and we shall not do so.

That is the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister for the purpose of placating the manufacturers. But he misapprehends the position altogether. The manufacturers are not complaining against the arrangement by reason of the fact that they are hurt, but because the producers of this country are hurt, and because without their prosperity there can be no prosperity for them, the manufacturers.

During the course of the discussion which has taken place in this House there has been considerable reference made to the late reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States, which was in force between 1854 and 1866. In this connection I would say that recently a letter appeared in the Halifax 'Chronicle,' the foremost Liberal organ in Nova Scotia, over the signature of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), in which he gave his reasons for supporting this trade pact. One of the reasons which he gave for his support of this arrangement was that, inasmuch as the reciprocity treaty of 1854-1866 was a great benefit to the country, and inasmuch as he thought the conditions were the same to-day, and similar benefits would follow another treaty of this character, he would support it. I wish to point out that there are many differences between the conditions which existed then and the conditions which exist to-day. In the first place, in 1854, the Crimean war broke out and raged until 1856. During those years, and for some time thereafter, the prices of all commodities in this country were very high. Wheat sold in Canada for over $2 per bushel. In 1861 the civil war broke out between the northern and southern states, and lasted until 1865. During the progress of that war the prices of farm commodities were tremendously enhanced. Five million men were withdrawn from peaceful avocations; production in the United States declined; there was a false condition of affairs, and, as a result of the war, and of the reduction in production in the United States, the prices of the various commodities rose to the very highest limit. It was not unnatural that Canada, having trade relations with the United States at that time, which were very satisfactory, should reap a very great advantage, and undoubtedly a very great advantage did accrue because of the fact that we found a ready market for everything we had to sell in the United States, while they had so small a production they did not hurt our home market.

But, Sir, there are differences between our condition then and to-day in regard not only to the state of the markets but also in regard to the markets which we enjoyed. In 1854, for example, we had no west and in 1871 we had secured the west but we had no railway to that country. In 1891, when there were some further negotiations towards reciprocity with the United States, we had a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but we had no market in the west, because the population there was comparatively trifling. In 1897, when there was a further looking to Washington, on the part of this administration, we had very little market in the west. The branch lines were just beginning to creep out over the prairies, and follow the settlers into those great regions.

But, in 1911, we stand in an entirely different position. We have one transcontinental railway in operation from sea to sea, we have two in course of construction; the western country is gridironed with branch lines, and this parliament every year is granting charters for the construction of thousands of miles more of railway into

that country, settlers are pouring in; the market is very much improved in a diversity of ways, and transportation is cheaper and more rapid. In those earlier days, too, we were more of an agricultural and fishing country, and less of a manufacturing country, and consequently we had at that time more products that we could market, and we consumed less within ourselves. To-day, things are somewhat different. Under the National Policy manufactures have sprung up in this country and Canada is now consuming 85 per cent of her farm products. Eighty-five per cent of the remainder finds a quick and profitable market in Great Britain, and altogether there is no similarity in conditions between those days to which I have alluded and the present time.

England is also as near relatively to-day, with modern systems of transportation, as the United States was during the reciprocity treaty of 1854-66. Again, in 1897, this government placed upon the statute-books in this country that piece of legislation which is known as the British preference. They have very frequently referred to that as the crowning credit of the Liberal administration. They have pointed it out and said: Look at what the British preference has done for Canada, and look at what Canada, by the British preference has done for the mother country. They point to the imports and exports. In 1897 the imports from Great Britain into Canada amounted to $29,401,000, and in 1910 they amounted to $95,336,000. In 1897 the exports from Canada to Great Britain amounted to $77,227,000 and in 1910 to $149,630,000. That is the condition which has developed as the result of the British preference.

There is a further difference between those bygone days, when the reciprocity treaty was in force, and when thereafter reciprocity was sought and the present time, and that is the fact that when we open our markets under this agreement to the United States, we have to meet the competition of those favoured nations which have, within the last fifteen years, become great exporters of the very products which we have to sell. Transportation also has changed to such an extent that they are able to place within our markets all they have to sell in the primest condition. With the assistance of refrigeration they can ship their meats and other products of that character and lay them down in this country in competition with what the producers of Canada have to market. Under this pact the following countries will get the same terms in the Canadian market as will be accorded to the United States. I place this statement on 'Hansard' because I think it very desirable that the people of this country, from one side of it to the other, should know just exactly what the situation will be:

Argentine Republic, Australia, Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela; all these countries come in automatically under the favoured nation clause of their treaty by the granting of these concessions to the United States. But, by the resolutions which are before the House the same privileges are to be extended also to the United Kingdom, and the several British colonies and possessions including of course, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. It will be readily seen that with competition such as that, the position of the matter will be entirely different from what it would be if we were merely opening the Canadian market to the American exporter. It is well that the people of Canada should have a proper appreciation of the condition of affairs in view of the fact that they are going to meet with this very great competition in their own market. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), in the letter to which I have alluded, stated that reciprocity was a problem which the statesmen of this country had been endeavouring to solve for the last forty years. I take issue with him there; I do not think the facts will bear out that statement. My hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) is a very ardent supporter of the right hon. the Prime Minister, and the right hon. gentleman has not within the last ten years been seeking reciprocity with the United States. In fact the right hon. gentleman has openly declared himself against it, and thrice have the people of this country endorsed him in that declaration. In the year 1899 the right hon. gentleman said on the floor of this House:

> If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling of Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with the hon. gentleman himself, would have given many things to obtain the American market. There was a time not long ago when the market of the great cities of the Union was the only market we had for many of our products but thank Heaven these days are past and over. We are not dependent upon the American market as we were at one time.

This was the declaration of the right hon. gentleman made in this House, and to the people of Canada in the year 1899, and he has received threefold approval of it from the electorate of the Dominion, in the years 1900, 1904 and 1908, and yet the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) would say that the statesmen of Canada have been for forty years endeavouring to solve the problem of reciprocity with the United States. Now, why are we met with such a change of policy on the part of

the right hon. the Prime Minister; why this reversal of the policy which he announced in 1899, and to which—because when he alluded to the British preference he was alluding practically to this new non-reciprocity policy—to which he afterwards pointed with every degree of pride. I think, Sir, that the reason is that the right hon. gentleman has been seeking some means to cover up and cloak the naval issue in this country. I believe, Sir, that if it were not for the unpopular naval policy of the right hon. gentleman and his government we would never have had these reciprocity resolutions placed before the House. But, Sir, I say this: That I believe the right hon. gentleman in exchanging the naval policy for the policy of reciprocity will learn, it may be too late for himself, that he has merely swapped his Satanic Majesty for a Witch. And, when the right hon. gentleman and his government have been asked to consult the people on this question, the Minister of Finance rises in his place and on behalf of the government answers: Canada's honour is pledged to give legislative effect to this agreement. To whom is Canada's honour pledged? Why to the United States. But is not the honour of the right hon. the Prime Minister pledged to the House and to this country? The right hon. gentleman at the opening of the present session of this parliament standing in his place in this House stated to the people of Canada that there would be no revision of the tariff without a thorough investigation, and he hinted also that a tariff commission would be appointed in order that the investigation would be most thorough, most systematic, and most complete. Why should the right hon. gentleman sacrifice this solemn pledge to the parliament and people of Canada? If the United States can induce or compel the right hon. gentleman to break faith with the people of this country now, what can they not do if they get us tied up and involved in this reciprocity agreement. The Prime Minister derides the suggestion: Let well enough alone, but why should he not let well enough alone until after he had investigated. The right hon. gentleman exclaims: Is this China or is it Canada? Well, from the manner in which he has been acting throughout in regard to this trade pact one would almost think he had concluded that this country was China, because he acts just as some Chinese dictator would act, the difference being that if this were China—fortunately for the right hon. gentleman it is not—and if the right hon. gentleman had acted in China as he has acted in Canada the chances are that he would lose his material head, whereas as it is, it is only his official head that will fall into the basket; a fact about which I have no doubt whatever. Now, what has this reciprocity policy of his cost the right hon. gentleman already? It has cost him, we know, the support of three of his most able followers in parliament. It has cost him the support of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), and of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris), each one of whom arose in his place, and in the presence and hearing of the Prime Minister denounced this pact in no unmeasured terms. And, there are others sitting on that side of the House whom we know to be wavering. I have not yet heard what the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) thinks of this trade pact; I observe, however, that during the various speeches which have been made on the subject he has not joined in the applause with his old-time political friends.

He has not seemingly enjoyed the situation very much, and I can imagine that the right hon. gentleman, when he contemplates the position in which he finds himself, when he sees the predicament with which he is confronted, when he hears the grumblings from the waverers in his own ranks, would give a good deal if he could turn back the hand upon the dial of time and be his own man once more. I believe that if the right hon. gentleman could turn back the hand of time to the 1st day of January last, we would never see these resolutions on this table; and I can imagine that when he thinks of what they have already cost him, and when, with his foresight, he forecasts what they will cost him in the future, and when he views the situation in which his following have been placed by this unhappy arrangement, he often soliloquises to himself, and his soliloquy would probably be along the line of a paraphrase of those lines with which we are all more or less familiar. I think the soliloquy of the right hon. gentleman, when he left this chamber last night, for example, would be something like this:

> Backward, turn backward, Oh time in thy flight,
> Cancel this Pact for me just for to-night;
> Give me my tariff and freedom to say
> How I shall mould it from day unto day.
> Give me hope the last glimmer of light,
> Cancel this Pact for me just for to-night.

I fancy that would be the soliloquy of the right hon. gentleman, very frequently of late, when he has left this House after the House rose.

Now, Sir, why has there been this break-neck haste to enter into this pact, when it was known that the new United States Congress, which would be controlled by the Democratic party, would take an entirely different view of reciprocity and trade relations generally from that taken by the old Congress and the Republican party? The Democratic party, as is well known,

has pledged itself to cut and slash the American tariff, and had the right hon. gentleman and his Cabinet decided to enter into a trade arrangement with the United States, they could have selected no more unhappy hour than the time they did select to make this agreement. It was absolutely a leap in the dark, and I think the right hon. gentleman regrets it very much now.

I wish to refer for a few moments to the manner in which this reciprocity pact is going to affect the farmers and the fishermen of the province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. Mackenzie), during the course of his remarks on this subject, read a list of farm products from which the duty was removed, and he implied by his remarks that as a result of Canada getting free trade with the United States there would be greater exports of those products from the province of Nova Scotia to the United States markets. But I wonder if my hon. friend remembered that Nova Scotia is now a very large importer of farm products. As a matter of fact, Nova Scotia is the importer of farm products to the value of over $3,000,000 per annum, an amount in excess of the apple exports of that province, of which export all Nova Scotians are proud, and very justly proud. In this connection I wish to quote Mr. Cumming, the principal of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the province. In the 'Halifax Morning Chronicle' of January 2, 1911, Mr. Cumming had a very able article on the subject of Agriculture in the province of Nova Scotia, from which I will read. He said:

It is a notorious fact that, although Nova Scotia exports a large amount of apples and a considerable amount of beef, butter, lambs, eggs, &c., yet she imports far greater quantities of these and other agricultural products which she might easily raise herself. It is difficult to get at the exact amount of the agricultural products which are imported into our country. Recently the Department of Industries and Immigration corresponded with the principal wholesale houses in Nova Scotia and ascertained from them what agricultural products they were buying. I have these figures to hand, and may comment on them by stating that these amounts have actually been imported, and there is no doubt that a great deal more, of which I have no record, has been imported. I will only deal with those products which I think we could largely raise at home, and not with such products for example as flour, of which we import $2 000,000 worth per year.

The figures I have, however, indicate that we imported last year 550,000 pounds of butter, worth $137,500. We also imported 4 000 tons of fresh beef and 5,500 barrels of barreled beef, worth about $1,100,000; 300 tons of fresh pork and 4,000 barrels of barreled pork, worth $210,000. Adding to this bacon and hams, imported by smaller dealers, and also the amount of lamb and mutton, of which I have no record, it must be evident that we import at least $2,000,000 worth of beef, swine and mutton products, which could easily be raised in our province, i.e. more than the value of our present fruit export trade. Of oats we imported, according to similar figures, 1,500,000 bushels, worth $750,000. Besides we imported vegetables, cheese, eggs, poultry and many other products to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars, all of which should be raised by our own farmers.

These imports were largely from other parts of Canada, and they were brought into the province of Nova Scotia because that province was not producing enough of these various articles to supply the home demand. How is this trade pact going to benefit the farmers of Nova Scotia by letting United States farm products come in free? I would like any hon. gentleman to tell me that. I will tell you what it will do. It will discourage the farmers of Nova Scotia; it will tend to drive them away, and will absolutely prevent settlers from coming into that province, an object to which the government of Nova Scotia and the government of Canada have been bestowing considerable attention. I have here some information with regard to the value of farm stock which I will place on 'Hansard,' but which under the rule of the House I will read, although it may not be very interesting. This information I have secured from the American Handbook on reciprocity with Canada, because we have not anything of a similar character available here, and I am using this in default of any similar handbook being furnished us by this government.

Information contained in a message from President of United States to the United States Senate: compiled from Census Statistics Monthly of Canada, January, 1911, and crop reports, United States February, 1911.

Average value per head of live stock on farms by classes.

—	Horses.	Dairy Cows.	Other Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
United States...	108 19	35 79	19 41	4 08	9 14
Canada..... ..	133 00	43 00	31 00	6 00	11 00
Nova Scotia.....	113 00	37 00	23 00	4 00	11 00

These figures show that a higher value prevailed in Nova Scotia as compared with the United States in the matter of live stock. I have here the comparative prices of farm products:

—	Spring Wheat, per bushel.	Barley, per bushel.	Oats, per bush.	Potatoes, per bushel.	Hay, per ton.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.
U.S., average price	0 89 9/10	0 57 8/10	0 34	0 53	12 26
Nova Scotia	1 12	0 76 6/10	0 48 8/10	0 8:	9 70

In all of these, with the one exception of hay, the Nova Scotia prices exceed those of the United States; and in western Nova Scotia I know, as a matter of fact, that hay is very frequently imported. The Digby correspondent of the Halifax 'Chronicle' on January 28, 1911, made the following report:

Mr. Johnson, of H. T. Wame & Co., Ltd., when interviewed said he did not think Digby county farmers can compete with the potato prices in Maine.

This is an opinion from western Nova Scotia and I shall now give a fact from the eastern part of that province. Here is a copy of an advertisement which appeared in the Glace Bay 'Standard' of March 31, 1911:

Carload of potatoes to arrive Wednesday, March 22 will be sold at car at ninety cents a bushel.

I do not think it will be any encouragement to the farmers of Nova Scotia to allow potatoes to be brought in free of duty from the United States when the high prices I have mentioned prevail in that province. The Maine dealers have been selling large quantities of potatoes in Montreal and St. John and in different parts of Nova Scotia, including Halifax, and paying duty and freight and making good profits.

I wish also to give the opinion of a very well informed gentleman with regard to the dairy business in Nova Scotia, Mr. C. H. Black, of Amherst, in the annual report of the secretary of Agriculture of Nova Scotia, for the year 1908, said:

The number of mining and manufacturing towns and villages in the province, which are sure to increase in size and number, provide us a market right at our door for all the dairy products we can produce for many years to come.

That is a statement which is just as true to-day as it was in 1908. There can be no question but that the best market which the dairymen of Nova Scotia can find lies right at their own doors.

Something has been said on the question of eggs and the prices in Canada and the United States. That question seems to be a fairly important one in the United States although the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), last night became rather jocose on the subject. It was, however, of sufficient importance in the eyes of our neighbours to be discussed at considerable length by a very prominent member of the United States official staff. This statement appeared in the Montreal 'Star' of March 25, 1911:

Need not fear Canadian eggs. If Canadian farmers are dreaming that reciprocity will give them better market for their eggs they might as well wake up now.

Charles M. Pepper of the United States.

We all remember Mr. Pepper as the gentleman who came to Ottawa last year for the purpose of negotiating with the government with regard to these reciprocity matters:

Charles M. Pepper, of the United States Bureau of Trade Relations, is telling the farmers in the States that they have nothing to fear from the Canadian hen.

He notes that every year, under the present arrangements, the States send 1,000,000 dozen eggs to Canada, and Canada only 35,000 dozen to the States, and that Canada has practically ceased to export, and is importing eggs even from China. Then he quotes wholesale prices of January, 1911.

At that time the wholesale price of eggs in Buffalo was 36 cents per dozen, in Toronto 40 cents. At Bangor, Eastport and Calais, Me., prices were from 26 to 30 cents; while across the line at St. Stephens, N.B., the price was 33c. At Manchester, N.H., the price was 27 cents; at Sherbrooke, Que., 35 cents; at Ogdensburg, N.Y., the price was 30 cents; at Prescott, Canada, 32 cents; at Burlington, Vt., the price was 27 cents; at Montreal, 35 cents.

One word with regard to a consignment of New Zealand chilled lamb which came into our Canadian market within the last couple of weeks. 750 carcasses were landed at St. John. They paid the duty of 3 cents per pound, and part of this lamb went as far west as Toronto and was sold there at 1 cent per pound less than the local producers were getting for their lamb. What would happen if the duty were taken off—and let me say that New Zealand is one of the British colonies which will come in under this pact and get free entry for its chilled lamb and any other commodities which the United States can supply to Canada free of duty—what will be the effect if the duty is thrown off and the market of Canada is opened wide to all the productions of these different colonies? Taking this shipment of lamb as an illustration, it would simply mean that the colony of New Zealand can lay down chilled lamb in this country at 4 cents per pound less than the prevailing price amongst our Canadian producers. If the government wants to kill farming in Nova Scotia let it take away the protection which our farmers have at present and give the producers of the United States and other countries free entry to our

market. That is just what the government are doing. What the farmers of Nova Scotia want, however, is not to get less for what they have to sell but to pay less for the manufactured goods they have to buy. But what did the right hon. the Prime Minister telegraph to Toronto the other day with regard to manufactured goods? We have not hurt the manufacturers, he said, and do not intend to do so. That is the present situation and hon. gentlemen opposite know it well.

I have dealt very briefly and imperfectly with the matter of agricultural products, and in the time at my disposal I could not go into that question more fully; but I wish to deal now with another subject of special interest in Nova Scotia, and that is lumber, and I may say, if I happen to be a little provincial, that this is owing to the fact that the legislature of Nova Scotia recently adopted a resolution endorsing this particular pact and intends, it is said, to go to the country upon reciprocity. It is significant, however, that the resolution was moved by the hon. member for Yarmouth, and that it was not spoken to by the hon. the Attorney General of that province. It is a significant fact that the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, the one man I think in the provincial legislature who has occupied a seat in this House, and who therefore, would have what I might call a Canadian outlook, did not speak in favour of this resolution, although apparently the government of Nova Scotia is going to the country upon that issue.

I wish to quote the opinions of some gentlemen in Nova Scotia who are familiar with the lumber conditions there with regard to the very important subject of lumber, and in doing so I shall quote from the Halifax 'Chronicle' which is the gospel of Liberalism in that province. In November last, Mr. J. M. Fraser, a member of the Halifax 'Chronicle' editorial staff visited the principle centres west of Halifax to ascertain the opinions of the people with regard to reciprocity, and its probable effect on business. As the opinions which I shall quote were given before this reciprocity pact was brought down, and before any party feeling had developed, I think they will be of special value.

I quote first the opinion of Mr. T. W. Pickles, of Annapolis Royal, a gentleman who has had a large experience in the lumber business, and who I think is a very staunch Liberal. Mr. Pickles said:

> We ship almost all our lumber to the West Indies and South America. This is true of all western Nova Scotia. If they want our lumber in the States they will pay the price, duty or no duty. The removal of the duty would not affect us in the least. We do not derive the benefit of the present reduction, they get that. Dressed lumber cannot be shipped in vessels, as it will have to be redried, and it suffers damage beside.

The last reduction of duty on lumber, to which reference was made, was a reduction of 75 cents a thousand and, according to Mr. Pickles, the American consumer, and not the Nova Scotia shipper gets the benefit of that reduction of duty. It never made any change, as I am informed, in the market price of lumber in our province.

I quote now from an opinion expressed by H. T. Warne, a lumberman and general dealer in Digby. He said:

> The limits here are in such a condition that I do not see how we could cut a satisfactory American schedule, while we can for South America.

This goes right to the root of the matter. Mr. Warne's statement is conclusive. If the timber areas in western Nova Scotia at least, and he is making direct reference to them, are in such condition that they cannot cut a satisfactory American schedule at the present time, how is the reciprocity in lumber, or the free admission of lumber into the United States going to change these conditions? According to the statement of Mr. Warne, who is an ardent Liberal, there is to be absolutely no benefit from the removal of the duty on lumber.

Mr. Fraser, after interviewing the Yarmouth dealers, and I believe that Yarmouth is said to be a great centre of reciprocity sentiment, says:

> Most of the Yarmouth lumber goes to South America; the removal of the duty would not affect the industry much, as the United States market is a poor one.

None of these expressions of opinion from the western portions of Nova Scotia favour the idea of the reduction on lumber with a view to improving their own market or enhancing the value of lumber to themselves. These opinions, as I have said, were given before the reciprocity pact was brought down.

I shall now give the opinion of a gentleman, expressed after the reciprocity pact had been brought down, and the agreement made known. This appeared in the Halifax 'Chronicle' of March 28, 1911, and is I think, a most important declaration. It is from Mr. W. G. Clarke, of Bear River, one of the best informed men in western Nova Scotia, not only with regard to lumber, but with regard to kindred subjects relating to trade in that province. He is also a very strong and ardent Liberal, one of the most prominent men in the Liberal party in western Nova Scotia. He was asked for his opinion after the reciprocity pact had been brought down, and replied. The statement reads :

HOW IT AFFECTS THE LUMBERMAN.

Mr. W. G. Clarke, of Bear River, one of Nova Scotia's leading lumber operators, in re-

sponse to the 'Morning Chronicle's' request, wired the following on the effect of the reciprocity agreement on the lumber trade:

'I consider the abolition of the duty on rough lumber will not materially affect the situation. We have better markets for pine and spruce than America offers. The reduction on laths and staves should prove advantageous. The danger of increased cutting consequent upon the reductions in duty may prove a menace to our forest reserve. Viewed together the proposed changes should be of advantage to Nova Scotia producers.'

This opinion was expressed after the agreement was entered into, and the pact brought down, and proclaimed as one of the greatest and most marvellous tariff arrangements ever entered into by any government in Canada, and more especially advantageous with reference to the province of Nova Scotia, yet the best that Mr. Clarke found to say was:

The reduction on laths and staves should prove advantageous.

But he prefaced this with the statement:

We have better markets for pine and spruce than America offers.

And he concludes:

The danger of increased cutting consequent upon the reduction in duty may prove a menace to our forest reserve.

Taking that statement at the time it was made, and from the gentleman who made it, we may conclude that so far as free lumber is concerned, there is not very much profit in it to the people of Nova Scotia who are interested in the lumber business.

There are some other commodities which are now, and have for some time been admitted free to the United States, but which have been confused by some newspaper men with some other articles which are now to secure free entry to the United States markets. These articles are: Firewood, sawn and split, and what is known as Rockland wood, logs and round and unmanufactured timber and piling. These articles have been going into the United States free of duty for years and so will not be affected in the slightest degree by this reciprocity pact.

While on the subject of the free entry of Canadian products into the United States market, I would like to ask the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Finance, neither of whom, I am sorry to see, are in their places, whether, in concluding this agreement with the United States, the United States authorities were pressed and consented to remove the tax now being imposed upon our shippers in the way of a consular fee for certified invoices. The United States authorities oblige us to pay this tax on shipments which we make to the United States, but we do not require them to make a corresponding expenditure for invoices upon shipments made into Canada. This impost really amounts to an export tax upon our shipments made in our own country by the United States government, and with increasing trade of course that tax would grow. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs, if they were present, whether any attempt was made to secure the removal of that impost? Perhaps some other member of the cabinet could give us that information.

Now, if this is a poor bargain for the farmers of the province of Nova Scotia, it is a much worse bargain for the fishermen of Nova Scotia, it is absolutely a retrograde step so far as our fisheries are concerned. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), speaking in favour of these resolutions some time ago, made a reference to fish sold by Canadian fishermen to the United States, and he instanced the item of canned lobsters, the value of which sold to the United States last year, he said, amounted to $1,137,000. In looking over the handbook which this government has issued relating to our shipments to the United States last year, I find this item stated as $732,000. I dare say that was merely a clerical error on the part of the hon. gentleman in preparing his table. But I wish particularly to observe that the hon. gentleman seemed to think we had no Canadian market for our fish, and that the upper Canadian and western market was not a profitable one for the fish of the maritime provinces. I think the statement which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made on several occasions in this House with reference to the development of the fish trade between the maritime provinces and the central and western provinces, is a complete answer to the statement of my hon. friend from Richmond. The minister knows that the trade has increased wonderfully, and he has rightly congratulated himself and his department upon the manner in which it was brought about, first, by raising the duty from a half cent to a cent a pound, and secondly, by assisting in the payment of transportation rates to give the Canadian shippers from the east an advantage over American shippers who formerly controlled our markets.

Now, my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) also alluded to the subject of the fisheries during the course of his remarks on these resolutions. He stated that there would be a very profitable trade in lobsters carried on if this free trade arrangement went through. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in possession of the information that lobsters had been on the free list for some time. But if he was not, it clearly shows the grasp which the members of the cabinet have of this subject, and if he was in possession of that

information, he was perhaps merely speaking for his own constituents and having in view the effect it might have on them. How free trade in fish is going to help the lobster business with the United States when lobsters now go in free of duty, is something which I cannot understand, and which I shall have to leave to the Postmaster General to explain to his constituents. On this point I wish to quote from a very informing letter written from Yarmouth, which appeared in the Montreal 'Star' a short time ago, signed Nova Scotian. I will read to the House the following extract:

While the United States is our only foreign market for fresh lobsters, and they are now free, we ship over two millions and a half dollars worth of canned lobsters to the markets of the world, of which our neighbours only take $732,000 worth, or sixteen thousand dollars worth less than Great Britain and nearly a quarter of a million dollars worth less than France consumes. Yet canned lobsters are on the free list of the United States and have been for years.

This shows that if the United States wants our fish they will take them, whether there is a duty on them or not; and if they do not want them, they will not take them, even if they are on the free list. There are other places to which we can send them. Now, I wish to refer to the trade returns with reference to the fisheries. First, I will deal with the United States market, and with the exception of the first two lines, the figures I shall read are taken from the government reports of this country. For the purpose of my argument, I am assuming that these figures are absolutely correct, they are at least the figures which this government has given to the people of this country, and unless the government repudiates them, we must assume that they are correct:

UNITED STATES MARKET.

Imports of fish into United States for year ended June, 1910.... ..		$13,835 968
Imports not affected by reciprocity—		
Lobsters and shell fish, now free..	$1,839,680	
Fish packed in oil, duty not changed.. ..	2,987,938	
		4,827 618
Imports on which duty is removed..		9,008,350
Canada sold to the United States last year...	4,592 419	
Of which were free.... ..	1,263,197	
		3,329 222
Extent of United States market to be won by displacing fish from other countries..		5,679 128

Let me say that within the last three years the United States imports of fish have increased a million and a half, and the United States exports of fish have increased almost four million dollars. Now I will refer to the Canadian market.

CANADIAN MARKET.

Value of fish catch year 1910 in Canada..		$29,629,169
Value of exports to United States..	$ 4,592,419	
Value of exports to other countries..	10,709,252	
		15,301,671
		$14,327,498
Fish imported into Canada for home consumption..		1,665,050
Home market for fish in Canada..		$15,992,548

So that while we sell $10,709,252 worth of fish to other countries and only $4,592,419 worth of fish to the United States, of which only $3,329,222 are now dutiable, we are going to give the United States the Canadian market of nearly $16,000,000, according to the government figures. For what? For the privilege of getting $3,329,222 worth of our fish in duty free, and the doubtful chance of displacing $5,500,000 worth of fish sold now to the United States by other countries. In other words, we are going to certainly exchange the substance for the shadow. The hon. member for Guysborough, in that letter to which I have already made reference, made the statement that the United States was the largest individual market for Canadian fish. The figures which I have taken from the government report absolutely disprove that statement and show that Canada is the best market for Canadian fish at the present time. The Canadian market is a growing market, it is a steady market, we are getting into the western market, and, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has said in this House on several occasions in regard to the increase of trade between the maritime provinces and the central and western portions of this country, the market of the west is growing, and a prosperous business can be carried on. He has also given us to understand that under the system that is now in vogue, the United States fish is being displaced by Canadian fish, a condition of affairs with which we are all pleased and of which we ought all to be very justly proud. The home market will naturally increase, it will take all our fresh and light cured fish at good prices, and as soon as transportation is provided there will be no difficulty whatever in marketing all our fish in Canada. After building up that trade it is proposed to hand it over to the United States because, with the removal of the duty Boston, Portland and Gloucester will absolutely dominate the Canadian market simply because

with a shorter rail haul they can get to the centre and the west of our country at a less cost than can the people of the maritime provinces. They did it before this duty was levied, they will do it after the duty is removed, and the people of the maritime provinces are going absolutely to lose the Canadian market if the duty on fish is removed.

There is another feature in connection with this matter which must not be overlooked, and it is that besides losing our market to the United States we are liable to meet with other very serious competition. By this reciprocity agreement we would have the following values of fish at present exported by the countries named getting free entry into the Canadian market. I have alluded to a list of countries which are going to get the same freedom in our markets as the United States does if this agreement goes through, and these are countries which are fish-exporting countries. This is the value of their yearly fish exports:

Norway..	$12,000,000
Sweden..	1,880 000
Denmark..	1,850 000
Japan..	1 000,000
United States..	9,652,088
Newfoundland (now free)..	7,962,000
Total..	$34,344,088

Which will come into direct competition with the fish of this country.

Now, we know that trade always seeks the best markets, and that an increased price in Canada would be followed by imports from any country which is seeking to sell its fish. Nova Scotia dealers at times now purchase from the fish dealers of Newfoundland. I do not know what you may think of this, Mr. Chairman, but I think it is better for us to preserve the Canadian markets for Canadian fishermen rather than to throw these markets open to the fishermen of the world.

I will refer to that letter signed 'Nova Scotian' again, which appeared in the Montreal 'Star,' because it embodied a thought which is now, I believe, entertained by a good many people in this country. It says:

> The annexation of the British West Indies would be of infinitely greater value to the fishing industry of Canada than the passing of the Taft-Fielding pact. Our sub-tropical fellow subjects take many times as much of our chief product, salt cod, as the United States does.

I wish to quote some opinions of some of the best informed fish dealers and those most familiar with the fish business of Nova Scotia, as gathered by Mr. Fraser, to whom I have already alluded, and published in the Halifax 'Chronicle.' Mr. Zwicker, of Zwicker & Company, Lunenburg, when interviewed by Mr. Fraser, as reported in the 'Chronicle' of November 16, 1910, said:

> Free fishing in exchange for United States markets and her colonies, including Porto Rico, do not include lobsters. Twenty-five years ago we had more fish than we could handle. Recently I have bought surplus Gloucester fish and brought them here.

The next gentleman whom I shall quote is a very ardent Liberal and a man who has been identified with the fishing business of Nova Scotia for many years. Mr. William Duff, of the Atlantic Fish Company, said:

> Under reciprocity there would be only a small quantity of fish shipped to the United States. In 20 years most of our fish will be going to western Canada and we will be getting better prices.

Mr. T. M. Irvine, M.P.P., also a good Liberal, and a member of the legislature of Nova Scotia, delivers himself as follows:

> This question of reciprocity is not so important as it was years ago. Our own fish are beginning to find their way to our own markets, and with good storage and transportation, Nova Scotia fish will soon be able to supply the greater part of the needs in western Canada, now largely supplied from the New England markets.

Mr. Irvine absolutely hits the nail on the head. The United States want to get a grip on our Canadian market which we have been wresting from them and if we enter into this arrangement they will secure that market. Here is the opinion of another representative gentleman—Mr. George A. Cox, ex-M.P.P. for Shelburne, also a good Liberal. He says:

> I do not consider the benefit to our fresh fish market will be so great as it is now. I think in a short time we can capture the fresh fish market (of Canada) from them—(United States). We have found a better market in Montreal and Toronto than in the United States. With a little better railway facilities to the upper provinces all our fish would go there.

There is no uncertain sound about that. The values of our fish depend largely on transportation and as an illustration of this I may say that the fishermen of the eastern portion of Nova Scotia, although they have always had the privilege of getting lobsters free into the United States, have been getting poor prices for lobsters. It is the same with any other class of fish. The question is largely one of transportation and it is the duty of any government to assist the fishermen of the maritime provinces by improving the transportation facilities in so far as it can be done. I will quote now from Mr. F. C. Whitman, of Annapolis Royal, a large fish dealer and a strong Liberal. Mr. Whitman says:

Reciprocity in fish would not help our dried fish business. Our best market is the West Indies and South America.

Every one who knows Mr. Whitman will respect the opinion he gives. Mayor Wolf, of Lunenburg, is reported in the Halifax 'Chronicle' as saying:

We require more men to enlist in our fishing navy. . .
There need be no fear as to our markets, the time is coming when our own Dominion will require large quantities of fish.

At Digby, Mr. Fraser interviewed several fish dealers whose opinions I intend to give. Mr. H. B. Short, local manager of the Maritime Fish Company, said:

They shipped fresh and smoked fish from Halifax to Vancouver. He thought the Canadian market was their market for fresh and smoked fish, and for salt fish, South America and the West Indies. There are times when they could send fish to the States, usually when the United States catch was off. When the Canadian government increased the duty on fish from ½ cent to 1 cent per pound, Nova Scotia captured the upper Canadian market. If fish were admitted free, the Americans would secure the Canadian market again.

That is the statement of Mr. Short who has been identified with the fish business for years, and who knows full well whereof he speaks. Now, I give the opinion of Capt. Howard Anderson, one of the leading Liberals of Digby county, a fish dealer, who says:

When I came here twenty years ago the fish dealers were calling for reciprocity, but I never agreed with them. We have a fine market right here in the Dominion for our fish, and it is only a short time till we will consume in this Dominion all we can produce. I believe reciprocity would kill our fresh fish business in Montreal and the west generally.

Now, Sir, in the Bay of Fundy district winter fishing is carried on, and the prices paid generally are higher than those prevailing in the United States, and they are more steady. I quote the opinion of Mr. E. M. Robertson, wholesale fish dealer of Digby, formerly of St. John, who was interviewed by the Digby correspondent of the 'Chronicle,' and who made this statement on January 28, 1911, after this reciprocity compact had been submitted to parliament. Mr. Robertson said:

It is a big thing to consider, but on the whole will benefit the wholesale fish firms, and be liable to injure the vessel and boat fishermen. For instance, fresh haddock are offered at Gloucester at present for $1.60 per 100 pounds, while they are $2.75 here. They can be imported by our firms cheaper than they can be bought from our own fishermen. Nova Scotia fish has a good market in the upper provinces at present, a business worked up by our dealers during the past twenty years. This will now be entered by the Americans, and we in turn will have to get into their markets.

That is a very clear expression of opinion from a man who has been for years identified with the fish business, and it is an opinion that is worthy of credit, and of very careful consideration. The Maritime Fish Corporation at times import fish from the United States, when the prices in the United States are low enough to enable them to pay the duty of one cent a pound on this fish, and the transportation charges, and lay them down at the place of business cheaper than they could purchase from Canadian fishermen. I believe that Mr. H. A. Brittain, of Montreal, general manager of the Maritime Fish Corporation, is in favour of this reciprocity agreement. Well, why would that be—it is because Mr. Brittain wishes to get cheaper fish. But would the fishermen of Nova Scotia or the maritime provinces favour reciprocity for the same reason? I think not. Mr. Brittain for instance is in favour of beam trawling, but the fishermen of the maritime provinces are opposed to it. Mr. Brittain is a business man, Mr. Brittain is a general manager of the Maritime Fish Corporation, Mr. Brittain's buisness is to make dividends for the stockholders of that corporation, and he is out to get the raw material at the cheapest possible price, and if he can get it cheaper in the United States as at times he can, and pay the duty and transportation charges, and lay it down cheaper in Digby than he is able to purchase it locally, I think that is a very good reason why Mr. Brittain should favour free fish. Simmered down then these opinions mean: The reciprocity agreement may help the fish dealers, but it will hurt the fishermen; it will not help the dry fish business upon the evidence I have given from all these gentlemen; the Canadian market is the best market for our fresh fish, and is a rapidly growing market, and that market we will lose to the United States according to the opinions of these gentlemen. Lobsters now go into the United States free, the Postmaster General to the contrary notwithstanding. Change this and while you may benefit the United States dealers you are bound to hurt the Canadian fishermen. There is another feature in connection with this question which I think has not yet been considered, and that is the combine danger. It is known to those who make a study of such matters that the control of 45 per cent of any commodity gives the people who control it a monopoly of the market. Now, what would happen, to our fishermen scattered around our coasts if a monopoly developed in the fish business? In British Columbia the combines practically control the buying and selling price of salmon and halibut. The price of halibut is controlled by the New England Fish Company, and the price of salmon is controlled by the Alaska Packers Association and the

Fraser River Canners' Association, and the government of this country permits this to continue. Possibly it may be impossible to prevent it, but at all events I am credibly informed that such is the condition of affairs. Now, if the United States combine were to get a foothold in the maritime provinces what would happen? The fishermen of the maritime provinces must control the marketing of their own fish in order to get the most out of it, and if they lose that control and if it is not within their power to at least make the selling price of fish, then they become little better than slaves and that condition I think we would all deplore.

There is another question which we must consider, and that is the question of bounties which I think will probably become a very serious matter. The United States may say to the government of Canada: You are paying a bounty to your fishermen and if you continue we will also pay a bounty to our American fishermen. Well, as soon as that is done the conditions upon which Canada entered into this agreement are changed, and changed prejudicially to the fishermen of Canada. I may say in passing that the same thing applies to the steel industry. The bounty upon steel rods expires and the government, as the Minister of Finance announced, has no intention of renewing these bounties. The government could not consistently renew the bounties under the terms of this agreement, because that would be giving an undue advantage to the Canadian producer, and to all intents and purposes it would be breaking faith with the United States government, and breaking the compact which has been entered into. Well, the American government might say: You will have to discontinue that fishing bounty because we will not permit bounty fed fish to come into the United States as free fish. And if the government of the United States should say that, what would happen? It would simply mean that Canadians would lose the United States market or that the Canadian government would have to discontinue the payment of the bounties. We have had as we know tangles with the United States before now in reference to matters which developed very unexpectedly because there was no clear expression with regard to them. I may remind the committee that a day or two ago I asked the Minister of Finance, and also the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whether there was any understanding with the government of the United States that the Canadian government might continue the payment of these bounties to Canadian fishermen, and the reply was that there had been no understanding, that the matter had not been discussed, and that the matter would have to be dealt with when it came up.

How is it going to be dealt with? Who can say what the outcome of it will be? We know that the United States administration is always very ready to take advantage of Canada when it can do so in connection with these trade agreements. We know what happened in connection with the agreement of years ago, under which Canada had free entry for our fish into the United States market. We had free fish, but when we went to export it into the United States market, they imposed a duty upon the packages containing the fish, and it was absolutely impossible for us to get our fish in there. In other words, they defeated the very purpose and object of the agreement; and the same thing may occur again in connection with these bounties. We know also that in more recent instances we have not found the United States very eager to live up to its arrangements. We had the matter of the boundary waters fishery regulations brought to our attention the other day by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor). He pointed out to this House that two years ago a treaty was entered into between the United States and Great Britain on behalf of Canada, with reference to the fisheries of the boundary waters, and that under that treaty, regulations were made by the Joint Commission which was appointed on behalf of the United States and Canada, and that it was clearly and distinctly provided that those regulations should be given legislative sanction as soon as possible, and that while they had received the sanction of this parliament the sanction of the Senate of the United States had been withheld up to the present time. That is only one of the instances to which I might refer showing that we cannot take things for granted when we are doing business with any foreign country. We must have the whole agreement expressed on the face of the document, and if we do not insist upon that we are not doing our duty to the people of this country. Take the matter of the Canadian fishing bounties, and what do we find? It is a very important matter to the Canadian fishermen. The number of fishermen receiving bounties in 1909 was: in Nova Scotia, 14,082; in New Brunswick, 2,004; in Prince Edward Island, 1,696; in Quebec, 7,340; a total of 25,122. The amount of money paid was $155,221.85, a very large sum of money distributed amongst a large number of people. Mr. Cowie, an officer of the Marine and Fisheries Department, in a report to the department, which appears in the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the past year, states that the existing system of distribution of these bounties is wrong. Now, that seems to me to be a very significant statement. Is it in con-

templation by the government to make any change in the payment of these bounties? Was it in contemplation at the time the representatives of this government proceeded to Washington and entered into these negotiations? And was that the reason why no definite statement was had from the United States authorities as to whether any objection would be taken by them to the continuance of these bounties in connection with the free entry of Canadian fish into the United States market?

Now, Sir, I am going to allude to another feature in connection with the fisheries, and in this connection I wish to say that this agreement is the most extravagant that was ever made in connection with the fisheries of Canada. The United States fishermen are 400 miles farther from the fishing grounds than are our fishermen. They could not in any large number successfully prosecute the Atlantic fisheries unless they got our ice, our bait, and crews from our ports. Under the old treaty of 1818 between Great Britain and the United States, the United States had long claimed certain rights in our waters for their fishermen. The United States fishermen were poaching in Canadian waters. The Canadian government was seizing vessels and confiscating them, and in the year 1887 the two countries were almost on the brink of open hostilities. In the year 1888 an agreement known as the modus vivendi was entered into pending other arrangements. Under that agreement licenses were issued to United States fishermen at the rate of $1.50 per ton. These licenses enabled the United States fishermen to enter Canadian ports for the purpose of purchasing ice, bait, and supplies, for the transhipment of their catch, and for the shipping of their crews. The effect of these licenses to United States fishermen was to give to the United States vessels all the privileges in Canadian ports which the Canadian fishermen had, with the solitary exception of the sale of their fish duty free, and, of course, the United States vessels also had in the United States ports all the privileges which belonged to them as United States vessels. The effect of this was that in the course of time thousands of dollars of Canadian money was invested in United States fishing vessels, and hundreds of fishermen from our maritime provinces went into those United States vessels and prosecuted the fisheries from United States ports; and I may say that they will never again return to Canadian vessels while the United States fishing fleet has this advantage. On the contrary, with free fish into the United States, and the United States having control of the Canadian markets, which they certainly will have under this trade pact, the United States will draw still more of our money to go into their ships and still more of our fishermen to form their crews to operate those vessels. The discontinuance of these licenses to United States fishing vessels is something which should have taken place immediately after the decision of the Hague Tribunal. The hon. Attorney General of the province of Nova Scotia, when he occupied a seat in this House, spoke very forcibly against the continuance of those licenses to the United States fishing vessels, and that was before the Tribunal at the Hague had pronounced with reference to our rights in our own territorial waters. But I would like to point out to the minister that we have reached an entirely different point—that we come to a new starting point, in fact—after the award of the Hague Tribunal. That disposed of all the difficult questions which had arisen under the treaty of 1818, and owing to which the licenses were originally granted to the United States fishing vessels, so that there was no reason to continue those licenses, and as a matter of fact I venture to say that the United States never expected but what they would be discontinued. Yet what do we find? After ninety years of these difficulties which had arisen under this old treaty, and after the government of this country has taken all the kudos to itself for the result of the arbitration at the Hague, it is absolutely giving away all the advantages we gained from that tribunal by continuing these modus vivendi licenses to the American fishermen. And we are getting absolutely nothing in return. If the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was in his place I would ask him what the Canadian fisherman gets for continuing these licenses to the American fishing vessels, but as the Minister of Finance is not in his place, I would put that question to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur)?

Mr. BRODEUR. The situation to-day of our Canadian fishermen is much better than the one they had under the treaty of 1888.

Mr. JAMESON. I do not understand what the hon. minister means, but I would like him to answer my question, and then I shall answer any question he may propound with regard to that treaty of 1888. What are our fishermen getting for the continuance of those licenses to the Americans?

Mr. BRODEUR. They get much better treatment than under the treaty of 1888?

Mr. JAMESON. If the minister will not answer that question, I shall ask him another. What are our fishermen getting for granting these licenses free to the United States vessels now?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are having the United States markets for our fish.

Mr. JAMESON. What do our fishermen get for giving the United States the Canadian market? I pause for a reply. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) takes a very different view from that which is taken by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie). The hon. minister says that the fishermen get better advantages to-day under this proposed arrangement than they did under the treaty of 1888. Well, I shall deal with that later on. What I say now is that Canada is actually paying three prices for getting her fish into the United States markets. In the first place, we are continuing the granting of licenses to American fishermen under the modus vivendi and that is something which, under the award of the Hague Tribunal, there is absolutely no reason for our doing. In the second place those licenses are being issued free, or at the rate of $1 per vessel, instead of $1.50 per ton. They would be cheap, so far as Canadian fishermen are concerned, at $500 per license, and in the third place we are giving the United States the Canadian market, because when we take down the tariff wall, the United States fishermen will absolutely control our market.

The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) waived aside in a lordly fashion all idea as to what might happen with regard to this country and its resources as a result of their policy. But what has already happened to our Atlantic fisheries? In spite of the fact that the highest tribunal in the world lately declared that Canadian fishermen have exclusive rights in Canadian territorial waters, with the exception of the Bay of Fundy, which was not, I am sorry to say, dealt with, this government has by this agreement actually taken the United States fishermen into partnership. In other words, what our fishermen should have gained under the award to the Hague Tribunal this government is taking from them by this ill-advised deal; and with the help of this government, the United States have already largely annexed the Canadian fisheries. No one contemplated the continuing of these licenses, the issuing of free licenses, and the giving of our markets to the United States fishermen in exchange for the United States market. The most any one expected was that we would give them free licenses in exchange of their market; and as to the continuance of these licenses, I am confident that the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) himself, if he would speak his mind, would like to see that done away with.

I shall now cite a few opinions regarding the question of these licenses to United States fishing vessels. These views were expressed by certain gentlemen to Mr. Fraser, staff correspondent of the Halifax 'Chronicle,' who interviewed them in November last, and they were published in that newspaper. Mr. Fraser, the staff correspondent of the 'Chronicle,' reported as follows:

> The general consensus of opinion in Lunenburg was free fish for free fishing under the modus vivendi.
>
> Mr. Fraser's conclusion was that the United States might be given the privileges they now enjoy under the modus vivendi, and the tonnage tax be removed in return for free fish.

The Lunenburg special correspondent of the Halifax 'Chronicle' wrote to that paper on January 2, 1911, as follows:

> Our citizens would be willing to concede to the United States the right to purchase bait and supplies in return for the free admission of our fish.

In the Halifax 'Chronicle' there appeared also a statement from Mr. Moses H. Nickerson, M.P.P. On being interviewed, Mr. Nickerson said:

> The sentiment of fishermen west of Lunenburg, as he understood it, would be that they would gladly welcome any reciprocal arrangements admitting free fish of all kinds to the United States in return for the privilege enjoyed by the American vessels under the modus vivendi, even with a reduction or abolition of the license fee.
>
> I think the fishermen would be willing to have the duty taken off gasoline engines, as a return for free fish. These are the only concessions they would be willing to make.

Our ministers when they entered into this agreement, were uninformed or indifferent as to the conditions, or they never would have given three prices for the American market. I would like to inquire of the Minister of Finance if he were here, about taking the duty off gasoline engines to which Mr. Nickerson refers. There was a resolution of the Fishermen's Union of Nova Scotia transmitted to the Finance Minister a year ago, asking him to have the duty removed, and he replied that he would give that request consideration. Well, I have not learned up to to-day that the duty has been taken off or reduced, but I do observe that there is a reduction in the duty on automobiles. Of course, we know that this pact has been negotiated in the interests of the toiling masses of this country. At least that is what the Finance Minister tells us, and this reduction of five per cent in the duty on automobiles will no doubt in his opinion, be of great benefit to our toiling masses and fishermen, who are large users of automobiles. Would it not have been more satisfactory to the fishermen and to the toiling masses of this country if the duty on gasoline engines had been removed and the duty on automobiles had been allowed to remain?

I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Canadian vessels under this agreement will have the same privileges in United States ports as United States fishing vessels will have in Canadian ports?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not aware that there is any provision in the treaty with regard to fishing vessels.

Mr. JAMESON. I am sorry the minister cannot answer the question. I suppose this is another matter about which there was no understanding, and which will have to be dealt with when it arises. It will probably then develop that it was a misunderstanding. The minister has said that under this arrangement the Canadian fishermen are getting better terms than they did under the treaty of 1888. He referred then to the Chamberlain-Bayard treaty which was negotiated by Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper. That treaty, while ratified by the parliament of Canada, was never ratified by the Senate of the United States. Under article 10 of that treaty it was provided that United States fishing vessels shall conform to harbour regulations common to them and to fishing vessels of Canada, and by article 12 that fishing vessels of Canada shall have on the Atlantic coast of the United States all the privileges reserved and secured by this treaty to United States fishing vessels on the aforesaid waters of Canada and Newfoundland.

The minister has taken the responsibility of saying that this is a better agreement for the Canadian fishermen than the Chamberlain-Bayard treaty of 1888, and yet when I asked him whether the Canadian fishing vessels would have the same privileges in United States ports under this agreement as United States fishing vessels are going to have in Canadian ports, he says he cannot answer.

Under the licenses issued to United States fishing vessels, and under this pact, United States fishing vessels have all the privileges in Canadian ports that Canadian vessels have. They can come and go at their will and the government is granting these licenses practically free, at a nominal fee of $1 per vessel. There are now 93 United States vessels paying an average fee of $125 a year for licenses. If these licenses are made free, does it not follow almost every United States vessel will take out a license? Mr. J. B. Osborne, chief of the United States Bureau of Foreign Commerce and a member of the Reciprocity Commission, speaking at Portland on March 15, 1911, said:

The New England fishing vessels would benefit largely by the reduction of the Canadian license fee from $1.50 per ton to $1 per vessel.

Of course they will. Mr. Osborne knows what he is talking about. This reduction of duty from $1.50 a ton, which meant an average of $125 a vessel to $1 a vessel, means practically a bonus of $124 a year to each American vessel that chooses to take out a license, a bonus granted by the government of Canada to bring United States vessels into direct competition with Canadian fishing vessels.

I think, Sir, that the people in the province of Nova Scotia or in the maritme provinces who wish to have these licenses continued to United States fishing vessels are largely the vessel outfitters at the ports frequented by United States fishing vessels. They make money out of supplying and outfitting the American vessels. The Canadian fishermen do not want the licenses continued, they do not want to meet American competition any more than they can help and consequently it is not the Canadian fishermen who are anxious to have these licenses continued, but a comparatively few dealers and outfitters who have the ear of the government while the Canadian fishermen, scattered around the coast, cannot get the ear of this government.

Under this pact this feature will work out to the very great disadvantage of our Canadian fishermen. Let us take, for instance, the matter of fresh fish. A Canadian vessel and an American vessel, let us say, reach an American port at the same time. The American vessel ties up at the wharf and throws her fish out at once. She has a license from the United States authorities which permits her to discharge her cargo without the formality of reporting at the custom house. The Canadian fishing vessel ties up perhaps at the same wharf, but the captain has to report to the customs. He would probably have to take with him a customs broker to enter his fish, because all fish landed by Canadian vessels must be entered under this compact in a formal way, and the American regulations in that regard are extremely formal. He must have a permit before he can land, and it is possible he may have to prove the origin of his fish. I would ask the minister whether, as a matter of fact, when a Canadian fishing vessel goes into a United States port, the captain has to prove the origin of those fish by a consular certificate issued by an American consular agent at a Canadian port.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not aware that in the agreement such regulations are provided for.

Mr. JAMESON. At the present time that is the agreement, and I would like to know whether, under this agreement, that provision has been done away with, and this disadvantage under which our Canadian fishermen would labour has been removed. The minister says no.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think there is any provision in the agreement to that effect.

Mr. JAMESON. I know there is no provision in the agreement on its face, and unless it appears on the face of the agreement itself I understand there is no 'understanding.' I conclude from the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the Canadian fisherman, if he goes into American ports, even if he does not have to prove the origin of his fish, would have to report at the customs house to get his permit to land and possibly has to pay a customs broker for doing this business. There is delay, there is expense, and when he comes to sell his fish he finds that he is perhaps two or three hours behind the American fisherman who entered the harbour at the same time as he did, but who could place his fish immediately on the market and get the top price, while the Canadian would have to take a lesser price. The prices of fresh fish in the United States markets are as mercurial as the prices of stocks on the New York stock exchange, and they will vary from hour to hour, according to the arrival of fish, or according to the demand for fish and the supply of that article. Now the United States fishermen can leave a Canadian port and sail to the fishing ground, and I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether a Canadian vessel can leave a United States port and clear for the fishing ground under this agreement.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not to be supposed that Canadian fishing vessels from Nova Scotia will go and get a clearance from the United States to go on the fishing grounds.

Mr. JAMESON. Supposing the captain of a Canadian fishing vessel finds that under this agreement he can get a little more for his fish in a United States port than in a Canadian port, and he goes to that port and sells his fish there, can he clear from that port to the fishing grounds?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not aware of such a regulation.

Mr. JAMESON. That just shows the lack of information on the part of this government. I want to tell the minister that there is at the present time a United States regulation which prevents a clearance being given to a foreign fishing vessel from a United States port to the fishing grounds, in other words, they will not grant her what is known as a clearance for an irresolute voyage. If the vessel be a foreign vessel, as a Canadian vessel would be in a United States port, she must clear for some other port, and she would consequently have to clear from the United States port to a Canadian port, and from a Canadian port she would have to clear for the fishing grounds, and if she wanted to sell her fish in the United States, again she would have to sail from the fishing ground to the United States port. In other words, Canadian fishing vessels must sail over three sides of a triangle, while United States fishing vessels can clear either from a Canadian port to the fishing grounds, or from a United States port to the fishing grounds, and she has to sail over only two sides of the triangle. In other words, one goes direct and the other does not go direct. We will take the United States fishermen absolutely into partnership, and when we get into their ports they treat us as strangers, and the ministers are satisfied to have it so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman considered the question of bait supplies in cold storage?

Mr. JAMESON. I intend to go fully into the bait question, even though the hour is late. Now I ask, will this agreement tend to bring home the fishermen of the maritime provinces who are at present on United States fishing vessels, who have left their homes to operate these vessels, or will it have a tendency to drive to United States fishing vessels those fishermen who are now sailing under the Canadian flag? The advantages are obviously with the United States fishing vessels, and the disadvantages with the Canadian fishing vessels. I cannot see that there is any doubt as to what the result will be. It will drive our Canadian fishermen to sail on United States fishing vessels and become United States citizens. As such they will supply the United States market, the United States will supply the upper Canadian market, because we have it on the evidence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we only get that market under present conditions because we are protected by a duty of one cent per pound, and the Canadian fisherman who stands by his nationality and his flag must find a new market for his fish. Now, I have shown that if the Canadian market is the best at any time, the United States fisherman can come in and sell his fish in the Canadian market exactly on the same terms as the Canadian fisherman; and if the United States market is the best, the Canadian must face regulations which will place him at a serious disadvantage as compared to the American. I have also shown that we are going to lose the upper Canadian and western markets to the United States, and that we must fight at a considerable disadvantage to displace the United States fisherman from the United States market. In other words, this agreement is going to build up the United States fisheries, and it will tend to depress and injure the Canadian fisheries. Let me point out another feature. It is going to

injure Canadian shipbuilding yards. I have seen it stated in the press, and I think it was stated by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) in that letter, that this agreement is going to result in great activity in the shipbuilding yards in the maritime provinces. I say it will have a contrary effect. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has not been very liberal in the information he has given me to-night, to give me a little information on another subject; I would ask him whether any arrangement has been made with the United States during the progress of these negotiations whereby they would discontinue the restrictive regulations which prevent a Canadian vessel from coming under the United States flag?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows exactly what there is in the agreement. I do not see anything of the kind.

Mr. JAMESON. The condition at present is this, that no foreign built vessel can go under the American flag. A vessel, to sail under the American flag, must be built in the United States and of United States materials. Now, if we are unable to increase our own fishing fleets under this agreement, and I have shown conclusively that it is going to interfere with our fishing operations; if we are not going to increase the fishing vessels of the Canadian fleet, and if we cannot, under existing regulations, get the privilege of selling our fishing vessels to the United States, how are we going to increase operations in the shipbuilding yards of the maritime provinces? It is an absolute fallacy. That was another of the matters which this government should have settled definitely at the time that they entered into this agreement. The United States were the suitors, according to what the government tell us, Canada was not seeking these reciprocal arrangements, it was the United States who was pleading for them almost on bended knee. If that is the case, as we are led to believe by statements which are made by hon. gentlemen occupying seats on the treasury benches, why on earth did not the government say: Here are certain things which we want you to do in order to place us in a position where we can reasonably negotiate this treaty to the advantage of our people? If the Minister of Finance were present I have several questions which I would like to have addressed to him.

The question of bait supply has been referred to by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and I want to say the control of the bait supply means the control of the fisheries and the lack of bait means that fishing vessels must lie idle. The shortage of bait in the maritime provinces led this government, as far back as the year 1900, to take steps for the purpose of remedying the situation in that regard. Between 1900 and 1909, $143,000 was expended by this government in aids and bonuses to bait freezers and cold storage for the purpose of providing bait for the fishermen. I may say that the condition which obtains at the present is not perhaps very satisfactory. According to the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the last year, out of 61 of these government-aided bait freezers, 20 reported. Of these reports 10 were favourable and 11 unfavourable, while 40 did not report at all. Since then we have heard rumours of fraud, forgery and criminal prosecutions in connection with the expenditure of money in regard to these bait freezers, but, as Kipling says, 'that is another story,' and we will not deal with it at the present time. What I wish to point out is that as far back as 1900 this government recognized that something must be done to aid the bait situation and to provide the requisite amount of bait and now we find that after the expenditure of this money for the purpose of aiding the situation with regard to bait for Canadian fishermen, they are actually bonusing these bait freezers for the purpose of furnishing bait to United States fishing vessels to enter into competition with our Canadian fishermen. We know that the bait supply in the Bay of Fundy is at times altogether inadequate and that the prices charged Canadian fishermen by the Grand Manan weir operators have been very high. In the answer that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave me some time ago to a question that I asked him as to the prices paid for bait at Grand Manan, he gave me the prices of bait in July last as $7.50 per hogshead and in November $16.75. I am informed that during the course of last year the price went as high as $20, $25 and even $30 per hogshead, continuing these licenses to United States vessels affects the bait supply. At the present time there are 93 of these American vessels taking these licenses and paying $1.50 per ton which averages $125 per year. We can assume that many, if not all other, United States fishing vessels will take these licenses if they only have to pay a dollar for them. The Canadian fishermen are brought into direct competition with the United States fishing vessels in regard to bait, in regard to crews, and in regard to the sale of fish. Our own fishing vessels cannot secure sufficient bait at times and have to go idle, and that is a condition which, even under existing circumstances, prevails at times. I have known fishing vessels and boats as well to be laid up for days at the time when fishing is most profitable in the whole year, and if they allow United States fishermen to come in and compete

with our fishermen for the supply of bait, we know that the condition will become much more serious.

The government, in continuing to allow United States fishing vessels to share our bait supply by issuing these licenses to them is keeping a competitor in business whom it was the business of this government to put out of business, in order to secure the trade for our own fishermen. By sharing the available bait with the United States fishing vessels this government is hampering our vessels in getting a sufficient bait supply, and this action of the government is preventing the fishermen of the maritime provinces who have left home and gone to sail on American vessels, from returning home. I see a danger both to our fishermen and to our fisheries from this agreement. As the price of meat advances, we know that fish will become more generally used and will command a higher price. We know that the United States have fished out their waters and they want to get at ours. Canada and Newfoundland control the only remaining fisheries in the western hemisphere and this government proposes to take the United States into partnership. We have lost control of our lobster fisheries to the United States when we cannot prevent them taking lobsters outside of the three-mile limit during the close season, according to a statement which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made to me in this House a few days ago. This agreement will work out to the disadvantage of our fishermen in every respect. The government had the situation absolutely in their own hands. If they had withheld the issuance of these licenses to United States fishing vessels, if they had backed up the government of Newfoundland, they would have deprived the United States fishermen of a base of operations, and we would have got free fish into the United States without making any concession whatever in return for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what this government should have required from the United States as the basis of any agreement with regard to the Atlantic fisheries was:

1. The prohibition of beam trawling in North Atlantic waters by United States and Canadian fishermen.

2. Prohibition of lobster fishing by United States fishermen in the Bay of Fundy and outside the three-mile limit on the Canadian coast during the Canadian close season.

3. Relaxation of United States regulations which prevent our Canadian fishermen from clearing direct for the fishing grounds after landing their fares at United States ports.

4. Relaxation of the United States regulations so that Canadian vessels in United States ports would have the same advantages as United States fishing vessels in Canadian ports.

5. Relaxation of United States regulations to enable Canadian builders to sell fishing vessels to the United States fishermen.

6. That bounties now paid to Canadian fishermen should be continued without United States retaliation.

As I have said, the United States were the suitors, they came to the government of this country, they want this reciprocal arrangement and, as the basis for the negotiation of this reciprocal arrangement, it was obviously the duty of this government, if they desired to protect Canadian fishermen, if they desired to improve the position of Canadian fishermen, to have laid down those or similar propositions and asked the United States, if they would not accept all, to accept what they would. And when I ask the Minister of Marine, as I ask him now, whether as a matter of fact any of these stipulations were made to the United States authorities, I anticipate that his answer will be either 'no,' or that he does not know. What does the minister say?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows the agreement.

Mr. JAMESON. Quite so, and the agreement does not mention these things at all and does not protect the Canadian fishermen.

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to show that this agreement was less advantageous to Canada than the agreement of 1888.

Mr. JAMESON. I have already shown that to the minister, and if I have not made it clear to him it was not my fault.

An hon. MEMBER. He was asleep.

Mr. JAMESON. I think perhaps he was taking forty winks. However, if I did not make it clear to the minister I will go over the ground again.

Mr. BRODEUR. I followed the hon. gentleman closely, but I did not notice that he proved that the arrangement of 1888 was more advantageous than the present agreement. In 1888 we gave to the Americans the right to come and fish in our waters, and the property in fish that belonged to us, but no such concession has been made under this agreement.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister says that the present arrangement is more advantageous than the arrangement of 1888, and yet he cannot tell us that Canadian fishing vessels in United States ports will have the same privileges that United States vessels will have in Canadian ports, a thing that

was expressly provided for in the treaty of 1888. Under the agreement of 1888 we got the same treatment in United States ports for our fishing vessels as they got in our ports, and in the second place, if we gave the United States rights within the three-mile limit, they gave us in return rights within their territorial waters.

Mr. BRODEUR. And that was worth a great deal to us.

Mr. JAMESON. That is the minister's opinion, but I will show what the opinion of the United States authorities was——

Mr. BRODEUR. I would like to have the opinion of the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. JAMESON. I will give the minister an authority that he will not dispute.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the opinion of the hon. member for Digby?

Mr. JAMESON. If the minister permits me to give him one answer at a time, he will get all the information he wants before he is through. In 1887 the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations made a report dealing with the Atlantic fisheries, from which I read:

From the investigations made by the committee during the last summer and fall, and as the result of the great mass of testimony taken by it and herewith returned, the committee believe it to be clear, beyond all dispute, that the right to fish within 3 miles of the Dominion shores is of no practical advantage whatever to American fishermen. The cod and halibut fishing has been for many years almost entirely carried on at long distances from the shores in deep waters, on banks, &c.; and it is believed that were there absolute liberty for Americans to fish, without such restriction or regulation of any kind, within three miles of the Dominion shores, no such fisherman would ever think of going there for the purpose of catching cod or halibut.

Mr. BRODEUR. Do I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Jameson) would be willing that we should concede to the Americans the right to fish within the three-mile limit?

Mr. JAMESON. Not at all. But what I say is that the government has practically done that in this agreement, and that is why I complain. Nay, more——

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; he is referring to the treaty made by Sir Charles Tupper in 1888. We have made no such concession this time.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister is trying to draw a red herring across the trail.

Mr. GRAHAM. It's a halibut.

Mr. JAMESON. Perhaps the Postmaster General thinks it's a lobster. I say that under this arrangement the Americans are getting all the advantages they require within the three-mile limit, because great advantages within the three-mile limit pertain to the catching of bait. This bait is caught by Canadian fishermen, it is stored in government-bonused freezers, and the government of Canada is going to permit United States fishermen to take advantage of that bait and enter into competition with our fishermen at times when there is scarcity of bait, and not sufficient for Canadian fishermen.

Mr. BRODEUR. All the profit goes to the Canadians. The fish have to be caught by Canadian fishing vessels, and all the business is to be done by Canadians, whereas under the 1888 arrangement it was done by the Americans. I know my hon. friend will agree that this arrangement is far better than the arrangement of 1888.

Mr. JAMESON. Is the minister serious in the statement that under the treaty of 1888 the Americans were going to get within the three-mile limit to fish?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. JAMESON. Is he not thinking of the treaty of Washington of 1871, which was negotiated by Sir John Macdonald, and by which the United States fishermen had the privilege of taking our fish within the three-mile limit, and the Canadian fishermen had corresponding privileges in United States waters, and there was distinct provision in the treaty that there should be a reference on the question as to which country had the greater advantage, and when the question was arbitrated at Halifax, the Halifax award called upon the United States to pay $5,500,000 because the balance of advantage was in their favour, and $1,000,000 of that was handed over to Newfoundland, which was a partner in the treaty.

Mr. CROSBY. And it should be a partner in the treaty to-day.

Mr. JAMESON. I agree with the hon. member for Halifax in that; and the balance, $4,500,000, is the basis of the payment of these fishing bounties to these Canadian fishermen. That is the way treaties were negotiated by the Conservatives. That is a treaty that was advantageous to the fishermen of this country and which continues to be an advantage to them to the present day.

Mr. LOGGIE. Would not that be an absolute answer to the hon. gentleman as to the value of our inshore fisheries to-day?

Mr. JAMESON. Exactly so. That is why I am finding fault with the government for

giving to the United States fishermen all the advantages which are to be derived from those inshore fisheries in the way of bait.

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. member is very unfair. It is not because of the bait. There are other fish caught in the inshore fisheries.

Mr. CROSBY. No.

Mr. LOGGIE. What about mackerel?

Mr. JAMESON. I do not mind an occasional question. I have answered more questions to-night than the hon. minister has; but I don't want too many speeches made during the course of my remarks. Now, I am opposed to this reciprocity agreement in its present form, for the reasons which I have stated, as well as for the following: The government is paying to the United States three prices for their market—first, by continuing the licensing system in force at all; second, by giving practically free licenses to United States fishermen; third, by giving them the Canadian market for their fish. This threefold payment to the United States for their market makes more difficult the obtaining of bait by Canadian fishermen, robs them of their own market, and hampers them in securing the market of the United States, and will drive them to United States fishing vessels. Our lobster fisheries in the Bay of Fundy, and three miles off our coasts are open to United States fishermen, and during the close season, when our fishermen cannot legally take them, United States fishermen perhaps can enter the Canadian market under this agreement, and sell lobsters taken off our own coasts. I will ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether it would be possible for United States fishermen during the Canadian close season, to take lobsters outside the three-mile limit, along the Canadian coast, and sell them in the Canadian market.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly not. American fishermen will not have the right, during the close season, to sell lobsters in Canada.

Mr. JAMESON. I understand, then, that the minister has laid it down that the United States fishermen will not have the privilege of selling in Canada during the close season lobsters that have been taken off the Canadian coast, outside of the three-mile limit. If that is the case, the Canadian lobster fishermen, I presume, are on the same footing, and cannot sell in Canada lobsters taken beyond the three-mile limit off the Canadian coast?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly not. The law is very clear. Nobody has a right to be in possession of lobsters during the close season.

Mr. JAMESON. Lobsters go out into deep water, and large lobsters are very often taken in very deep water, sometimes four or five miles off the coast; and the situation is that United States vessels can take these lobsters three miles and upwards off our shores and can market them in the United States during the Canadian close season. I think the minister will admit that.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. While Canadians cannot take lobsters three miles and upwards off our shores and sell them in the Canadian market at the same time.

Mr. BRODEUR. They can sell those lobsters to the Americans. If Canadian fishing vessels caught lobsters outside the three-mile limit during the close season, those lobsters could be sold in Boston. There is nothing to prevent that.

Mr. JAMESON. That just shows that the United States fishermen can catch lobsters off our coast and sell them in their own market, while Canadian fishermen if they catch lobsters off our coast during the close season, cannot sell them in the Canadian market, but have to go to a foreign market to sell them. I venture to say that if this government had said to the United States authorities at the time they were making arrangements for this agreement, we want to prohibit the catching of lobsters on the Canadian coast, and in the Bay of Fundy, three miles off the shore during the Canadian close season, for the purpose of protecting and preserving the lobster fisheries, they could have had that agreement made. The United States would have conceded it, because it is a most reasonable provision. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not say that that arrangement has been made, or even asked for, and yet his department has been aware of the fact that American fishermen have been taking lobsters off the Canadian coast beyond the three-mile limit for a couple of years.

Mr. BRODEUR. What makes the hon. gentleman believe that the Americans would have accepted such a position? They have no close season for lobsters.

Mr. JAMESON. We have a close season in Canada, which gives the Americans the privilege of catching lobsters outside of the three-mile limit, and selling them in the markets of the United States at a time when they cannot be sold in Canada, and the minister is apparently satisfied with it. Another reason why I am opposed to this agree-

ment is that while our fishermen get only the United States market, the fishermen of the United States, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Japan, are given our market. Another reason is that Canadian fishermen are not guaranteed such favourable treatment in the United States ports as American fishermen will have in Canadian ports.

Now, it is not because they are unselfish or that they wish to help us that the United States are making this move—not at all. Senator Beveridge, the chief mouthpiece of the American administration at Washington in this reciprocity movement, said, speaking of the present tariff wall between Canada and the United States:

That policy has driven American manufacturers across the Canadian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workmen to supply trade. That capital should be kept at home to employ American workingmen to supply the Canadian demand.

It is to weaken Canada and to prevent United States capital coming into our country that the United States are so anxious to enter into this agreement. Mr. Osborne, of the United States State Department, already quoted, said further, with regard to the employment of American labour:

The free entry of Canadian fish into United States markets would benefit the New England canneries and build up an important industry in the curing and preserving of this cheap and palatable food staple.

If reciprocity works out in the way the United States expect, they will get this business and we will lose it; and the fishing business has reached a stage where not only the taking of the fish, but the labour incidental to preparing them for market, must be thought of.

Financial and business men of Canada are beginning to forecast the result of this trade pact; and as an indication of what they think, here is an extract from a circular sent out by one of the members of the Montreal Stock Exchange. It reads:

Why should I invest in American enterprises when there are as many Canadian enterprises just as good?

And the circular goes on to say:

Now that there is so much talk of reciprocity between Canada and the United States we strongly recommend the investment of funds not only in Canada but also across the border as should reciprocity or other tariff changes adversely affect Canadian securities they would benefit American securities.

This is a pretty broad hint of what capitalists think is likely to result. I wish to quote once more from the Halifax 'Chronicle' of January 22, 1911, from an article written by Mr. W. G. Clarke, of Bear River, the same gentleman whose opinion on the lumber business I quoted before. Mr. Clarke, in the course of a very able article on the lumber resources of Nova Scotia, makes this statement:

Since Nova Scotia possesses large pulp-wood areas and excellent water-power awaiting the magic call of capital to spring into industrial life would it not seem that an attractive field was open either to Nova Scotia or foreign capitalists?

That we should conserve our resources for the up-building the developing of our own provinces and the repatriation of our sons and daughters, who for lack of employment have found homes in other lands, rather than be regarded as a base of supplies for raw materials, to be drawn upon at will by industries already located on foreign soil, where the entire profit of manufacture, and the attendant increase of population, must accrue to the country in which are located the manufacturing centres, is an argument which will, I think, appeal to every patriotic Canadian.

That is the opinion expressed by a prominent and ardent Liberal who is very thoroughly informed as to the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia. I think he takes a high minded view of the situation, and I think that taking it in connection with the opinions of other men on both sides of the line, it clearly shows that this particular pact, if we enter into it, is bound to result to our disadvantage.

For the reasons I have given already, and from the best consideration I have been able to give this important question, I am absolutely opposed to this pact. I say it is hostile to the best interests of our country, and in particular to the best interests of the maritime provinces. I do not wish to speak from a provincial point of view, but I do say that this pact, if carried into effect, will in my opinion work most serious hardships to our people, and cause them loss and detriment. For these reasons I intend to vote against this resolution when the opportunity comes, and shall oppose it as vigorously as I can upon every occasion possible.

Mr. A. B. HUNT (Compton). On rising to address you, Mr. Speaker, on this important question of reciprocity, I feel it my duty, coming as I do from the province of Quebec, and representing one of the border counties in that province, to place my views on 'Hansard' with regard to this great question—a world wide question as it is, attracting the attention at the present time of not only the Dominion of Canada, and the British Empire, but the United States as well. I feel first that it is my duty to congratulate our Minister of Fin-

ance (Mr. Fielding) and our Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) on the splendid agreement they have been able to obtain from our neighbours to the south of us. I am sure it is an agreement much better than could have been expected by any hon. member on this side of the House; and I am proud to think that we have such men in our party, men who have the courage of their convictions, and who are prepared to stand by this agreement until it becomes law, notwithstanding the undue and unfair criticism made against it by the party opposite, and the opposition press of this country.

Two delegations have already waited upon this government, numbering 1,000 each or thereabouts, and the one in direct opposition to the other—the one asking for free trade in every particular, and the other for higher protection. Consequently you can readily see that this is one of the difficult questions of the day—a question that cannot be decided by the views of the delegations which may wait on this government as their views will be as discordant as are those of the press of this country, each looking at the situation from his own standpoint or from the little selfish circle that may be drawn around him. We must learn to make, at some time during our lifetime, certain sacrifices for the benefit of our country, and the upbuilding of the nation, or otherwise we can never expect to be a prosperous people or a prosperous country. Therefore, this is one of those great questions that must be settled so as to do the most good for the greatest number. A tariff cannot be adapted to the views and wants of every one, people must, to some extent, adapt themselves to the tariff, and the situation around them and raise what the markets call for, what this country is adapted to raise and what the lands are suitable to grow. There is no use in any one trying to grow oranges in the province of Quebec, and then asking the government to protect him with a tariff from the rest of the world until such time as his oranges are ripe. Any one who does this will simply hinder the trade of this country. Yet, that is the position in which some of the Canadian fruit growers are at present when they object to this agreement. In visiting the fruit exhibit on Sparks street from British Columbia, an hon. member who was with me from the province of Quebec, said that the fruit looked very nice, but he did not think that the apples had as good a flavour as the apples grown in the province of Quebec. Well, said the exhibitor, that merely shows a difference of opinion; and to prove that they had the best fruit in the world out in British Columbia, he said that for two years they had taken the first prizes and gold medal in every exhibition in which they had made a display both in Canada and in the United States. Now, it seems, however, that these fruit growers in British Columbia are putting up a great cry with regard to the proposed agreement now before us, and are asking to be protected against the rest of the world. But if they have the best fruit in the world why should they desire protection? One could understand the objection coming from those who are trying to grow fruit where nature never intended it should grow.

Just a word concerning the manufacturers of this country, and the railway transportation companies. I believe that the agreement now before this House will benefit our manufacturers instead of injuring them, and our manufacturers are the last people on the face of the earth who should make any objection whatever to it. Knowing, as they do, the clamour raised all over the Dominion for free farm implements, they are making a mistake in fighting this proposed agreement. Inasmuch as it affects only a reduction of from 2½ to 5 per cent on agricultural implements, leaving a duty of 15 per cent in their favour, and giving them a market of 92,000,000 people more to deal with, and inasmuch as their factories, I understand are paying, 22 per cent dividends, I cannot see what they have to complain of. They should be able to manufacture as cheaply as our neighbours to the south.

Coming to the great question of transportation and the objection raised by the opposition that the traffic will be changed north and south instead of east and west, I think that is looking too far ahead for trouble. But imaginary trouble is trouble of the worst kind. In speaking the other day to an old gentleman, whose head was white as snow, he said that if there was any one thing which had made his head grey faster than another, it was the imaginary troubles that he had to meet through life, and I think that is exactly the position in which the Conservatives are at present as regards this agreement. No one can tell just how it is going to affect the traffic of this country. The railways are able to take care of themselves and railway stocks have been increasing in price from day to day ever since it has been talked of. And after all it is only an agreement that can be cancelled at any time whenever we find it is not working to the general advantage of Canada. We can cancel any part of it, or all of it, any time we see fit, and the United States have the same privilege. If the argument set forth by the opposition be true and the traffic of our railways and canals is going to be so seriously affected, what is to prevent the United States from taking the duty off our products at any time they

see fit, as they are master of the situation at present so far as the levying of their own duties is concerned. But I do not believe that our railways are in any such flimsy condition. I believe they are able to take care of themselves.

We can also see that it is not plain sailing on the other side of the line by any means. While there are objections on this side, there are still more on the other side. While delegations are waiting upon this government objecting in the strongest terms to this agreement, there are still more delegations waiting upon the United States government and putting up the same cry as the opposition are doing here.

My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) has said that the prices are better in the province of Quebec than on the other side of the line, and he quoted figures to prove that statement. He also quoted figures to show that prices were better on farm produce in the province of Quebec than in the United States, but I think that I shall be able to show before I get through that such is not the case. One of the greatest proofs is that the young people along the border line in the different counties in the province of Quebec are selling their old homesteads and crossing over the line. They are buying farms on the other side and paying $2,000 more for the same amount of land in the same climate and on the same soil, but with this difference, that there they have the United States market and they feel that they can sacrifice the old homestead for the sake of getting that market.

I do not think that we have it all our own way so far as this treaty is concerned, neither do I think that the United States have it all their way. In my opinion it is a fair and square deal between the two countries; and if we are an honest straightforward people we ought not to ask for anything more, as no other kind of an agreement can last.

Viewing this matter from the standpoint of the province of Quebec, and especially the constituency I represent, I have looked up the exports and imports to see whether the balance of trade was in our favour, or against us, and I can come only to one conclusion, that is that we have everything to gain and nothing to lose by this agreement. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) says that trade will seek the higher markets. I have taken the imports and exports for Quebec alone in order to show just what the balance of trade is. He also stated that horses, cattle, sheep, and other things, were bringing a better price in Canada than in the United States. I find that in the year ending March 31, 1910, we exported to the United States from the province of Quebec alone horses to the value of $72,255, and we received back from the United States $17,911, giving a balance of trade in horses alone of $54,344. Of cattle we sent 2,970 head valued at $17,210, and 27½ per cent duty was paid on them. No cattle were imported into the province of Quebec from the United States. Of lambs we exported from Quebec to the United States, 22,941 valued at $98,084, and 75 cents duty was paid on each lamb. No lambs were imported to Quebec from the United States. This shows that there must be a better market in the United States or these animals would not have been exported from Canada.

Of hay we exported 80,027 tons, valued at $611,116, and there was a duty on that hay of $4 a ton. Still it went to the United States market. My hon. friend from Brandon the other night said it was poor farming in the province of Quebec to sell hay. Let me tell you, as was stated by the Minister of Agriculture, that there are parts of the province of Quebec, where, if they did not sell hay it would be considered bad farming. I cannot better explain this than by quoting the words of the Prime Minister at page 4853 of 'Hansard' on March 7, 1911, where he says:

> Along the two shores of Lake St. Peter there are natural meadows a few inches only above the level of the water, which are yearly flooded, and which, to the knowledge of every one in the province, have been for a hundred years or more growing hay and nothing else. The counties of Berthier, Montmagny and St. Maurice, on the north shore, and the counties of Nicolet, Yamaska and Richelieu on the south, are so situated that they have a population of, perhaps, 1,000, who are growers of hay and for whom this treaty, if it becomes law, will be the most positive boon.

That shows you that these people have been growing hay for a very long time. As that land is overflown with water every year, the sediment enriches the soil, so that it will grow hay for hundreds of years. For that reason if they did not sell hay it would be considered bad farming. What I consider is good farming is that which enables a man to make the most of his farm, not for one year, but year after year.

Of milk and cream we exported 147,250 gallons valued at $141,599, against a duty of 5 cents a gallon. None of these products were imported into Canada.

Of butter we exported 761,000 lbs., valued at $138,969, and 6 cents a pound duty was paid on that butter.

We also exported cheese, potatoes, maple syrup, and many other agricultural products. We have recently had people going through our county lecturing the people and we find reports in the Montreal 'Star'

headed: 'Farmers urged to oppose reciprocity.' These gentlemen say that in 1910 in the United States there was an overproduction of butter. Perhaps I cannot do better than to read what he said. He said:

Last year there was more butter and cheese made in the United States than could be consumed in that country. This has been put away in cold storage during last season, until now the best of authorities agree that there is in four of the principal cities of the United States, 880,000 packages of butter weighing about 60 pounds each, nearly double the quantity that there was the year before. This surplus could not be consumed in the United States and had to be exported. It was now being exported to Great Britain and other countries. Supposing, said he, that the reciprocity arrangement was in force now, a portion at least of this great quantity of butter would be slaughtered on the markets of Canada. It is only the three cents per pound duty that keeps it from competition with the Canadian article.

It was a mistaken idea to think that the United States did not produce as much or even more butter and cheese than they consume at home.

We find that in the same year with such an overproduction of butter in United States we exported from the province of Quebec alone 761,000 pounds of butter after paying a duty of 6 cents a lb. Thus if the United States had as much butter as the hon. member says they had that year, why did they import from the province of Quebec 761,000 lbs?

The other gentleman who spoke at this meeting said that this butter was kept in cold storage in the United States until it reached the enormous price of 40 cents a lb., and then they sold it. If that is the case I do not think there is much danger of butter coming from the United States and competing in our market.

I would like to place on 'Hansard' a few of the principal articles that interest the farmers of Quebec, which will, under this agreement, be on the free list, with a statement of the duties which are now being paid on them. That list is as follows:

Cattle, less than one year old, $2.
Cattle valued at more than $14, 27½ per cent.
Horses value at $150, $30 per head.
Horses valued at over $150, 25 per cent.
Swine, $1.50 each
Sheep and lambs, less than one year, 75 cents each.
Sheep and lambs one year and over, $1.50 each.
Poultry alive, 3 cents per pound.
Poultry dead, 5 cents per pound.
Oats, 15 cents per bushel.
Barley, 15 cents per bushel.
Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel.
Turnips, 25 per cent.
Cabbage, 2 cents each.
Apples, 25 cents per bushel.
Berries of all kinds, 1 cent per quart.
Dried apples, 2 cents per pound.
Butter, 6 cents per pound.
Cheese, 6 cents per pound.
Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.
Hay, $4 per ton.
Straw, $1.50 per ton.

This shows you that the balance of trade for the province of Quebec alone in the few articles I have mentioned, is very heavily in our favour. While we exported $1,500,000 of farm products to the United States we received back only $17,911 worth, giving us a balance of trade of about $1,500,000 in our favour. The duty on our lambs alone in the province of Quebec in 1910 came to over $60,000, and the duty on our hay to $320,000. I do not think that we will get the full amount of this duty added to the price of our products in Quebec, but I do think we will have an active market and no doubt will get a higher price for our lambs and other farm products.

I would also like to place on 'Hansard' a few of the principal exports and imports of Canada that affect the farmers. I find that we have shipped from Canada $642,674 worth of cattle to the United States, and we received back $25,150 worth. I have here a table showing, in the first three columns, the exports to the United States during the year ending March 31, 1910, and in the next three columns, the imports from the United States during the same period:

Exports.	No.	Value.	Imports.	No.	Value.
		$			$
Cattle, 1 year or less	1,797	23,679	Cattle	1,012	25,150
" over 1 year	10,413	61 8,995			
Total	12,210	642,674	Total	1,012	25,150
Horses, 1 year or less	20	6,215	Horses, 1 year or less (value $50)	86	3,600
" over 1 year	1,886	446,971	" over 1 year	6,518	397,903
Total	1,906	453,186	Total	6,504	401,503

Exports.	No.	Value.	Imports.	No.	Value.
		$			$
Swine	205	6,088	Swine		2,140
Sheep, 1 year or less	87,814	415,912	Sheep	36,844	131,492
" over 1 year old	16,553	153,767			
Total	104,349	569,679	Total	36,844	131,492
Poultry		111,241	Poultry		52,597
Wheat.....Bush.	1,857,181	1,883,647	Wheat.....Bush.	54,964	55,139
Oats.....Bush.	1,285,660	534,680	Oats.....Bush.	23,361	13,833
Peas.....Bush.	232,560	273,956	Peas.....Bush.	12,875	35,406
Hay.....Tons	86,127	673,220	Hay.....Tons.	7,680	141,956
Maple sugar.....Lbs.	1,714,555	127,082	Maple sugar.....Lbs.	7,057	717
" syrup.....Gal.	1,994	1,996			
Potatoes.....Bush.	678,632	345,913	Potatoes.....Bush.	215,238	179,849
Turnips.....Bush.	1,268,538	173,933	Turnips.....Bush.	None.	

In regard to horses, I may mention that we have received more horses than in former years on account of the west being settled up so fast that the farmers have had to go across the line and buy horses there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have spoken of the railways and of the manufacturers, and we admit that they are deserving of our consideration in discussing this matter. But as a farmer, and as representing one of the banner counties in the province of Quebec, I thought it my duty to explain my views and the views of my constituents in regard to this great question. I could have spoken from the lumberman's standpoint, and perhaps have made a great deal better showing than from a farmer's standpoint. But as the farmers comprise about sixty per cent of the population of Canada, and as their holdings are far more important than those of the manufacturing and transportation interests put together, it must be admitted that the larger class of people deserve the more consideration from this House. From the figures already quoted I have shown that the agreement now before this parliament will benefit the farmers. I know that the government cannot satisfy every one on this great question, any great question is sure to meet with opposition. Even the overruling power above has failed to satisfy everybody with the weather, and if a delegation could be received, the corners of the streets would be thronged with people waiting their turn to go up and enter their protest in regard to the weather. This is not a new measure, it has been discussed before, and I am sure the Liberal party will not deny its past as being always the friend of the farmer. Just one word more. They say that Sir Wilfrid has lost his hold in the province of Quebec, and is now endeavouring to capture the west. Well, let him capture the west by this agreement, as I know he will. Let me say, as one of the members from the province of Quebec, that the people of that province are just as loyal to Sir Wilfrid as ever they were, they are just as loyal to the Liberal party as ever they were, and they are just as loyal to the Dominion of Canada and to the British Empire as the people of any other province. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up any more of the time of this House, I merely wish to say that I should give my hearty support to this agreement now under consideration.

Mr. STANFIELD moved that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Brodeur, House adjourned at 12.22 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 10, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

APPOINTMENT OF TRANSLATOR.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That it be resolved, that the recommendation of the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, laid on the table of the House with other papers on the subject, on Friday the 7th instant, that Mr. H. M. Vital LaRose be appointed, pursuant to section 21 of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, as translator in the translation branch of the House of Commons, with the rank of an officer in subdivision A of the second division, be concurred in.

Mr. HUGHES. Before this motion passes I would like to have an undertsanding as to the status of the committee known as the Debates Committee. It is well known that we are ornamental, that goes without any question. Have we any use, have we andany function is the next question which impresses itself upon us. I have no hesitation in saying that I shall never sit on the Debates Committee again, after the manner in which it has been operated lately, as it now seems to be the rule that we are to have no word in the appointment or even in the suggestion of officials. I shall never sit on the committee again and the Prime Minister may take my name off whenever he chooses.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know the reasons which have induced my hon. friend to make use of this very severe language. I know that there is a report of the Debates Committee before the House which has not yet been adopted. I understand that the committee have made certain recommendations of appointments, and it is claimed that these appointments should be made by the Speaker of the House under the authority of the House. This is a question of law as to which I would not be ready to give an opinion as I am not sufficiently familiar with the provisions of the Civil Service Act. The House will remember that when the new Civil Service Act was passed three years ago, it was provided that the officers of the House should be appointed under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, the clerk taking the place of the deputy minister, the Speaker taking the place of the minister, and the House taking the place of the Governor in Council, all appointments to be made with the approval of the Civil Service Commission. If the committee to which my hon. friend belongs has infringed upon that rule I am sure he will agree, on reflection, that the law must be observed.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the object of the Debates Committee if all the functions of that committee are to exercised by the Speaker? I am told that the clerk, the servant of the House, has authority to make appointments, that his recommendation must be taken, and that the members of the House of Commons who constitute the committee have not a word to say in the matter. If that is the law it is a very peculiar state of affairs. It would make the committee quite useless, only ornamental, and not much at that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is not only ornamental but useful also. The committee was organized before 1880. Its powers at that time were to supervise the debates of this House. Whatever may have been the intention of the committee at that time it is now admitted that the law which prevails in the matter is the Civil Service Act of 1908, when, after long debate, it was agreed that all appointments should be made under the Civil Service Commission, that is to say, by competition, and upon recommendation to and approval by the Civil Service Commissioners. There is also another part of the report which is before the House, which has not been approved or brought up for approval. The committee actually recommends and sets forth that an additional employee should be taken into the service. I understand that the position is taken that this is an infringement on the well known law that all such appointments must come from the Crown. The committee, of course, can be very useful in advising the government. If the committee should advise the government that another reporter had to be appointed, that the present staff was insufficient and not able to carry on the work, of course such a recommendation would be very useful to the government.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the House not know that? Have we not known for a long time that reporters are wanted here? All we have to do is to read the debates, and we can see that two or three require changing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The committee has to advise the House of this. It may be within the knowledge of all, but it has to be put in concrete form before the House so that action can be taken.

Mr. HUGHES. Why should not the Speaker and the clerk run that business? You had better dissolve the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. It would seem to me that some one should be charged with the responsibility of looking into the qualifications of those who are to be put on that staff, and I do not know of any committee or set of men in the House likely to be more competent to do that than the Debates Committee who have to scrutinize and analyse what the reporters are doing and

how the 'Hansard' is made up. While technically the law may provide that the clerk and the Speaker have the right to appoint, they ought to get some competent information from some source to justify their appointment. It might naturally be presumed that the most reliable source from which that would be likely to come would be from the Debates Committee. I would think that the law would be carried out without any trouble and without ignoring that committee, but it would rather seem now that you are completely ignoring it and rendering its work absolutely valueless.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, as far as I remember the provision of the Civil Service Amendment Act, they amount to this; in certain cases an officer has to be appointed upon the report of the deputy minister, followed by the recommendation of the minister and, upon that report and recommendation, an order in council is made appointing the officer to the position. If I remember the position correctly with respect to appointments to the staff of the House of Commons, the report of the clerk of the House is substituted for the report of the deputy minister, the recommendation of the Speaker is substituted for the recommendation of the minister and the order of this House, by its vote, is substituted for the order in council. Appointments to the House of Commons, I think, are made in that way under the Civil Service Act. I am not quite sure of it, but that is my recollection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not absolutely certain, but I think it works out somewhat in that way. In all cases, of course, there must be a report from the Civil Service Commission. In some cases there must be a report made upon examination; in other cases there must be a report made upon inquiry. That is common both to appointments in any department of the government and to appointments to the staff of the House of Commons. Assuming that the provision of the Civil Service Act had been complied with in that respect, it is worked out in that way, and it would seem that the course provided by the law has been pursued in this instance. That leaves out entirely the question as to what should be the functions of the Debates Committee in that regard. I do not know whether the officer now proposed to be appointed is exclusively concerned with the Debates or not.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is for translation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He is concerned with the translation of the debates.

Mr. FISHER. Not even that; it has nothing to do with the debates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. His duties are to translate reports, journals, everything of that kind which comes before this House. The debates are outside of that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that the reference made by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) is not so much to this particular instance as to some other instance in which it would appear that the Debates Committee, according to his view, have been overruled or that a recommendation that they have brought to the attention of the House has been passed over. I am not offering any opinion upon it at the present time, because I do not know anything about it, but, in so far as this is concerned, if I remember the provisions of the Civil Service Act correctly, I believe they have been carried out.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is quite correct. This is an appointment which has nothing to do with the debates. It is the appointment of a translator and according to the statement of the resolution which is here before us, the Civil Service Act has been complied with in every respect. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down explained the Act correctly. In so far as officers of the House are concerned, the House takes the place of the government, in recommendation and in action, the clerk of the House takes the place of the deputy minister and the Speaker takes the place of the minister. But the Speaker's action as minister has to be confirmed by the House just in the same way as the minister's action has to be confirmed by council. My hon friend the leader of the opposition explained it quite correctly. This resolution has nothing whatever to do with the Debates Committee. The Debates Committee does not deal with this officer, and has nothing to do with him at all.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not hear the language used by the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) clearly enough to understand him. I thought he was ignoring a report sent in by the Debates Committee last week recommending some appointments. It was because I misunderstood him that I brought up the question.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the powers of the Debates Committee concerning appointments, its position is about the same as the position of the Board of Internal Economy. This board used to make appointments of officers to this House, the Debates Committee also presented reports suggesting appointments to the House, and the actions of each had to be confirmed by the House. Now, by the Civil Service Act,

the powers which were formerly exercised by the Board of Internal Economy and the Debates Committee have been transferred to the Civil Service Commission and to the clerk, the Speaker and the House. The Board of Internal Economy has no more to do with appointments than the Debates Committee. That is my way of reading the law.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not abandon the Debates Committee?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Debates Committee has a great deal to do outside of that. It has to do with the supervision of debates generally. For instance, the important question might arise some day as to whether we should allow members to hand in their speeches without delivering them in the House and have them printed in 'Hansard.'

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of Finance always settles that.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are other important questions that might come up as well and the Debates Committee would be the committee to deal with that. The Debates Committee was appointed in 1874 or 1875, for the purpose, not only of looking after appointments, but of making contracts for the publication of 'Hansard.' Later on it was decided to entrust the publication of 'Hansard' to the Printing Bureau, and so the powers of the committee decreased to that extent. Now, the situation of the Debates Committee is absolutely the same as that of the Board of Internal Economy as far as appointments are concerned. The powers that were vested formerly in that respect are being now exercised by the Civil Service Commission and the House.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Canal statistics for fiscal year ending 31st March, 1910.—Mr. Graham.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Association.—Mr. Geoffrion.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 177) to amend the Indian Act. He said: This Bill has two objects. First, under the existing law a railway or any public work authorized by this parliament can be authorized to pass through an Indian reserve by the Governor in Council. The object of the Bill is, that if any similar work is ordered under provincial statute the Governor in Council may by order in council permit it to pass through an Indian reserve. The second object of the Bill is to deal with a question which is becoming of considerable interest in view of the rapid development of the country, and especially so in British Columbia. There are Indian reserves in British Columbia which are now situated in the vicinity of growing towns such as the Songhee reserve in Victoria and the reserve in the vicinity of Vancouver. The Indians are on these reserves by virtue of an arrangement made with the Crown, and it is the boast of Britain that faith must be kept absolutely with the aborigines. Every one knows that when Indians are located in the vicinity of these growing places they are an impediment to their development, but they are there by virtue of a compact with the Crown and hitherto the government has not thought it advisable to dispossess them. We have been negotiating with the Indians on the Songhee Indian reserve for 15 years, and I am happy to say that an agreement has recently been made which is satisfactory to the Indians, to the people of the province, and to the citizens of Victoria. There are other reserves with regard to which it is not possible to come to a settlement, and it is suggested that where such a condition has arisen in the case of a reserve within ten miles of a city application can be made to the Exchequer court on behalf of the Indians to decide whether or not it would be advisable to dispossess the Indians from that reserve, and place them elsewhere, and if so on what terms that should be accomplished.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By whom is the application to be made on behalf of the Indians?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By the superintendent general. The clause says, that in the case of such reserves the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the superintendent general may refer to a judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada for inquiry and report the question as to whether it is expedient, having regard to the interests of the public and of the Indians, that the Indians should be removed from the reserve or any part of it. The Bill provides, if the question is resolved by the court in the affirmative, the procedure that shall be taken for the preservation of the rights of the Indians.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Bill make provision for the manner in which the Indian reserve shall be disposed of. I presume the Fort William Indian reserve would come within the scope of the Bill. How are these Indian reserves to be disposed of?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have provided for that.

Mr. HUGHES. It is provided for in this Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Corporation.—Mr. Geoffrion.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. BLAIN. I call attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the following advertisement which appears in the Elora 'Express' of February 8, last:

Pilkington Liberal Association.
Notice of meeting.

A meeting of the Liberal Association of the township of Pilkington will be held on Friday the 10th of February, 1911, at three o'clock p.m.

At the residence of the undersigned in Elora, for the purpose of naming census enumerators for the township of Pilkington.

THOMAS MARSHALL,
President.

Elora January 31, 1911.

I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any recommendations for the appointment of enumerators in the province of Ontario have come in this way and whether all the enumerators for the province have yet been appointed?

Mr. FISHER. No enumerators have yet been appointed for Ontario or any other province.

Mr. BLAIN. None have been appointed?

Mr. FISHER. None. I know nothing about that recommendation, and I take my recommendations where I think I have the greatest need to.

Mr. BLAIN. If a similar request comes from the Conservative association of my own county will it be complied with?

Mr. FISHER. I will take the recommendation and act upon it according to my judgment.

PRIVILEGE—CUSTOMS DUTIES, 1906-1910.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I desire, Mr. Speaker, to avail myself, I think for the first time, of the rule respecting a question of privilege, not to ventilate any grievance, for I have none, but to call attention to a matter which perhaps I cannot at the present stage present in any other way. It relates to a conflict of statement between my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and myself in the short budget debate. I had stated in the budget speech that the liberal revenues which we were receiving came to us under a customs tariff that was on the whole lower than the tariff of the preceding government. With that statement as a text my hon. friend from North Toronto proceeded to say:

Now we have discussed that question from my standpoint in this House, and other hon. members have discussed it. I propose to discuss it to-day from the government standpoint. I have here a return which was prepared by the government. This return simply makes a calculation of the rate of duty actually paid upon actual importation in 1896 and in 1910, and puts them side by side. And what is the result? The result is that the rate of taxation paid in 1910 is much greater than the rate of taxation paid in 1896. Here is the table:

Then my hon. friend read a very lengthy list, occupying nearly two pages of 'Hansard,' setting forth the rates of duty in 1896 and the rates of duty in 1910, and purporting to show that while in a few cases the rates of duty are lower at present, yet in the great majority of cases the rates of duty in 1910 are substantially higher than the rates of duty in 1896; and having given the two columns in this way, my hon. friend concluded:

Now, that takes in the whole list of articles imported into this country which are subject to ad valorem duties, and a comparison of the list shows that with very few exceptions the real duty levied on the actual imports in 1896 was lower than the real duty levied on the actual imports in 1910. With respect to nine-tenths of all the articles that is true, with respect to the other one-tenth or about that there is either an equality, or the 1896 duty was a little bit higher. I think that is a convincing argument out of the return of the government itself prepared at the order of the House, which will set at rest as far as that is concerned the debate which has been between the two sides of the House for the last 15 years.

I was rather surprised, I am bound to say, at the conclusions which my hon. friend drew from his statement, and I was not able to follow him at the moment; but I have since had the return brought to my notice, and have caused some inquiry to be made into it, and I find, if I am correctly informed, that my hon. friend made a simple but very extraordinary mistake. He took the figures of 1896 and placed them under the heading of 1910, so that in every instance in which this statement purports to show an increase in 1910, the facts appear to be just the reverse. In every instance in which his statement purports to show an increase, it really shows a decrease. I merely wish to call the attention of my hon. friend to the matter, and I am sure that if he finds that he is in error, he will, himself, draw attention to the mistake.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, if I find that I am in error, I will acknowledge the corn, and do it very cheerfully, but I do not acknowledge that yet. I will immediately look into the figures and see.

While we are having some of these little differences adjusted, I might call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fish-

eries (Mr. Brodeur), to an error into which I think he fell the other night in reference to the treaty of 1888, that is, the treaty passed by this House, but not by the Senate of the United States. If I read 'Hansard' rightly, the hon. minister stated that that treaty provided for free fishing in our inland waters by American fishermen.

Mr. BRODEUR. I perhaps said 1888, but it was in 1871 that the right of fishing was given.

Mr. FOSTER. It was given in 1871, and I notice that my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), called the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to that fact, saying that he must have meant the treaty 1871; but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries denied that he meant the treaty of 1871, and said that he meant the treaty of 1888.

CONDITION OF THE PARLIAMENT GROUNDS.

Mr. HUGHES. I presume that the hon. Minister of Public Works, since I drew his attention a day or two ago to the condition of the parliament grounds and of Wellington Street, in front of the buildings, has consulted his officers with a view to having something done. I understand that the government has charge of Wellington Street from the post office to Bank Street. It would be hard to find in the Dominion of Canada any farmyard in a more disreputable state, even in the spring of the year, than that street is in to-day; and the condition of the grounds in front of the building is simply disgraceful. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what he has done with regard to the matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that my hon. friend refers to the lawn in front of the building.

Mr. HUGHES. I mean the grounds right up to the doors of this building, where the horse-manure this morning was several inches thick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is said that some people see double, and I am satisfied that my hon. friend has seen double the quantity. I walked up to-day with a gentleman of some discernment, and he remarked how quickly the avenue was drying up and how well it looked.

Mr. HUGHES. Was the minister coming from a luncheon and seeing double?

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to the lawn, perhaps my hon. friend is not a farmer, and does not know that the fertilizing of a lawn is absolutely necessary. The fertilizer is spread all over the lawn to-day, and if my hon. friend waits for a few days, he will see the green grass coming up, and will then be glad that the department has fertilized it in that way. With regard to Wellington Street, the employees of the department are having it cleaned up. But there are six inches of ice on the street, and to remove that would cost several hundred dollars; but in a few days the sun will melt it away. If my hon. friend will have a little patience, everything will be lovely in a few days.

Mr. HUGHES. We would not have to wait for a few days if the hon. minister had in his department officers who understood the proper method of fertilizing lawns. I am a farmer myself, though I did not grow up between two rows of corn like some gentlemen who claim to be farmers. This kind of fertilizing with manure is done in the remote parts of the country, but not in towns.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is where I did my farming—in the country.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the trouble with the minister.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that Wellington Street might be put into a much better condition at the crossings. It is often almost impossible for people leaving the parliament grounds to cross the street without going through manure and debris which, to say the least, is very unsightly and uncleanly. If the crossings were put into proper shape, and that could be done without hauling away the ice, people could cross the street with some comfort. If the old saying be true that 'cleanliness is next to godliness,' the Minister of Public Works does not seem to be very anxious to get towards heaven, judging by the state of the crossings on Wellington Street. The crossings at Metcalfe Street, O'Connor Street and Elgin Street could be made passable at a very small cost.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 151) to incorporate the Canadian Security Company.—Mr. McCraney.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 165) respecting a Patent of the Goldschmidt Thermit Company.—Mr. Rivet.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Rutan.

Bill (No. 167) to incorporate the Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

Bill (No. 169) to incorporate the Canada West Loan Corporation.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 171) to incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—Mr. Rutan.

Bill (No. 172) respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 173) for the relief of Robert William Logan.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 174) to incorporate the Casualty Company of Canada.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CREAM EXPORTS.

*Mr. MONK:

1. What were the total exports of cream from Canada to the United States during the year ending March 31, 1911?

2. What were the total exports of cream from the provinces of Quebec to the United States during the same period?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The total exports of cream from Canada to the United States during the year ended March 31, 1911, were 1,823,821 gallons, valued at $1,714,528.

2. The total exports of cream from the province of Quebec to the United States during the year ended March 31, 1911, were 1,435,485 gallons, valued at $1,376,524.

TOBACCO DUTIES.

* Mr. MONK:

1. What are the duties imposed upon leaf tobacco imported from the United States into Canada?

2. What are the duties imposed by the American tariff law upon leaf tobacco exported from Canada to the United States?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The duties imposed on leaf tobacco imported from the United States into Canada are collected through the Department of Inland Revenue, as follows:

Stemmed leaf tobacco, 42 cents per pound.

Unstemmed leaf tobacco, 28 cents per pound.

2. The duties imposed by the United States on leaf tobacco imported into that country under the tariff of 1909 are as follows: Item 220. Wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than fifteen per centum of wrapper tobacco, and all leaf tobacco the product of two or more countries or dependencies when mixed or packed together, if unstemmed, one dollar and eighty-five cents per pound; if stemmed, two dollars and fifty cents per pound; filler tobacco not specially provided for in this section, if unstemmed, thirty-five cents per pound, if stemmed fifty cents per pound. Item 222. All other tobaccos . . unmanufactured, not specially provided for in this section, fifty-five cents per pound.

ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL.

* Mr. MONK:

1. Is the government aware that buoys used for the St. Lawrence ship channel and temporarily placed on the government wharfs at Sorel are said to have been taken away and converted to private uses for various purposes, to the knowledge of those in charge of said buoys?

2. Has any complaint been made to the government upon this subject, or has the government been notified of these abstractions?

3. Have any steps been taken by the government in the said matter?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1, 2 and 3. Information reached the department a short time ago, to the effect that buoys intended for the use of the St. Lawrence ship channel have been taken away and converted to private use. The officers who are investigating into conditions at Sorel have been instructed to ascertain the facts, and the matter is now receiving attention.

UNITED STATES WARSHIPS IN GREAT LAKES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax):

1. Referring to the armament of the United States warships or training ships on the Great Lakes, and to the answer of the Prime Minister given in the House of Commons on the 30th day of March, 1908, in which he stated the armament of the 'Nashville' to be 8 4-inch guns, 4 6-pounder quick-firers and 4 machine guns, what is the armament of the following United States warships or training ships, respectively: The 'Essex,' the 'Don Juan de Austria,' the 'Wolverine,' the 'Dorothea,' the 'Wasp' and the 'Sandoval'?

2. Are these ships still stationed on the Great Lakes?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER:

1. According to the latest information in the possession of the government the armaments of these vessels were as follows:

'Essex'—6 4-inch, 4 6-pounders, 4 machine.

'Don Juan De Austria'—6 3-inch, 4 6-pounders, 4 machine.

'Wolverine'—4 6-pounders, 4 machine.

'Dorothea'—4 6-pounders, 4 machine.

'Sandoval'—2 3-pounders, 2 machine.

'Wasp'—4 6-pounders, 2 6-mm. Colts' rapid fire rifles.

2. With the exception of the 'Wasp', which has never entered the Great Lakes, being too large to pass through the canals, all these vessels are still stationed on the Great Lakes.

EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. RUTAN:

What have been the dutiable exports by provinces from Canada into the United States for 1908, 1909 and 1910, respectively, of wheat, barley, flax, oats, beef, eggs, butter, sheep, swine, potatoes, hay and fruit?

Mr. PATERSON. The quantity and value of the under mentioned articles (Canadian produce) exported from Canada, by provinces, to the United States, during the fiscal years 1908, 1909 and 1910, was as follows:

Provinces.	1908.		1909.		1910.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
Swine—No.		$		$		$
Ontario	414	8,326	109	2,589	187	5,881
Quebec	22	444	13	123	3	32
Nova Scotia						
New Brunswick	3	145			1	15
Manitoba	2	7	6	78	2	35
British Columbia	3	75	2	8	6	50
Prince Edward Island						
Alberta			2	28		
Saskatchewan	10	35			6	75
Yukon	44	1,335				
Total	498	10,357	132	2,826	205	6,088
Sheep—No.						
Ontario	84,335	525,335	38,069	224,287	53,100	368,461
Quebec	61,774	266,018	29,363	109,950	23,047	99,124
Nova Scotia	3	150			51	230
New Brunswick	31,692	118,557	26,980	85,659	28,093	100,904
Manitoba			4	47	3	10
British Columbia	13	245	45	402	49	910
Alberta					6	40
Yukon	30	435				
Total	177,847	911,740	94,461	420,345	103,349	569,679
Butter—Lbs.						
Ontario	4,700	1,117	25,546	4,377	332,277	58,001
Quebec	179,701	35,501	61,970	12,485	760,760	138,969
Nova Scotia	337	91	50	9	585	137
New Brunswick	2,275	485	1,048	245	5,340	1,255
Manitoba	540	118	643	145	27	6
British Columbia	186	53	1,421	360	1,108	335
Prince Edward Island	229	52	290	65	1,439	312
Alberta					147	37
Yukon	2,948	1,482	1,500	560	2,154	802
Total	190,916	38,899	92,468	18,246	1,103,837	199,854
Eggs.—Doz.						
Ontario	6,493	1,303	5,614	1,243	9,469	3,553
Quebec	172	41	740	210	133	37
Nova Scotia	109	19	2,220	512	580	114
New Brunswick	5,995	1,240	8,910	2,281	5,922	1,438
Manitoba			60	9		
British Columbia	3,074	573	817	219	88	21
Prince Edward Island	330	77	29,640	6,934	14,868	4,365
Saskatchewan					4	1
Yukon	6,878	2,700	4,200	1,646	4,668	2,022
Total	23,051	5,953	52,201	13,054	35,732	11,551
Beef.—Lbs.						
Ontario	25,464	2,332	12,326	1,246	10,404	999
Quebec			13,871	1,193	320	42
Nova Scotia	450	28	650	95	400	20
New Brunswick	434	26			150	7
Manitoba	3,821	378	400	31		
British Columbia	20,430	1,386	22,802	1,660	17,305	1,432
Saskatchewan			10	1		
Yukon	30,993	7,372	21,155	5,015	19,924	5,061
Total	81,592	11,522	71,214	9,241	48,503	7,561

Provinces.	1908.		1909.		1910.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
		$		$		$
Flax—Cwt.						
Ontario	9,330	90,971	3,307	33,465	2,741	23,009
Quebec	7,470	71,654	8,582	87,114	6,038	61,026
Total	16,800	162,625	11,889	120,579	8,779	84,035
Apples, Green—Brls.						
Ontario	98,926	288,896	4,063	10,894	37,549	101,226
Quebec	3,385	10,280	2,467	7,209	9,456	15,606
Nova Scotia	7,682	15,599	11,771	17,975	6,086	12,376
New Brunswick	779	2,152	620	916	248	497
Manitoba	37	131	28	108	86	426
British Columbia	226	807	240	357	485	1,777
Prince Edward Island	3	6	9	13	190	303
Saskatchewan	2	9	11	24	172	599
Yukon	2	24	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	111,042	317,904	19,209	37,496	48,272	132,810
Berries, all kinds.						
Ontario	.....	51,157	.....	30,330	.....	49,390
Quebec	.....	27,148	.....	30,837	.....	17,243
Nova Scotia	.....	57,221	.....	67,431	.....	43,372
New Brunswick	.....	52,879	.....	47,458	.....	34,991
Manitoba	.....	17	.....	73	.....	79
British Columbia	.....	.....	.....	486	.....	608
Prince Edward Island	.....	12,618	.....	.....	.....	2,990
Alberta	.....	.....	.....	1,820	.....	.....
Saskatchewan	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3
Yukon	.....	44	.....	5	.....	.....
Total	.....	201,084	.....	178,440	.....	148,676
Green Fruits, all Other, N.O.P.						
Ontario	.....	42,660	.....	25,331	.....	33,137
Quebec	.....	3,903	.....	1,361	.....	1,498
Nova Scotia	.....	29	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Brunswick	.....	142	.....	723	.....	75
Manitoba	.....	221	.....	97	.....	220
British Columbia	.....	201	.....	13	.....	438
Saskatchewan	.....	2	.....	14	.....	14
Yukon	.....	6	.....	27	.....	.....
Total	.....	47,164	.....	27,566	.....	35,382
Barley—Bush.						
Ontario	204,528	136,660	105,510	58,564	87,037	43,889
Quebec	2	3	159,569	85,574	.....	.....
New Brunswick	2	1	.....	.....	12	12
Manitoba	6,256	2,909	1,000	512	60,505	22,667
British Columbia	.....	.....	15	9	17	16
Saskatchewan	.....	.....	2	1	25	24
Total	210,788	139,573	266,096	144,660	147,596	66,608

Provinces.	1908.		1909.		1910.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
Oats—Bush.		$		$		$
Ontario	249,037	95,762	698,274	286,927	700,047	305,638
Quebec	78,628	36,725	709,880	356,975	5,473	2,726
New Brunswick	575	264	1,362	682	243	118
Manitoba	6,398	3,060	51,670	20,055	66,209	23,118
British Columbia	12,420	6,210	67,310	22,922	434,049	175,612
Prince Edward Island	100	50	.....	.....	3	2
Alberta	2,971	843	1,086	355	769	210
Saskatchewan	53	28	22,409	10,683	77,751	25,609
Yukon	809	1,603	2,260	2,892	1,089	1,647
Total	350,991	144,545	1,554,251	700,491	1,285,660	534,680
Wheat—Bush.						
Ontario	93,020	83,416	354,288	322,795	660,106	743,392
Quebec	20,701	19,050	272,941	260,695	215,507	218,626
New Brunswick	1	1	683	342	.....	.....
Manitoba	48	55	3,438	3,428	973,975	915,284
British Columbia	.....	.....	29	29	20	23
Alberta	35	21	50	30	176	154
Saskatchewan	1,092	1,091	19,169	15,369	6,394	6,168
Yukon	29	65	3	9	.....	.....
Total	114,926	102,699	650,601	602,661	1,856,181	1,883,647
Hay—Tons.						
Ontario	5,158	51,491	86	803	2,318	24,563
Quebec	22,061	177,857	2,445	21,663	80,027	611,116
Nova Scotia	.....	.....	.....	.....	51	603
New Brunswick	284	2,913	752	6,494	3,634	32,707
British Columbia	18	206	1	5	19	239
Prince Edward Island	.....	.....	.....	.....	37	367
Yukon	37	3,804	33	3,044	41	3,625
Total	27,558	236,271	3,317	32,009	86,127	673,220
Potatoes—Bush.						
Ontario	704	477	159,900	78,284	315,155	169,478
Quebec	2,101	1,282	2,597	1,176	66,203	30,251
Nova Scotia	5,702	3,770	66,395	33,166	26,672	15,988
New Brunswick	7,546	4,125	205,935	104,434	220,441	112,701
Manitoba	6	3	18	17	33	19
British Columbia	500	268	828	740	59	35
Prince Edward Island	17,560	4,450	138,723	33,971	49,530	15,713
Saskatchewan	.....	.....	6	6	3	2
Yukon	273	1,084	52	113	535	1,716
Total	34,392	15,459	574,454	251,907	678,632	345,903

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—DR. C. A. MURRAY.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Dr. C. A. Murray, dentist Moncton, officially connected with the Intercolonial railway as a ticket agent?

2. What amounts has the said Dr. Murray received in rebates from the Intercolonial railway from the return to the department of unused tickets of first and second class, mileage, and duplex denominations, during the past five years?

3. What is the total amount yearly that he has received since 1896?

Mr. PATERSON.

1. No.

2. During the past five years Dr. C. A. Murray has received $103.31 in rebates from the Intercolonial for the return of unused first and second and mileage tickets; there is no record of refunds on duplex tickets.

3. 1896 to 1900, nil; 1901, six dollars and ninety-five cents ($6.95); 1902 and 1903, nil; 1904, thirteen dollars and forty-seven cents ($13.47); 1905, one dollar and eighty-one cents ($1.81); 1906, thirty-six dollars and eighty-one cents ($36.81); 1907, thirty-three

dollars and ninety cents ($33.90); 1908, twenty-two dollars and seventy-five cents ($22.75); 1909, four dollars and forty-five cents ($4.45); 1910, five dollars and forty cents ($5.40).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many locomotives have been purchased by the federal government for use on the Intercolonial or any other government railway in each year since 1896?

2. From what firm or firms were such locomotives purchased and what were the prices paid?

Mr. GRAHAM:

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Year.	Locomotives purchased.	Name of firm purchased from.	Price paid per locomotive.
1896	Nil.		
1897	Nil.		
1898	2	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	$ 14,500 00
	2	Baldwin Locomotive Works..	10,000 00
1899	1	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	14,500 00
	2	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	12,000 00
	20	Baldwin Locomotive Works..	9,700 00
1900	1	Canadian Locomotive Co. ...	9,798 40
	1	Canadian Locomotive Co. ...	12,000 00
1901	10	Manchester Locomotive Co...	15,500 00
	9	Manchester Locomotive Co...	13,500 00
	20	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	19,000 00
	6	Dixon Locomotive Co... ..	15,000 00
	10	Richmond Locomotive Co....	14,817 65
1902	6	Dixon Locomotive Co.....	15,000 00
	4	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	17,681 88
1903	11	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	20,270 00
1904	15	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	20,270 00
	5	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	17,500 00
1905	10	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	20,300 00
	12	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	23,950 00
1906	5	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	18,430 00
	1	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	21,950 00
	15	Locomotive and Machine Co.	24,000 00
1907	19	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	21,950 00
1908	32	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	21,950 00
	3	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	18,430 00
	10	Locomotive and Machine Co.	24,000 00
1909	Nil.		
1910	10	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	19,600 00
	1	Locomotive and Machine Co.	22,500 00

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

1896	Nil.		
1897	Nil.		
1898	Nil.		
1899	2	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	8,250 00
1900	2	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	8,730 00
1901	Nil.		
1002	2	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	10,150 00
1903	Nil.		
1904	4	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	9,450 00
1905	1	Canadian Locomotive Co.....	9,450 00
1906	Nil.		
1907	4	Canadian Locomotive Co,....	13,250 00
1908	Nil.		
1909	Nil.		
1910	Nil.		

CUSTOMS IMPORTS AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What quantities of hay, cereals, vegetables, poultry, eggs, fruit and general farm, garden and dairy produce, respectively, were entered for consumption at the Port of Sault Ste. Marie from the United States of America during the fiscal years ending March 31, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910, both inclusive?

2. What were the values of such imports, respectively, and what duty was paid thereon?

Mr. PATERSON:

The quantity and value of the undermentioned articles entered for consumption at the port of Sault Ste. Marie, from the United States, during the fiscal years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

	Year.	Quantity.	Value. $	Duty Collected $ cts.
		No.		
Cattle..	1905	1	18	3 60
	1906	2	20	4 00
(9 months).	1907	1	20	4 00
	1908	1	25	6 25
	1909	1	20	5 00
	1910	.....	.....	.....
Horses..	1905	67	5,380	1,076 00
	1906	67	4,420	884 00
	1907	61	5,479	1,012 05
	1908	99	5,815	1,453 75
	1909	18	1,273	318 25
	1910	10	190	137 50
		Bush.		
Barley..	1905	10	15	4 50
Beans..	1905	14	36	2 10
	1906	.....	.....	.....
	1907	71	100	16 55
	1908	57	92	14 25
	1909	26	73	6 50
	1910	.....	.....	.....
Oats	1905	186	88	18 60
	1907	125	44	12 50
Pease..	1908	10	13	1 50
	1910	12	13	1 80
		Doz.		
Eggs	1905	6,180	2,245	185 40
	1906	7,110	1,031	213 30
	1907	13,260	2,491	397 80
	1908	9,604	1,982	288 12
	1909	13,890	2,667	416 70
	1910	8,400	1,909	252 00
		Brls.		
Apples	1905	75	204	30 00
	1906	12	38	4 80
	1907	68	205	27 20
	1908	43	207	17 20
	1909	33	244	13 20
	1910	89	481	35 60
		Lbs.		
Berries..	1905	8,556	994	171 12
	1906	7,684	759	153 68
	1907	72	15	1 44
	1908	2,224	284	44 48
	1909	3,368	278	67 36
	1910	2,892	341	57 84
Cherries	1905	1,162	95	23 24
	1906	650	104	13 00
	1907	80	13	1 60

	Year.	Quantity.	Value. $	Duty Collected. $ cts.
Cherries	1908	.....	.....	.....
	1909	820	92	16 40
	1910	370	62	7 40
		Bush.		
Cranberries	1905	289	669	167 25
	1906	80	249	62 25
	1907	140	408	102 00
	1908	169	546	136 50
	1909	37	120	30 00
	1910	66	179	44 75
		Lbs.		
Grapes..	1905	8,526	645	170 52
	1906	7,092	597	141 84
	1907	9,330	757	186 60
	1908	4,655	444	93 10
	1909	3,605	272	72 10
	1910	5,757	452	115 14
		Boxes.		
Oranges, lemons and limes.. ..	1905	3,099	9,989	774 75
	1906	3,022	10,954	755 50
	1907	805	3,877	201 25
	1908	Free.		
	1909	Free.		
	1910	Free.		
		Lbs.		
Peaches	1905	27,894	1,029	278 94
	1906	32,282	1,310	322 82
	1907	28,050	1,436	280 50
	1908	15,290	1,065	152 90
	1909	19,470	869	194 70
	1910	14,580	744	145 80
		Bush.		
Plums..	1905	137	517	129 25
	1906	225	440	110 00
	1907	329	708	177 00
	1908	77	441	23 10
	1909	121	381	36 30
	1910	106	459	31 80
		$		
All other green fruit, n.o.p. ..	1905	.....	599	119 80
	1906	.....	466	93 20
	1907	.....	738	147 60
	1908	.....	493	42 68
	1909	.....	337	33 95
	1910	.....	733	58 90
		Tons.		
Hay..	1905	1,042	8,506	2,084 00
	1906	604	4,657	1,208 00
	1907	1,351	13,050	2,702 00
	1908	3,837	56,516	7,674 00
	1909	1,677	17,815	3,354 00
	1910	483	5,869	966 00
		Lbs.		
Honey..	1905	831	112	24 93
	1906	898	117	26 94
	1907	546	76	16 38
	1908	522	100	15 66
	1909	40	6	1 20
	1910	.....	.....	.....
		Lbs.		
Butter..	1908	1,250	288	50 00
	1909	1,060	290	42 40
		Lbs.		
Cheese..	1905	420	73	12 60
	1906	1,892	406	56 76
	1907	7,087	1,436	212 61
	1908	4,588	990	137 64
	1909	2,485	551	74 55
	1910	.....	.....	.....

Mr. PATERSON.

	Year.	Quantity.	Value. $	Duty Collected. $ cts.
		Lbs.		
Lard	1905	3,816	302	76 32
	1906	108,602	10,498	2,172 04
	1907	53,380	5,380	1,067 60
	1908	26,824	2,705	536 48
	1909	11,004	1,144	220 08
	1910	1,474	178	29 48
		Lbs.		
Bacon and hams.	1905	14,927	1,609	298 54
	1906	58,607	6,155	1,172 14
	1907	38,832	5,279	776 64
	1908	23,274	2,899	465 48
	1909	14,803	1,826	296 06
	1910	22,726	2,997	454 52
		Lbs.		
Beef, salted, in barrels..	1905	2,810	262	56 20
	1906	57,299	5,522	1,145 98
	1907	4,963	483	99 26
		Lbs.		
Mutton and lamb, fresh..	1908	1,000	101	30 00
		Lbs.		
Pork, barrelled, in brine..	1905	15,512	1,311	310 24
	1906	200,932	18,186	4,018 64
	1907	155,180	15,651	3,103 60
	1908	22,971	2,323	459 42
	1909	51,911	5,507	1,038 22
	1910	36,856	2,361	737 12
		$		
Poultry	1906	.....	7	1 40
	1910	.....	16	3 20
		No.		
Melons..	1905	3,176	360	90 00
	1906	3,729	480	120 00
	1907	3,369	531	132 75
	1908	2,852	560	85 56
	1909	4,731	1,026	141 93
	1910	3,288	463	98 64
		Bush.		
Potatoes	1905	25,801	8,751	3,870 15
	1906	6,483	3,613	972 45
	1907	6,418	3,584	992 65
	1908	13,814	8,739	2,762 80
	1909	646	553	129 20
	1910	3,691	2,172	738 20
		Bush.		
Tomatoes, fresh.	1905	324	847	149 50
	1906	221	860	130 20
	1907	120	377	61 70
	1908	278	479	143 70
	1909	164	292	87 60
	1910	188	174	52 20
		$		
All other vegetables, n.o.p. ..	1905	.....	4,274	1,068 50
	1906	.....	3,120	780 00
	1907	.....	2,300	582 85
	1908	.....	5,077	1,523 10
	1909	.....	3,123	936 90
	1910	.....	4,900	1,470 00

RECIPROCITY CONFERENCES.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What was the length of the session of the United States and Canadian representatives held in Ottawa to discuss reciprocity?

2. What was the length of the sessions held in Washington?

3. How many plenipotentiaries and assistants represented the United States at Ottawa during the discussion?

4. How many plenipotentiaries and assistants represented Canada at Washington during the conference?

5. What was the expense at Ottawa and at Washington?

6. What portion did Canada pay?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. The United States representatives were in Ottawa a week.

2. The Canadian representatives were in Washington fifteen days.

3. The negotiations at Ottawa were conducted on the part of the United States by two representatives of the State Department at Washington and the United States Consul General at Ottawa, and on the part of Canada by two ministers of the government.

4. At the Washington conference the United States was represented by the Secretary of State and two officers of his department. Canada was represented by two ministers of the government. After some progress had been made the Canadian ministers called in the assistance of two officers of their departments and thereupon the United States representatives called in the services of two officers of their departments.

5 and 6. As the accounts have not been closed the exact amount of the expense cannot now be stated, but it will be quite small.

RECIPROCITY STATISTICS.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Was the purpose of entering into negotiations for reciprocity with the United States to secure better prices for Canadian produce?

2. Were the representatives of Canada before entering upon the negotiations supplied with comprehensive data and statistics collected by experts and officials covering a considerable period and showing a comparative list of prices of all products in the principal markets of Canada and the United States?

3. If so, will data and statistics be available to the members of the House by laying them on the table of the House?

4. Generally speaking, how do the prices of farm produce in the United States compare with prices in Canada?

5. Upon what information is the answer to the preceding question based?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. The purpose of entering into negotiations for reciprocity with the United States was to obtain that expansion of market for Canadian products which has been sought by all governments in Canada since the formation of the Dominion.

2 to 5. These questions have been fully discussed in the House since the hon. member placed his question on the notice paper and the views of the government thereon have been stated.

CHEMIN GOUIN POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. AMES:

Who is the postmaster at Chemin Gouin, P.Q., what salary does he draw, and when was he appointed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A. C. Miquelon is postmaster at Chemin Gouin, Quebec. He was appointed on October 16, 1908. The revenue of the office entitles him to payment at the rate of $99 per annum, this including night and rent allowance.

EXPORTS OF MILK AND CREAM.

Mr. EDWARDS:

What quantity of milk and of cream were exported to the United States from Canada in each month of the fiscal years 1910 and 1911, and what was the value of the same in each month?

Mr. PATERSON:

Milk and cream were not separately enumerated in the classification of exports during the fiscal year 1910. The exports, quantity and value, of milk and cream from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year 1911, by months, were as follows:

	Milk, sweet.		Cream, sweet.	
1910	Gallons.	Value.	Gallons.	Value.
April..	7,204	$ 901	16,263	$ 18,488
May	175	22	52,430	55,150
June	.....	....	152,070	145,818
July	260	52	238,805	221,559
August..	2,592	226	266,967	265,538
September.. ..	9,027	957	271,463	262,393
October	11,069	1,099	327,064	309,919
November.. ..	.....	....	213,656	196,570
December.. ..	7,270	766	151,903	119,882
1911.				
January	.....	....	68,873	62,583
February.. ..	2,178	253	47,083	42,034
March..	18,327	1,115	17,244	14,594
Total.. ..	$58,102	$5,391	$1,823,821	$1,714,528

CANSO—GUYSBOROUGH MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. How many tenders were received for the carrying of the mail between Canso and Guysborough, N. S.?

2. What were the names of the men who tendered and the amount stated in each tender?

3. Was the contract given to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Whilst the tenders have been received and awarded, the contract has not been returned completed, and until such completed contract has been received the department cannot give the information asked for.

INQUIRY INTO MARINE DEPARTMENT AT SOREL.

*Mr. MONK:

1. On what date did the government institute an inquiry into the Marine Department at Sorel?
2. Who was commissioned to conduct the said inquiry?
3. What instructions were given to the commissioners in regard to the object and scope of the said inquiry?
4. Is the said inquiry held in public?
5. Who is acting as secretary of the commissioners?
6. Has the government appointed counsel to represent the department?
7. Have the commissioners begun their sittings? If so, on what date and where?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Instructions were issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on the 6th September, 1910; the 26th October, 1910; the 22nd November, 1910, and on the 21st March, 1911, instituting an inquiry into alleged irregularities at Sorel. Three employees suspected have been proceeded against and brought before the courts. Of these, two have been convicted, and the other one has been committed for trial.

2. Mr. C. Doutre, purchasing and contract agent; Mr. A. Boyle, chief accountant and inspector of agencies, and Mr. R. A. Wiallard, agent of the department at Montreal.

3. The instructions were to the effect that a thorough and searching inquiry into alleged irregularities was to be made.

4. No.

5. Nobody is acting; the officers are doing secretarial work.

6. Mr. J. L. Perron, of Montreal, has been retained to advise the officers who are conducting the investigation.

7. The officers to whom the matter has been entrusted have been pursuing the investigation at Montreal, Sorel and Ottawa, on different occasions since the 7th of September last.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Labour and various labour organizations, or their officers, in connection with the Quebec bridge.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all the evidence taken by Chief Justice Howell in connection with his commission re St. Peters Indian Reserve.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a copy of all papers, documents memoranda and correspondence relating to the parliament site in the city of Winnipeg for the province of Manitoba, including the reservations made in the Crown grants to the Hudson Bay Company, and the purpose for which the same were made, and also a copy of the Dominion Order in Council, dated the 23rd January, 1872, and all subsequent orders in council and correspondence dealing with the site for both provincial and Dominion purposes.—Mr. Haggart (Winnipeg).

For a return showing the names of all persons in the province of New Brunswick who have received fishing bounties during the year ending March 31, 1911, with the amount received by each.—Mr. Daniel.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. C. J. THORNTON (Durham). Mr. Chairman, as the farmer representative of an agricultural constituency which is one of the best in Ontario and one of the best in the Dominion, it becomes me to have something to say on this question of reciprocity, because of the effect that reciprocity will have on the farming industry of this country. I desire to be brief, because there are so many to speak and because so much time has already been consumed in the discussion of this question.

I consider this the greatest question that has been before this House, perhaps, since 1878. A change is contemplated in our tariff affecting between 250 and 300 articles on the list. If this goes into effect, it will be revolutionary in its operation. Now, let me say at the start, I believe that, in a few localities and from a local standpoint, benefits will arise from the adoption of this proposed resolution. But at the same time, it is not to be forgotten that this is legislation for a country which is at least 4,000 miles from east to west, and 2,000 miles or so from north to south; and I think that we, as members of this House, ought to look at the question from the broad national standpoint, considering what is best for the country and not what is best for any particular locality.

In this discussion a great deal has been said about the reciprocity treaty which was in force from 1854 until January, 1866, and of the prosperity that Canada—the older provinces—enjoyed while that reciprocity was in force. A very unfair conclusion is reached sometimes in considering the operation of that treaty. I can remember distinctly as a boy—and I took an intense interest even as a boy in public questions—how reciprocity at that time worked, and I remember some of the reasons why it worked as it did. It is well known that the Crimean war was on during the early years of that treaty, and that, because of that war, wheat reached a price that, perhaps, it never reached before or since, in the history of this country. I remember distinctly that some farmers got as high as $2.50 a bushel for wheat. But very shortly

after that war closed wheat went down to 70 cents a bushel—in some cases, indeed, below that, but that was the general price during the years 1857-8. While the war was on and prices of wheat were high, there was an abundance of money in the country. Times were good; there can be no question on that point. But this was followed, from 1857 to 1860 by the hardest times, I think, that Canada has ever experienced—the hardest times for Canada within my recollection, at least. Immediately following that, from 1861 to 1865, came the war of the American rebellion. The Americans were fighting instead of raising the produce to feed their people, and the result was that there was an unlimited demand for Canadian products. The result was beneficial from a commercial standpoint to the Canadians. That treaty was abrogated in January 18, 1866. We are apt to look back at that period and say that the commercial prosperity that Canada experienced during these years was due to the treaty, when practically it was not. Every man who is familiar with the history of Canada at that time knows this.

I shall perhaps discuss this question from the standpoint of the farmer, but while I do so I do not wish to be understood as desiring any favouritism in legislation for a class. It is most important that we in this country should recognize that our interests, no matter what our occupation or profession, are all identical, that we are interdependent, one on the other, and that when the country prospers, or when any one class prospers the good effects must be felt among other classes. I recognize that agriculture is the basic industry in Canada, and that this proposition will affect agriculture directly perhaps more than it will any other branch of industry; but indirectly it may affect, and I believe will affect other classes, especially the traders, the manufacturers, and the transportation companies. Thus, we should look at this question from the broad standpoint of what is best for the country, and for the great majority of the people, and not in any sense from a class standpoint. During the past 30 years, the farmers suffered on occasions from adverse times. Speaking particularly of the country between Toronto and Kingston, and to some extent of Western Ontario, when the McKinley tariff went into effect in the United States, in 1890, increasing the duty on barley, from 10 cents to 30 cents per bushel, it seemed a serious blow to our agriculture. Barley was the staple product of the farmers of a great portion of Ontario at that time, and money had been made out of it by the farmers beyond question. In fact they had raised barley so much that the land began to get barley sick, and even now it would not be possible to raise such crops of barley as were produced prior to 1890. When the American duty was raised the farmers thought it was a calamity, but experience has shown them, I think, that perhaps it was a blessing in disguise. The farmers have so regarded it since 1890. Because of the pinch they felt when that tariff was put on they were compelled to devote their attention to other systems of farming, to go into a class of farming different from anything they had practised before. In Ontario the farmers turned their attention to the raising of cattle, hogs, poultry, butter, cheese and eggs. When this change in methods took place they had not had the experience necessary to enable them to make the most complete success of the new system of farming, especially in the raising of hogs. I am safe in saying it took the farmers of Ontario at least 10 years to learn how to breed and feed hogs properly so as to make money. The acquiring of that knowledge was a slow process. There is just as much science in the breeding and feeding of the proper kind of hogs as there is in taking care of the product and properly curing it after it has been raised. I know that the majority of people are apt to lose sight of this fact, and to think that any fool can raise hogs, but it is a great mistake for any person to think that; it takes years to learn how to breed and feed hogs properly, to produce the right kind of hog to make the right kind of bacon to suit the demand both in Canada, and in the British market. It also took the packers years to learn how to handle and treat the hogs so as to make the industry profitable. There has been, in the past, complaint of unfair treatment of the farmers by the packers. I shall not say how much truth there is in that accusation, although I believe there has been reason for complaint in some instances on the part of farmers because of treatment they have had at the hands of packers. If the government had devoted their attention to remedying difficulties where they may have crept up as between occupations they would have done something which would have resulted in good to this country. If there were differences between the packers and the farmers, I think that proper legislation would easily have corrected whatever trouble there was. But wherever the business of the hog raiser and the packer was threatened by unfair competition, you found the packer and the farmer pulling together. That was the case in point in a question that came before this House. A deputation of farmers and packers waited upon the government and urged them to remedy evils that existed in connection with the marketing of foreign pork in Canada. You will find every time that the farmers' and packers interests are bound up together. Whenever their interests are threatened by unfair means in connection

with outside competition, you will find them pulling together, and there will be no difference in that respect. If ever there was a time when the farmers and packers ought to combine to protect their interests, this is the time. I will return to this question of the hog industry again.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) had considerable to say in addressing the House on this question as to why the government introduced this question in connection with reciprocity. He tried to convince this House that the government had a mandate from the people to introduce reciprocity legislation. I am glad the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in his place, and I would like if the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had been here, because I want to quote something that has been said by both these hon. gentlemen, which I believe will show what the mandate was that the government had. I said a few minutes ago that there never had been a time in the history of this country when such great changes were contemplated in connection with the revision of the tariff. I am sorry that the right hon. gentleman has gone out because there are things in connection with this question that I want to bring to his attention; indeed, I believe it is the duty of the right hon. Prime Minister, and of the Minister of Finance to stay here every minute while this question is being discussed.

Mr. BLAIN. Try the Minister of Customs.

Mr. THORNTON. Well, the Minister of Customs has his hands full of biscuits. But, here are the deliverances of the right hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance on the question of the tariff, which I think are pertinent to this question. If ever it was plain what the mandate of the government was in connection with the revision of the tariff it is plain on this question. I find in 'Hansard,' volume L, May 2, 1899, page 2476, that the hon. Minister of Finance said:

> In the first place, a certain reasonable degree of tariff stability is always important if we are to have that confidence in business without which we cannot hope to have prosperous times. Therefore, even though in all respects the tariff may not be as we would like it, it is better to bear some imperfections than to enter upon revisions which might create disturbance in the business of the country.

If ever there was a declaration which was direct on the question of what should be the policy of the government in connection with the revision of the tariff this is a distinct, emphatic declaration, and it is that there must be stability of the tariff. He says further on:

> Nevertheless it is true that the demand for reciprocal trade relations with our neighbours to the south is by no means so strong as it was a few years ago.

Remember this was said by the Finance Minister in 1899.

> Whatever our American friends may have intended by their trade policy, there is one thing that they certainly have done; they have made Canadians more independent and self-reliant and have caused them to look more steadily than before to their home market and to their markets over the sea, where there is an open door. Especially have our producers given attention to the British market during the past two years, when our trade relations with the mother country have been so developed and increased by the preferential tariff. Therefore, the market of our friends to the south of us is much less important to us than it was a few years ago, and we are better able to do without reciprocity than we have been at any previous time in the history of Canada.

This was said by the Minister of Finance twelve years ago. If that was the case twelve years ago, how much more so is it the case to-day? In 1902, three years afterwards, this was the declaration of the Minister of Finance, and it will be found in 'Hansard,' volume 1, page 1309, March 17, 1902:

> When the moment for tariff revision arrives, the public of Canada may rest assured that the government will undertake the work in the spirit of moderation and caution that has prevailed in their past actions in tariff affairs, avoiding the extremes which almost always find advocates, and having regard for what is best; not for particular industries or particular sections of the country, but for the interests of the people of the whole of the Dominion.

There is a declaration that caution was the watchword of the government in connection with tariff revision,—avoiding the extremes which almost always find advocates, he said. The right hon. First Minister, on April 15, 1902, on the floor of this House, made the following declaration:

> What the Canadian people are looking for at the present time is the improvement of the trade relations which exist between the mother country and the colonies.

There runs all through these declarations the idea of tariff stability, that no unusual changes should take place in the tariff without looking carefully into the question to see how these changes would affect the country. Then, the principle is also laid down that the first duty of the government of this country was to cultivate trade with Great Britain for all it was worth. We find again, in 1905, on the floor of this House, that the Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, said, as reported in 'Hansard,' page 8906:

Now, I said in the earlier part of my remarks that it would not be anticipated that there would be any extensive tariff changes this session for the reason that it was the policy of the government to have an inquiry into the tariff before extensive changes were made.

Here was the avowed policy of the government on the question of the tariff changes laid down by the Minister of Finance and that policy, definitely stated, was that there would be an exhaustive inquiry into the tariff before extensive changes were made. Here is the most drastic change that was ever contemplated perhaps in the tariff since 1878, made without any warning, without any investigation, without any inquiry whatever after the declaration that no change should take place without inquiry being made. He said further:

That inquiry will be made by what is called a tariff commission, which is a committee practically of members of the cabinet. The advantages of a public inquiry will be quite apparent.

I would like the House to pay attention to what the minister further said on that occasion:

There is a decided advantage therefore in having a public inquiry so that the people who are interested in the tariff rates on one side or the other may know what representations are being made, and if they see fit to do so may come forward and present their views.

Now, I ask, previous to this being sprung on the House and the country, what chance was there for any industry or class to present their views to the government or to parliament? No chance whatever was afforded, and without a moment's warning we have this radical change sprung upon the people of Canada, who are deprived of the opportunity which was promised to them on the faith of the government of Canada. In the same speech the Minister of Finance said:

It will be the policy of the government to have that inquiry made throughout the Dominion with the utmost care . . . care will be taken to afford opportunity to every class who wish to present their views to come and state in what respect they think either that the tariff is right and should be maintained or that it is defective and what changes they believe should be made.

You will notice that he repeats it was to be the 'policy' of the government and that inquiry was to be made with the greatest care. In the year 1909, speaking in this House, the minister said:

But we remember that it is only two years since our tariff was revised and we think that the idea of tariff stability is worth something to the business of the country. We thought the business men of the country other than the particular ones who would like particular changes will readily concur in the view that tariff changes should not be made very frequently.

Here again we have a declaration as to the necessity for tariff stability. Again, in 1906 (page 286, 'Hansard,' 1906) the Finance Minister, after saying that under the tariff up to this time, we had developed a marvellous condition of prosperity, stated:

Our desire has been to encourage a large degree of tariff stability, not a slavish adherence to every item in the tariff.

But we have been desirous that the impression should go abroad that the government were not willing to make changes hastily. That they were rather slow to do anything in that line, and only when a case became of extreme urgency would we undertake to make changes.

Here is a declaration of the Finance Minister that only in a case of extreme urgency would the government undertake to make any change in the tariff. What was the extreme urgency that caused the government at this particular time to bring down this radical change in the tariff without notice to the people, and who was urging them? Had there been any demand on the part of the people of Canada generally that such drastic legislation should be enacted at this particular juncture? If there had been, I failed to see it. The Minister of Finance continued:

We have therefore from time to time resisted many applications for changes, not because in some instances there may not have been something in the argument, but because it was not wise to make changes too often, and if in one or two cases there was some reason perhaps to justify a change I do not think anybody has suffered any serious loss by the delay.'

Now that we are approaching the question of a general Tariff revision we again wish to keep in mind this idea of tariff stability. We do not desire to make radical changes.

We feel that the general condition of Canada to-day is such that no radical changes in the tariff are called for.

Here we have declarations from time to time that tariff stability is the policy of the government, and not only did the Minister of Finance make this emphatic declaration but the Prime Minister was also emphatic in his pronouncement upon what should be the policy of the government. On November 21, 1910, early in the present session the right hon. gentleman said:

But the people of the west are now asking for a reduction of duty on certain articles which they consume. That is a proper subject for investigation, and we intend to investigate it.

I stated to the people of the northwest during my recent trip, that it would be our duty to consider their requests and to deal with them in the spirit in which we have always

dealt with requests from the people. And I repeat that now.

In this speech the right hon. gentleman told us that the request which came from the west was in respect to a reduction in the duty on articles that the people of the west consumed, but he said nothing whatever with regard to the matters which this reciprocal arrangement deals with. He continued:

I stated that we would have a commission of investigation before we undertook a revision of the tariff . . .The statement made by myself and quoted by the hon. gentleman that we would have an investigation by commission before we altered the tariff called forth a special cheer from hon. members opposite. Does any member on the other side take issue with the promise I made? Would any of them advocate rushing into a revision of the tariff without previous investigation? . . . This work of investigation will be carried out at the proper time.

That is what the right hon. gentleman said this session. Some people have been, I was going to say foolish enough to state, that this proposal submitted to us does not amount to a tariff change, but if it is not a tariff change I would like to know what it is. I want to quote another authority on the importance of tariff stability, and it is an authority that gentlemen opposite will not dispute; I refer to the Hon. Edward Blake, who, in 1891, speaking on the question of reciprocal negotiations with the United States, said:

Uncertainty would alarm capital and paralyse enterprise and therefore I repeat that permanence is essential to success.

Speaking of our retaining control over changes in the tariff and discussing reciprocity, Mr. Blake further said:

I see no plan for combining the two elements of permanency of the treaty and variability of the tariff which does not involve the practical control of the latter (the tariff) by the United States.

The reorganization to which our neighbours look is of course the unification of the continent.

That speech refers to the control of our tariff by the United States, and that is one of the difficulties in which we are placed to-day. The people of Canada have been asking how it came about that there was a proposition to make such drastic changes in the tariff as this agreement contemplates and they have come to the conclusion generally that the dictator is at Washington, who in future will dictate what the tariff of Canada shall be. And, if for a moment we admit that the President of the United States shall dictate to Canada what our fiscal policy shall be, how long will it be before he will dictate what our political policy shall be?

Mr. THORNTON.

Without a question, it is the entering of the thin end of the wedge, as President Taft has said: There is the danger that faces us. I know that there are many people who say there is no danger in that connection. Mr. Blake recognized the danger in his time, and warned the country of it. It is important to recall the utterances of the right hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Finance Minister in regard to the policy which they had adopted, and which they declared time and again was the policy of this government; and if they had a mandate at all from the people, they had a mandate in favour of the policy of thorough investigation before changing the tariff, because that was the policy that was endorsed by the people. In 1899 the right hon. the First Minister said:

If we know the hearts and minds of our people, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with the hon. gentleman himself, would have given many things to have the American market; there was a time not long ago when the market of the great cities of the union was the only market we had for any of our products. But thank Heaven, these days are past and over now. We are not dependent on the American market as we were at one time.

The right hon. the First Minister said further:

We have removed from our limbs the shackles which were impediments to the great trade within the broad domains of our empire and the policy which we have thus introduced we shall pursue with care and prudence and without undue haste.

The hon. the Finance Minister, on the question of the British preference in 1906 said this:

We adhere to the principle of the British preference, because notwithstanding some criticisms which have been made, we believe it has been a good thing for Canada.

We are satisfied that it has given Canada prominence in the eyes of the empire and all over the world; and we believe that it has brought us commerical advantages. Advantages derived from sentiment—but advantages which are substantial. It has also had a most desirable effect in increasing the interest in Great Britain in Canadian products.

The Finance Minister said further:

We desire to turn trade to Great Britain wherever we can properly do so, because Great Britain is our best customer, and if by any arrangement that we can properly make, we can turn trade from people who will not buy from us to people who do buy from us, then we think we ought to do so.

There was no question about the stand taken by both the right hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Finance Minister on

the question of what Canada ought to do in regard to the tariff and trade of the country. I might also quote a declaration which was made by the right hon. the First Minister in a speech delivered at the Canadian Club banquet to Sir James Bryce, at Ottawa, on April 1, 1907. He said:

We are turning our hopes towards the old mother land. We have introduced the doctrine and policy of preference to Great Britain and towards all the British Empire, and this is the policy by which we stand at the present time. Not for my part that I do not value American trade; not for my part that I do not value all that we would have to gain if our relations were on a better footing. But this is a matter on which we shall have no more pilgrimages to Washington. This is the simple message I have to convey to your guests at the present moment.

Here was the avowed policy of this government on the question of the tariff and on the question of British trade; and I notice, by the way, that neither the First Minister nor the Finance Minister nor the Minister of Agriculture nor the Minister of Customs is at present in his place in the House.

Before proceeding to touch on the economic side of this question, I want to say a word or two as to why this policy was pressed by the United States on Canada. A great deal has been said as to the motives that actuate leading politicians in the United States. Some quotations have been made from speeches made by the Speaker of the new House of Representatives of the United States, Mr. Champ Clarke, and I know that an effort has been made in this country to discount anything he may have said in regard to this reciprocity proposition, because it is said that he was speaking jocularly or in a spirit of braggadocio. But let us see what he did say. He said:

I look forward to the time when the American flag will fly over every square foot of British North America up to the north pole. The people of Canada are of our blood and our language. If the treaty of 1854 never had been abrogated, our countries would be much further advanced than now towards this end.

Mr. Martin of South Dakota—Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and make free trade on all products?

Mr. Clarke—By taking Canada in, to become a part of the United States—Yes.

Mr. Norris of Nebraska—As I understand it, the gentleman favours the Bill for at least one reason, that it will have a tendency in the end to bring Canada into the union?

Mr. Clarke—Yes, I have no doubt about that.

Now, with regard to Mr. Champ Clarke's standing and his ability as a statesman, I want to quote what the 'North American Review' says of him editorially, in the month of January of this year:

He is the one commanding figure, resolute, though amiable; careful, yet courageous, broad, thoughtful and above all, in his place at this time, experienced.

The editor of the 'North American Review' knows Mr. Champ Clarke personally, and this is the high estimate he places on his ability as a statesman, which is not what we have been told of him here in Canada. Mr. Champ Clarke knew well what he was saying when he said that he hoped the time was not far distant when the American flag would float over the whole of the North American continent. There is no mistaking the idea American statesmen had in making this proposition to the Canadian government. Not only was it the opinion of Mr. Clarke that it would lead to the annexation of Canada to the United States, but it was also the opinion of W. R. Hearst, the proprietor of the New York 'American,' who a few months ago said: 'Let us have commercial union first and political union afterwards.' Mr. Henry M. Whitney, a Boston financier, made practically the same statement, when he said:

What might ultimately be the political effect of the establishment of friendly relations between Canada and the United States is a problem that had best be left to work itself out in years to come. It is quite possible, I think indeed quite likely, considering the number of questions of domestic and foreign policy which might arise under such a condition, that the two nations would in the end become practically one.

There can be no mistaking the intention of the Americans in connection with this proposition. I have here a declaration made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) which seems to me very pertinent at present. I know it has frequently been said that the hon. minister has political sympathies with the United States. I know the charge has frequently been made against him that he is not just as true to Canada as he ought to be. For my part, however, I am not going to make any charge against him in that connection, but shall merely quote what he said in this House during this discussion. I do not know whether we can read anything between the lines or not, but here is a significant declaration made by him on February 22:

If the United States, which has too often treated us with indifference and almost contempt——

Here, therefore, is an admission on the part of the Finance Minister himself that the treatment which Canada has received from the United States was anything but what it ought to have been. He went on to say:

—if the United States, which has too often treated us with indifference and contempt

has come to a different view, if the people of the United States, if their public men feel that Canada is worth cultivating, whether in the form of better trade relations or any other form, why should we complain?

If the United States have come to the conclusion that Canada is worth cultivating and that the products of our forests and fields and mines are to be poured into the United States to be manufactured there—and that is the idea which is at the bottom of this movement, as the Finance Minister admits—what objection, he asks, ought we to make. Well, as a member of this House, and a citizen of this country, I object in the most emphatic way I can to our exporting our raw material from this country to be manufactured in the United States for the benefit of the people of the United States. I think we ought to enter our solemn protest against any such policy. Can there be any mistake as to the intention of the United States wanting the raw produce of Canada? What, for instance, do they want our wheat for? Let me read what the Northwestern 'Miller' said on February 8, last, on this point:

When it is considered that owing to the high quality and superior strength of the wheat grown in the newly opened Canadian northwest, one bushel mixed with three bushels of the less virile wheat grown in the United States, and ground into flour, is sufficient to raise the whole to high value, it is apparent that the free importations of this wheat would not only fail to depress the price of American wheat, but would actually give it added value because it would enable the American miller to use the Canadian product as a leaven to raise the value of his mixture; thus every bushel of Canadian wheat exported as flour by the American miller would carry with it a much greater amount of wheat grown in the United States.

The miller who is able to grind this enormous crop will be the miller of the future, and where he is there will be the great mills of the world.

With free Canadian wheat secured, the prospect is a grand one. With this enormous and steadily increasing crop free to pursue its natural geographical and commercial channel flowing into the mills and elevators of the States, a splendid tide of activity and prosperity would follow in its wake.

Assured of their future supply of raw material, the mills of America would go forward on their developing course continuing the march of progress which has brought them to the front. New mills would be built and capacities enlarged. New markets abroad would be sought and conquered.

The returns from this renewal and extended activity would be felt in increased commercial prosperity. New railways would be extended into the wheat-growing territory; American railways carrying the flour from the mills would secure additional freights; American banks would obtain increased deposits, and greatly enlarged exchange accounts; American mill operators would be in

demand, and pay-rolls would be increased; mill machinery, bags, barrels and other mill supplies would be required in larger quantities; more money would be in circulation and the benefit would be felt in every artery of industrial life by milling.

There would be an increase in grain firms, in elevators and in every branch of the grain handling and flour making interests.

This would be felt in the added value of real estate and in the solid and substantial development of every undertaking and enterprise that makes a community prosperous.

Here is a declaration by the American millers that the profit on our Canadian wheat shipped to the United States and ground there, would amount to millions of dollars a year, which would go to the American millers. I know that the Americans have the power to take off the duty without any proposition of the kind coming from Canada and get Canadian wheat free of duty, but what would Canada then do? Canada would lose exactly what the Americans claim they would gain. The Americans claim that they would gain great profits in the transportation of immense quantities of Canadian wheat. Canada would lose to the same extent. We have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in our lines of transportation with the avowed purpose of transporting the products of the west to the east, and goods, stock and products to the west. Nobody on either side will dispute that such was the policy of both parties. That policy was to keep building and keep up lines of transportation for the transporting of the products of our own country west to east and east to west. But by this new departure we would lose in transportation; we would lose in manufacturing; we would lose in the wages paid to expert labour, in the wages paid working men, in the supply of machinery, bags and barrels, and other things required in that business. But our greatest loss would be in the by-products. In Ontario and Quebec especially the development of business has led to an almost unlimited demand for farm products in the shape of butter, cheese, eggs, cream, pork, lard and other articles of that description. These by-products, bran and shorts, which we get from the milling of wheat, are needed in these eastern provinces to feed our stock and enable us to provide our industrial population with food. It will be a serious loss to Canada if that great flow of wheat is changed—if the spout is made at Minneapolis instead of at Port Arthur and Fort William.

Now, as I have already said, I am a farmer. I was born on the farm on which I live, and on which I have passed nearly all my life. I know what the farmer has to contend with. I know what the adversity of the past has brought him, and I know the splendid prospect ahead of him

if the present commercial policy of Canada is followed out to its legitimate end. There has been an increase of prosperity for years. There has been no great demand for any change in the commercial policy of this country. I do not care to deal at length with the question of the demand of the west; but I have travelled in the west and know something of the conditions there. I think, that in many respects, the people of the west are making a serious mistake. I travelled over hundreds of miles through the west, not on trains, but driving. And the gentleman who drove me more than any other was a warm supporter of this government. He was in favour of what the farmers' delegation from the Northwest asked of this government. I put this question to him: Who is the most prosperous man in the west? And his answer was: Outside the places where the drought or hail may have struck the country, the farmer is the most prosperous man in the west. In the course of a half day's driving he could point out to me the homes of a dozen men who were worth from $25,000 to $100,000 apiece. You can drive for the whole day in my section and you could not strike more than two or three worth $25,000. The farmers of the west, man for man, are wealthier than the farmers of Ontario. And they have made their wealth in the west, according to their own showing, in a very few years. They may have something serious to complain of; I think they have in connection with the mixing of their grain in the elevators. I cite these things to show that, perhaps, some of their grievances may be imaginary. But, in connection with the state of business with the farmers of Ontario, it is pertinent for us to inquire closely into prices at this time. I am sorry the government did not see fit to do as the American government did, institute a most searching inquiry into the subject of prices and supply and demand. The government could have given us, I think, a great deal of information which they have not given us. The main products of the farmers of Ontario—and I presume this will apply to Quebec to some extent—are hogs, horses, butter, cheese and cattle, and, in some localities, hay. In my own section of country, as I stated early in my remarks, the farmers, during the years of the McKinley Bill, were compelled to change their lines of agricultural production. They devoted their attention to the raising of horses and hogs more than to any other line of farming, and they are making money out of this line to-day. I think I am safe in saying that more money has come to the Ontario farmer inside in the last fifteen years from one staple product, hogs, than from any other. According to the statistics the farmers of Canada to-day are producing, besides enough for their own use, about $20,000,000 to $25,000,000 worth of hog products. As I said before, it took the farmers years to find out what was the best kind of hog for the production of bacon, and how to breed and feed that kind of hog. It might look easy, perhaps, to those who are not in the business, but it is very difficult indeed. The breeding of hogs with a view to the production of a certain kind of bacon has resulted, within the last few years, in changing very markedly the shape of the hog. This has been accomplished by very careful breeding for years and years. The result is that Canada to-day produces, perhaps, the best bacon hog in the world. Not only that, but the farmers have succeeded in breeding and feeding the hog so that, I am safe in saying, nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand hogs are good. Time was in the history of hog breeding and feeding in Canada—and only fifteen or twenty years ago—when it was usual for the farmer to have what are called 'crippled' pigs, because of his want of knowledge in properly breeding and feeding; now it is a rare thing for a farmer to have a 'crippled' pig or to find any of these going on the market at all. Not only has it been necessary for the farmers to exercise great care in breeding and feeding, but it has been necessary for the packer to exercise great care in handling the product from the time it came into his hands until it was shipped to the market. And not only the farmer and the packer, but the government also has had to exercise great care, for it has been their duty to protect this industry. I find that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) claims to have been very busy in protecting the hog industry. He said on the floor of this House, as recorded in 'Hansard' of 1907-8, page 221:

Now, the hog industry is one in which I have taken a great deal of interest. I believe it is one of the most satisfactory branches of agriculture in Canada. I have always advised farmers to go into that industry, because I was satisfied they could make money in it. I protected the interests of the Canadian hog-raiser and feeder, and saw that he had a chance to raise animals which were to be made into Canadian bacon and that alone.

Mark these words, Mr. Chairman, because they are pertinent in connection with the discussion of the bacon industry in Canada. He said that he was careful to see that the farmers had a chance to raise animals which were to be made into Canadian bacon and that alone, and that nobody else should be allowed to raise animals that were afterwards going to be converted into a product that was to be sold as Canadian bacon. He was jealous of the reputation of Canadian bacon.

Mr. BLAIN. A delegation waited upon the minister asking him to increase the protection on hogs.

Mr. THORNTON. I shall refer to that in a moment. The Minister of Agriculture wanted us to believe that he was looking with great care after the bacon industry in this country. Now the proposition, and he boasts of it, is that Canadian hogs shall go into the United States. Then what becomes of the reputation of Canadian bacon? If, as statistics show, there are sixteen American hogs to one Canadian, and the Canadian hog goes into the United States market, as he boasts it will, what will become of Canadian bacon and its reputation? An hon. member suggests that there will be nothing but the squeal left. Sir, there will not be any squeal.

The minister's statement that he was jealous of the Canadian bacon trade, and that he was gong to be careful that Canadian farmers should be protected in connection with the raising and marketing of the bacon hog, arose out of a discussion on the floor of this House. A deputation waited on the government to ask them for protection. Protection against what? Protection against cheap American pork. You will find at page 5160 of the 'Hansard' of 1908, under date March 17, the reply of the Minister of Finance to the deputation. He said:

> The production of pork, particularly of bacon and hams, has become in Canada a very large and important trade, and we should be very careful to see that everything possible is done to encourage it. I am hopeful that the result of the investigation by the Minister of Customs and of the application of the law, if necessary, in a stricter form, will give these gentlemen the relief that they desire.
>
> Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does the minister mean by that that the Chicago article is now flooding the Canadian market?
>
> Mr. FIELDING. The complaint made is that a considerable quantity is coming in and sold at prices that they cannot fairly compete with; they suggested that there was something illegitimate in the prices.
>
> Mr. BRODER. Was the deputations composed of people outside the trade?
>
> Mr. FIELDING. They were chiefly representing the farming interests, I believe, some of the gentlemen were more or less connected with the packing trade, too.

Here was a case in which the packers and the farmers combined to protect their interests when the trade was threatened. Then an hon. gentleman asked:

> Was the deputation composed of people outside the trade?
>
> Mr. FIELDING. They were chiefly representing the farming interest, I believe, and I think some of the gentlemen were more or less connected with the packing trade, too . . .
>
> I understand that the deputation was chiefly representing the farming interest. Although there were one or two gentlemen having some interest in the packing trade farmers' interest was the one most strongly represented to us.

Mr. BLAIN.

It is claimed by the supporters of this proposition that the farmer will find a market in the United States for his hogs. Either the Canadian hog will go to the United States or it will not. If the Canadian hog goes to the United States (and if there is a better price there it will go), then what becomes of the identity of Canadian bacon. What becomes of the Canadian packing house? If the Canadian hog goes to the United States its identity will be lost in the greater quantity of bacon made in the United States, the identity of Canadian bacon will be nowhere. Not only that, but if the Canadian hog goes to the United States the Canadian packing house will have to close. If the Canadian packer has to close up his business, what will be the result? All competition in that line is keen in our market in the old country from Denmark, the Argentine and Australia. It is said that if this pact goes into force and it does not work well it can be changed at any time. Assuming that it can be changed, and that it is changed, then if the market for the Canadian hog is in the United States, and the Canadian packing houses have been closed, the Canadian packer will have lost his market in the old country because he cannot supply it. Do you think the Canadian packer, if he reopens his packing house in the event of this bargain being rescinded after being put into operation, could ever recover his trade? Let me tell you of a case that came under my own observation. A Canadian packer had for some years filled a contract for a weekly shipment of forty boxes of the best Canadian bacon. During the scarcity of hogs some years ago he was not able to supply that bacon for two or three weeks. When he was ready to supply it again he asked his customers in England to give him the order again, but they said they could not, that they had given the order to some one in Denmark, and he has never recovered that order since. Where competition is keen, it is very hard to recover trade once lost.

I do not know of anything that is more delicate, that should be guarded more carefully than the production of hogs by the farmer and the making of the best class of bacon by the packer. Once that trade is disturbed, as this promises to disturb it, I think it will be a disastrous thing for the Canadian bacon trade.

I wish to quote a few figures in regard to prices in this trade, but I shall do so briefly as I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, and as I think there has been a tendency during this debate to quote figures which should not have been quoted.

There is an impression among the people that the American farmer gets a better price for hogs than the Canadian farmer.

There is something a little peculiar about it and it is that, with regard to some lines of hog products, the United States duty on imports into that country is less than the Canadian duty on certain lines coming into Canada. I presume it is not generally known that, as a matter of fact, lard is one of the principal products of the bacon trade, and the duty on lard coming into Canada is half a cent a pound higher than the duty on lard going from Canada into the United States. You would think, if the duty affected the price, and if there was a trade flowing in either direction, the Canadian trade would flow towards the United States. But, strange to say, while the Canadian duty is higher on lard than the United States duty, the amount of lard going from Canada into the United States is almost nothing compared with that coming from the United States into Canada. Let me quote these figures which were given in an answer to a question asked in the House during this session. Canada imported from the United States for the year ended March 31, 1910, of lard alone, $1,347,887 worth. That is an immense sum just for one of the products of the hog industry. The duty on that was two cents a pound. This is the most absolute proof that the American farmer cannot and does not get as much for his hogs as the Canadian farmer does. On the other hand, what was the amount of lard exported to the United States against a duty of only 1½ cents per pound, or half a cent lower than the duty on lard coming into Canada? It was only $2,555 worth as against $1,347,887 worth imported by Canada from the United States. These figures alone ought to open the eyes of the Minister of Agriculture who ought to know something about hogs. On the question of bacon, hams, shoulders and sides, Canada imported from the United States $816,042 worth, whereas, the exports of Canadian bacon and hams to the United States were only $14,892. That shows conclusively which way the trade in hog products is flowing; it is from the United States into Canada. The pork packers are alarmed today. Why? Because if the duty is placed where this proposal places it the American packers can flood the Canadian market with American hog products.

What are the facts in so far as prices are concerned? I want to quote the price of hogs in Buffalo, Chicago, Toronto, Peterborough and Hull, and I want to say that these are the prices that the drovers receive from the packers. They are drovers prices in every one of the places I name. I shall give the prices for the years 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910. These are the average prices, taken from the weekly returns made by the drovers themselves, they agree with the prices paid by the packers, and if anybody doubts these figures the books of the drovers and packers are open for inspection. In 1907 the average price in Buffalo for live hogs was $6.67; Chicago, $6.10; Toronto, $6.94; Peterborough, $7.01; Hull, $7.02. I am quoting these prices because, in Ontario and Quebec, we are close to this market. We are close to the market in Toronto, in my section of the country we are close to the market in Peterborough, and in this part of Ontario and Quebec we are close to the Hull market. These are the prices actually paid to the drovers, by the packers. You will see that the price was higher in every one of the Canadian markets than it was in Buffalo and Chicago. In 1908 the average prices were, Buffalo, $6.22; Chicago, $5.70; Toronto, $6.57; Peterborough, $6.71; Hull, $6.79. In every case the prices in Canada were higher than in Buffalo and Chicago. In 1909, the prices were: Buffalo, $7.92; Chicago, $7.35; Toronto, $8.06; Peterborough, $8.25; Hull, $8.55—higher in every case in the Canadian market than in the American. In 1910, the statement shows that the price was slightly higher in Buffalo than in the Canadian centres. The prices were as follows: Buffalo, $9.58; Chicago, $8.90; Toronto, $9.13; Peterborough, $9.26; Hull, $9.30. The total average for the four years is: Buffalo, $7.60; Chicago, $7.02; Toronto, $7.68; Peterborough, $7.81; Hull, 7.92. There is the most conclusive proof that the best market that the Ontario and Quebec farmers have for the bacon hog is right at home.

Mr. BLAIN. How does my hon. friend explain the big market at Peterborough? Is it because you have a porkpacking establishment there?

Mr. THORNTON. Yes, one of the largest porkpacking establishments in Canada is located at Peterborough. The farmers of my section of country sell their hogs to the porkpacking factory at Peterborough.

Mr. BRODER. That establishment is operated by the people who control the factory in Hull?

Mr. THORNTON. Yes, and the same firm, I believe, have a packing-house in Brantford. It is not necessary that I should quote further on the question of the price of hogs. I would deeply deplore the loss of the trade that the Canadian farmer has in hogs and of the profits that he makes out of the hog industry. It is the most easily discouraged trade that the farmers have. You will remember that the price of hogs went down, some three or four years ago, so low that it was impossible for the farmers to raise hogs and make it pay; indeed, they were raising hogs at a loss. The result was that the farmer sold his brood sows and went out of business and a scarcity of hogs in Canada followed.

It is a delicate business, a business that it is difficult for the farmer to get into it, it takes him some time to get into it and once he gets out of it, once the prices go down below the cost of producing, he is afraid to take it up again because of the danger of some future disturbance of the business.

I am satisfied, considering the scarcity of labour in Ontario and its present market value, that it will be very difficult for the farmers of Ontario to again start raising hogs. The supply has been steadily met for a great many years and the hog industry has represented to the farmers of Canada between $20,000,000 and $25,000,000 a year, they having marketed about 1,300,000 hogs per annum. The perfection that has been attained in the quality of our bacon is a great asset in our industrial resources, and I hope that nothing will be done to interfere with the industry. When adversity overtook the farmers of Canada some years ago they had to look round for other sources of profit, and many of them turned their attention to horse raising. If it was difficult for them to find the right grade of hog for the market it was still more difficult to get into the raising of horses to meet the demand. The fact is the demand for heavy horses is increasing while the demand for light horses is decreasing, due no doubt somewhat to the increasing use of automobiles. Never has there been in Ontario, and I presume in Quebec, such a demand for heavy horses as there is to-day. It is pertinent to inquire where the demand comes from and the result of the inquiry is that there are three sources, namely, first, the home market afforded by the towns and cities, next, the lumbering camps of northern Ontario and Quebec, and next the Canadian west. Let me say that the home market always is the best market for the products of the farmer, and success has never come to the farmer so much as when he has a home market; the dwellers in towns and cities either, if they have not suitable food products close to their doors. Therefore, the best market the farmer has for his horses is the home market afforded by the towns and cities of Ontario. I might mention that there are four times as many horses used in the city of Toronto as there were seventeen years ago, and in one instance which has come under my observation the Dominion Express Company in the city of Toronto used eighteen horses seventeen years ago, where to-day they require seventy-five. Then, the demand for heavy horses in the Canadian lumber camps has been a great source of revenue to the Canadian horse raiser. The market of the Canadian west has also been a remunerative one, and the protection—because that is what the small duty means to him—that the Canadian farmer has enjoyed has assisted him in securing that market for his horses. It required for the farmers, years to build up the horse raising industry; it is a slow process for a farmer to get to the point where he can sell two or three or four horses a year, but even if he only sells one horse a year at $200 it is something well worth taking into account. Now, we find from the United States returns, because the United States authorities have gone very carefully into the question of comparative prices, that the average price of a horse to-day is $108 in the United States as against $133 in Canada which shows that the Canadian market for Canadian horses is by all odds better than the American market. Some people have told us that the market in New York state is the best market for Ontario horses, but after careful inquiry I am satisfied that such is not the case, because the average price of horses in New York state is $125 while it is $133 in Ontario as proved by the United States Commission of Inquiry, a conclusive proof that the home market is better than the market across the border. What advantage can be gained by our giving our western horse market and our market in our lumber camps to the Americans, because that is what this arrangement will do? There are in the western states close to the Canadian frontier an unlimited supply of horses that will find a market in the Canadian west and crowd our horses out. My candid opinion is that if this proposition goes into effect it will ruin the horse trade of Ontario. I should be very sorry indeed to see that, but I fear there is no other outlook for us. There are other things which farmers produce in large quantities and which find their best market at home. These are what might be considered the less important products, or at least so they were considered a few years ago, but they have become staple products to-day, and are sold at remunerative prices. There is a large demand all through our section of the country for cream for consumption in the cities, but the chief demand is for butter and eggs. Let me say in this connection that I believe the poultry industry is capable of being developed 100 per cent over what it is to-day, and if the Minister of Agriculture were wide awake he could easily devise means to bring about that result. The results obtained in the production of eggs on our experimental farm at Ottawa are far from satisfactory, and in the Agriculture Committee a short time ago we succeeded in eliciting the fact, which had been demonstrated time and again, that the poultry department was not receiving that attention from the Minister of Agriculture that it ought to receive. We succeeded in eliciting from him this fact, that the poultry manager had asked for 25 acres of land on which to demonstrate what

poultry would do, and yet the minister would not give him another foot of land. There is no question that the egg output of Canada could be doubled if it were rightly taken hold of. The great staple product of the United States to-day is corn, of which they produce $800,000,000 worth. What comes next? It will perhaps surprise most members of this House to learn that next to corn, eggs are the greatest industry of the United States—that they produce over $700,000,000 worth of eggs in a year, and the consumption is keeping ahead of the supply all the time, and it is the same here in Canada. These figures show what can be done with proper effort along this line.

It is claimed that a greatly increased revenue would come to the farmers of Canada if the markets of the United States were opened up to their potatoes. It is true, there are times when there is an abundant supply of potatoes in Canada, and a shortage in the United States. Potatoes are a very peculiar crop. There are sometimes whole districts, or perhaps even states, where in one year the crop is a failure, and other districts where the crop is wonderfully prolific. If there is a big crop in the United States and a light one in Canada, then the Canadian market will be the best, and vice versa. What are the facts to-day? We find, by the evidence given before the Committee of the Senate of the United States, that in the month of February last farmers in the state of New York were selling potatoes to buyers for 30 cents a bushel, and the farmers in the state of New Hampshire were selling them at 33 cents a bushel. At the same time, I find by the market reports that Ontario farmers were getting from 40 to 50 cents a bushel for potatoes. So that in this year at least our market is the best market. In some other years it might be different. But is it not better that we should, by a small protection, hold the markets of Canada which for years we have been so carefully and diligently building up, and which have been such a source of prosperity to the country?

There is another question that looms large and is perhaps the most important in connection with this reciprocity proposition. It is a fact, which perhaps the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs were not fully aware of, that twelve other countries can send their products into the markets of Canada without any customs barrier, while the markets of all these countries are practically closed to Canadian farm products. It is said, and frequently said, that we need not fear any of these other countries sending their products to Canada. But, as a matter of fact, during the month of January of this year there was over $100,000 worth of butter and eggs imported into Canada. The butter paid a duty of four cents a pound, and the eggs a duty of three cents a dozen; yet in the face of the duty they were imported and lowered the prices of these products. It has been claimed that this reciprocity pact is a wonderful elixir for all ills, that it is not going to hurt the manufacturer, that it is going to benefit the farmer, giving him more money for his products, and that the consumer is going to get the food he needs for his family at a lower price. I think the right hon. the First Minister made these claims for it. I think he sent a telegram, which was spread broadcast all over this country, stating that it was going to help everybody. Let me tell you what I think it will do for the farmer, because he is the man next to the consumer who is specially interested in this reciprocity proposition; and the consumer is mightily interested in it. I met two red-hot friends of the government one day. One was a trader and the other a farmer. They were conversing together, and I said to the farmer: 'What do you think of the reciprocity proposition?' He said: 'I think it is all right; we want the markets of the United States.' I said, 'What for?' He said, 'So that we can get more for our stuff.' I said to the trader, who was a boot and shoe dealer: 'Do you pay enough for the food of your family?' He said, 'Yes'. I said, 'Couldn't you stand a little more?' He said, 'I don't think we could.' I said, 'If what the farmer says is correct, that he is to get more for his produce, you must pay more for the food of your family.' He said, 'Well, we cannot stand to pay any more.' Let me tell you what I think this reciprocity pact will do when it opens the markets of Canada not only to the products of 90,000,000 who are raising the same kind of things that we do, but to the products of twelve other countries in the same line. If there is a glut in any one of those countries, where will it find a market? There is nothing in the world to prevent it being dumped on the Canadian market. The result beyond any question will be that the price will go down to the consumer; but I ask, what benefit is that going to be to the consumer? For instance, what benefit would it be to the consumers of Ottawa if fifty carloads of oranges were dumped down here to-day? The oranges might sell for ten cents a dozen, but would that be a benefit? I claim that if large quantities of produce are dumped on the Canadian market, while it would lower the price to the consumer for a time, it would have the effect of driving the Canadian farmer out of business. Take, for instance, garden stuff. Here is a farmer with a few acres of land who with his wife raises vegetables for the near-by market.

If a large quantity of vegetables are to

be dumped into our markets, that will mean that our farmers will not be able to sell their products in that line to advantage. What will be the result? Our farmers will go out of the business, prices will fluctate to a greater degree than ever, and there will be very high and very low prices; but the average price to the consumer will not be one cent lower than before. This also will cripple the home market. It will drive a number of our farmers, especially the small farmers, out of business. The result will be a decrease in production, and such a decrease will have the effect of causing less money to be circulated in Canada. It will also decrease the buying power of our people, and that will react on the traders in the towns. You can easily see how it cannot help the consumer in the long run, how it will lessen the income of the farmers and consequently injure the business of the trader.

I deplore the prospect which is facing us because of this proposition. It seems to me that the government ought to have done what they pledged themselves repeatedly to do. Ever since 1897, year after year, they have declared that there would be no revision of the tariff until trade matters were thoroughly investigated. But they have gone back on this pledge, and I deplore the want of candour exhibited by the right hon. the Prime Minister, and his colleague the Minister of Finance. Why did they repeatedly make this pledge year after year? Why did the right hon. the Prime Minister pledge himself that there would be no change in the tariff and then not carry out his pledge. At this very session he said there would be no change until a thorough investigation had taken place. But he has since cast that pledge to the four winds. It is indeed lamentable that we cannot have more candour on the part of the right hon. gentleman. I believe that if the Prime Minister, and the Finance Minister, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) had any idea at all of the way this proposition would work out in connection with our agricultural interests, they would not have consented to a pact which is bound to revolutionize our farming industry, and perhaps ruin it along many lines. There ought to have been the most careful inquiry before negotiating any such measure as this. I regret exceedingly that this proposition has been made to us. I wish from the bottom of my heart that a thorough investigation into all the facts in connection with the trade between the two countries had been made before any move in this direction was taken. Thousands and thousands of facts pertinent to this discussion ought to be made public. I have considerable more material which I might use, but I think I have taken up already too much of the time of the House, and have only very feebly expressed what I desired to say in this connection. In my opinion a most thorough investigation into the facts concerning all the industries that might be affected, directly or indirectly, by this proposition ought to have been made, before entering into a hard and fast bargain which will tie us up to a country that the Finance Minister himself acknowledges has hitherto treated us with contempt and indifference. To my mind we cannot be too careful before entering into any alliance with a people who have treated us in this way.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Chairman, we listened this afternoon to a speech replete with facts; if the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Thornton) will permit me, I would say a very fair speech, well argued. I feel confident that if he had been speaking for reciprocity instead of against reciprocity his speech would have been a great deal stronger. Since 1866, when the last treaty of reciprocity was abrogated, no question has arisen in this House or in this country which would call for more serious consideration than the motion which is now under debate. In the few remarks I propose to make, I shall try to constantly keep in view the different aspects of the case as they affect the producer and the consumer, and before I conclude I shall have a word or two to say about certain phases of the question introduced by certain hon. members opposite, and some writers in a section of the press opposed to the government, and having reference to the political position of Canada in the Empire.

It has been argued by some hon. gentlemen opposite that reciprocal trade relations with the United States will affect their particular provinces adversely; by others that our market will be overcrowded with American products; by others that our transportation routes will be diverted from east and west to north and south; by others that the gardeners and fruit growers will be ruined, and by a few that we shall be absorbed by the United States and shall awaken some morning to find ourselves under the star-spangled banner. Let me at once say that I am a great admirer of the United States of America. I find that no country has made such progress in the time which it has been a nation except perhaps Canada. The Americans have made great progress; with the population which they have to-day their industries are flourishing and they are progressing. But in proportion to population ours are much greater. But greatly as I admire the United States

of America, I am proud to be Canadian born; and I say without vainglory that I want to live and die under the free flag which floats over this Chamber, free from any political alliance with any other country outside of the British Empire. We in Canada are proud, very proud, of our connection. And no two men have done more to foster the spirit of Canadian patriotism than the late right hon. Sir John Macdonald and the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this government. I approach this question, therefore, not from a sectional or provincial point of view but from a purely Canadian point of view. And before giving the reasons which prompt me to support what I believe to be a measure all to the advantage of Canada and of the different classes within this country, I would like to deal with some of the objections which are offered by hon. gentlemen opposite to this reciprocal pact. The first objection, and one that we find mentioned in practically every speech delivered by a Conservative in this country, and in practically every newspaper opposed to this government, is that negotiations were entered into without the will of the people. I am not going to weary the House by repeating what has been so often said, that the reciprocity pact is an agreement which was fostered by both political parties in this country, and one which has met with favour from Conservatives as well as Liberals. But supposing that the reciprocity pact had never been spoken of before in Canada, yet, the fact that it is to the general advantage and good of this country is proof enough that this parliament has a perfect right to legislate upon it. But the second objection is that the negotiations were not sufficiently made public whilst details were in course of arrangement. That seems at least to those on this side of the House, futile. There has been no agreement yet sanctioned between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada. There is no agreement yet which is in force in this country or in the States providing for free trade in the articles mentioned in the statement brought down to the House; there can be no agreement until it is sanctioned by the people through their authorized representatives in this House. Let me assure hon. gentlemen opposite that if the people of this country are not in favour of reciprocity, and if their authorized representatives in this House were to vote in favour of reciprocity, then, at the time fixed by the constitution for an appeal to the people the pact upon which we are now entering could be set aside. That is one of the terms of the arrangement which has been concluded, or is about to be concluded, between the United States and Canada. But, further, it is not in accordance with British usage to make public the details of a treaty, not even to the representatives of the people in parliament assembled. Do you require proof of that? You have simply to refer to the history of England, or to the debates of the British House of Commons, and you will find instance after instance in which it has been laid down as a rule of parliamentary practice in England, not to make public the negotiations preliminary to treaty making. Let me cite, for instance, words used in the British House of Commons, of 15th February, 1904, of an eminent member of the British House, Mr. Wyndham:

> In the case of the Cobden treaty, the negotiations took place in the year before—1859—and in the 'Life of Mr. Gladstone,' written by the right hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, we read that there was some perturbation in the cabinet over this project of entering into negotiations for altering certain duties without the knowledge of parliament. But these fears did not weigh with the cabinet of the day and the treaty was concluded, and what was the result? Why, in, I think, Mr. Gladstone's words, France was persuaded to lower her duties on a number of articles of British production and export, and more especially upon iron, which Cobden called the daily bread of other industries. If it was legitimate—and it was legitimate—in 1860 for the cabinet without the knowledge of parliament to enter into diplomatic relations with another country and to state that it was the policy of that government to alter certain duties and thereby get a reduction of duties on articles of British production and export, is it illegitimate to-day to do the same thing?

It is not illegitimate.

And further on Mr. Wyndham said:

> I may say, in order to reply to the right hon. gentleman, that negotiations are likely to be embarrassed if, before negotiation begins, ministers are asked to state, step by step, all the arguments that will be used. Negotiations begin with nothing more than a bland smile——

And I know the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) is capable of a bland smile.

> —and a warm welcome, and they are embarrassed if any further indications are given.

That is language, Sir, that cannot be gainsaid, that is language which should guide us in dealing with this question. The great objection urged against the reciprocal agreement is that such action is disloyal and will tend towards annexation. I must say I was amused when I saw a little flag float from an ink stand in this House. I respect the flag but I like to see it fly at the top of the institution in which we now find ourselves. I do not think that it is necessary in this House, in order to prove our loyalty, to carry a little flag in our waistcoat pocket. The relations which

exist between the members on both sides of this House are such that no one will say that any member in this House is disloyal to his country. It is well known that there is no more loyal portion of the British Empire than is the Dominion of Canada, and therefore, on this side of the House, we consider such manifestations of loyalty rodomontade, we consider them filibustering loyalty, and we do not bring our little flags with us every time we come here to discuss a question affecting Canada. I do not believe that loyalty follows trade, or that trade follows loyalty. If trade followed loyalty or if loyalty followed trade, then England would be the most disloyal country in the British Empire. Do you suppose for a moment that England considers Canada when she goes on to the markets of the world to purchase? Do you suppose that the Englishman is not a wiser purchaser than to be governed in his purchases by his loyalty? The Englishman buys where he gets the best bargain, he sells where he can get the best price, and we all admire him for it; we simply want to do the same thing ourselves. England, I protest is not more loyal to Russia or to Germany or to Denmark than she is to Canada. England is no more loyal to the United States of America than she is to Canada. Have hon. gentlemen opposite ever examined the English trade reports to find out where England buys her goods? England buys from Canada about 19,000,000 cwt. of wheat, it is true, but she buys from the United States nearly 15,000,000 cwt., and she buys from Russia over 26,000,000 cwt. She buys nearly 10,000,000 cwt. more wheat from Russia than she buys from Canada, and yet nobody claims that England is trying to annex Russia or that Russia is trying to annex England. I find that she buys in a year from Canada of wheat meal and flour 2,800,000 odd cwt.; but she buys from Germany over 6,000,000 cwt. Will any hon. gentleman opposite say that England is trying to curry favour with Germany because she prefers to go to Germany to buy her wheat, meal and flour rather than to come to Canada, or from the circumstance that she buys more from Germany than from Canada? I find that she bought last year 24,417 cwt. of butter from Canada. At the same time she bought over 1,600,000 cwt. from Denmark. She bought 572,000 cwt. from Russia, and only a little over 24,000 cwt. from Canada. I hope that none of my hon. friends opposite will become more disloyal on this account, because it would be foolish. I am simply pointing out to them how it is that England does not consider that her loyalty is dependent on her trade.

The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Thornton) was very keen this afternoon about Canadian trade in eggs. He was afraid that if we had reciprocity the price of eggs might be affected. I find that England, so keen about the egg industry of Canada, bought from Canada last year 3,969 cwt. of eggs, but she bought at the same time from Denmark 3,500,000 cwt.; from Russia about 9,000,000 cwt., and from other countries over 2,000,000 cwt. The hon. member was also very keen about the bacon industry. I find that England bought from Canada last year 391,000 odd cwt. of bacon, but she bought from Denmark 1,701,000 odd, and from the United States of America, the very country that we want to deal with, in order to show us an example, she bought not 391,000 cwt., as from Canada—she did not go to some other British colony, but she went where the star spangled banner floats and bought 1,500,000 cwt. When she looked around to purchase hams she could only buy 39,000 cwt. from Canada, but over 59,000 cwt. from the United States.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose she could not buy more from Canada than Canada had to sell.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman vouch for it that Canada had no more to sell?

Mr. BLAIN. It all found a market either at home or abroad.

Mr. DEVLIN. Which goes to prove exactly that this government has done so much good for the farmers of Canada that while they could not get a market prior to 1896, to-day they can get a market anywhere they want to go.

I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that England, for years, has been trying to do exactly what we have succeeded in doing, but England has not succeeded. England has been seeking for an open market in the United States. England did not send to Canada to ask whether Canada would consider her conduct disloyal. Let me go back to the 'Hansard' of the English House of Commons, and I am going to quote Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Mr. Balfour, two authorities that, I think, will be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Balfour, speaking on the 8th February, 1904, said this:

> Now, if we cannot induce the United States to lower their tariff——

They were trying to induce the United States to lower their tariff, but at that time they did not succeed.

> If we cannot induce the United States to lower their tariff, at least, it will be possible for us to provide against the kind of bounty which arises from the combination of producers operating from behind the shelter of a protection system. It is possible to put on duties if necessary.

Mr. Balfour is not a Liberal politician. He is one of the members of the Tory party in England and he was speaking as a Tory leader. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach goes farther than that. Speaking on the same day, here is the language that he used which of course, if used in this country towards England would be considered disloyal, but, used by him and used in the British House of Commons, it must be accepted as loyal and if we are bound to follow the English House of Commons in the making of history, we must not be considered disloyal in doing the very acts which they have been doing for years and teaching us to do. He said:

There is one thing I should say, however, that you must dissociate this matter from the question of colonial preference.

There was a question then before the House of Commons of giving Canada a preference.

In my belief the two things, under certain circumstances at any rate, would be found incompatible. What is the principle of retaliation? Surely, that you should treat other countries as they treat you. What is the principle of colonial preference? Surely, that you should treat a colony better than any other country, because it is part of the empire. How are you to work the two things together? Now, let us see. Suppose 2 shillings a quarter were imposed upon all corn coming from the United States, and Canada was exempted from that duty. Suppose the result was what those who would promote colonial preference desire—that a great deal of our corn supply were to come from Canada instead of from the United States, and suppose that the corn growers in the United States induced their government to propose to this government that if they would remit the 2 shillings duty on United States corn, they, the United States, would remit certain of their protective duties which pressed most hardly upon our manufactured goods, and the remission of which would do enormous benefit to the trade and commerce of this country. What must the answer be under colonial preference? Surely this, 'Our word is pledged to Canada; we cannot remit the duty.' Yet the offer from America might be infinitely more valuable to our trade and industries——

Note too 'our' trade and industries.

—here than anything that Canada had given in return for preference or could possibly give. Would not that be a dangerous limitation to the freedom of bargaining which His Majesty's government desire to resume with reference to this matter? Would it not excite bitter feelings in this country on the part of those interested, whether as employers or workmen, in the industries which might be enormously benefited by the remission of these United States duties. Would that tend towards the unity of the empire? I am afraid it would be found in working that difficulties of this sort would constantly and continually arise. I would say this. It is a very inconvenient thing to bind this country by treaty not to impose duties; but it is something more than an inconvenient thing to bind this country by treaty not to take off duties in circumstances which no man can possibly foresee.

Had Champ Clarke used that language it would have been quoted all over this country. I would like to ask my hon. friends opposite, whether, in the declining years of their party, and we must consider the present year as one of the declining years of the Conservative party, are they sincere in their cry of loyalty? Let me put a test. What hon. gentleman, from the leader to the humblest of the party is ready to sacrifice the manufacturers of this country for loyalty? Not one. England is not affected one jot or tittle by the present agreement, but the English House of Commons and the English people have been clamouring for an increased preference upon manufactured goods coming from England. Will any hon. gentleman on the opposite side say that he is ready, out of the loyalty of his heart, to give a preference on manufactured goods to England and answer the call of England which has been heard during these long years? Not one. Mr. Chairman, I think that with the few words which I have spoken up to this I have found most of the objections which are thrown against this reciprocity agreement. There are others in detail but they are not serious.

I assume that it will be conceded by hon. gentlemen in this House that Canada is essentially an agricultural country, with four times the wealth invested in agriculture as in manufacture and if it is proved that the farming classes are benefited by reciprocity it must of necessity be a good thing for Canada. I take direct issue with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who stated in the House the other day that the farmer is getting more than his share of the prosperity of the community. The farmer cannot get more than his share of the prosperity of this country, the farmer is the very backbone of Canada, and it must become the imperative duty of this House to see to it that the farmer is protected beyond all classes in this country, because, if you make the farmer wealthy, you will make all classes wealthy. The money which goes into the farmer's pocket goes out of the farmer's pocket to benefit the different classes of Canada. I especially call the attention of the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Gilbert), to this fact, and I hope that when the vote is taken he will vote for the farmers of Canada to be consistent with the line of conduct which he took in his election, that prior to 1896 the manufacturers were protected. They have not been disturbed yet. It is not the idea on this side of the House to cripple the manufacturers of Canada, but instead of the manufac-

turers always looming highest in the eye of the government, this government has cast its eye at times upon the poor farmer who was neglected by hon. gentlemen opposite prior to 1896. The government asked the farmers to come forward and lay their grievances before them; and they answered by that monstrous delegation which met in this Chamber on the 16th December last, and in which the farmers of the different provinces were well represented. There was a unanimous demand from that monster delegation for reciprocal trade arrangements in agricultural products with the United States.

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. member for Peel deny it?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, I did not want to weary the House with quotations, but it is well that the hon. member (Mr. Blain) and the country should know what the farmers demanded. Mr. Scallion of Virden, Manitoba, speaking in the name of the farmers of that province said:

> Our protective tariff is held to be a great burden upon the agricultural industry of Canada and upon the great body of protected commodities . . . No trade arrangement which the Canadian government could enter into with any country would meet with greater favour or stronger support from the farmers of this country than a wide measure of reciprocal trade with United States.

What does the hon. member for Peel think of that. Did the hon. member read what Mr. Drury of western Ontario, secretary of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, said. If not, I cite it for him:

> In the increased British preference and ultimate free trade with England we look for relief from the general tariff burden. To this proposal we hope for little opposition from our manufacturers since it gives the man opportunity to show in a practical form what their much vaunted loyalty to the empire amounts to. Would the hon. member for Peel in answer to that request coming from western Ontario allow free trade with England in manufactured goods?

The hon. gentleman is as dumb as an oyster. Did the hon. member (Mr. Blain) read what Mr. Thomas McMillan of western Ontario, a member of the executive committee of the Dominion grange and of the Canadian Council of Agriculture said: did he read what Colonel Fraser said, did he say what Mr. Fawcett said; did he read what Mr. Parker said; did he read what Mr. Robert Sellars said; did he read what every farmer representing every agricultural industry of that country said at that great meeting. And why do we want reciprocity?

It is our view that Canada is a prosperous country, it is our view that since 1896, when this government came to office we have had successive years of untold prosperity. Why do we want reciprocity? the answer is simple; it is because the United States affords us our nearest market and is our natural market for our perishable goods. Let us drop the flag for a minute.

Mr. BEATTIE. What have we done with our perishable goods for the last 20 years?

Mr. DEVLIN. That is a pretty broad question.

Mr. BEATTIE. We did not have the American market, and we did well without it.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, our goods were consumed, and that is about the best answer I can give to the hon. gentleman, but I will go further and tell him that prior to 1896 our products in a great portion perished. Since 1896, due to the cold storage facilities afforded by the government to the farmers of this country, we have been able to export our goods in a condition that enables them to find a market abroad. Is the hon. gentleman satisfied with that answer?

Mr. BEATTIE. No, I am not.

Mr. DEVLIN. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beattie) is one of the most genial members of this House, but when it comes to a political question I fear there is nothing I might say which would satisfy him. Let us consider what would happen in the United States if any one state of the union had built around it a high protective wall. Would that state be as prosperous, do you think, as the other states of the union which had unrestricted free trade between them. Speaking purely from a business standpoint are we not geographically bordering the United States for 3,500 miles, and if the individual states have succeeded is it not a natural sequence that by taking down the tariff wall which separates Canada and the United States the provinces of Canada will succeed just as well as the different states of the union. But of course, hon. gentlemen must not construe my words to mean the taking down of the political wall. There is no question—and I want to lay emphasis upon that point—there is no question in any of these arrangements of either commercial union or annexation. It is true that Mr. Champ Clarke has been quoted, and certain newspapers, notably the Montreal 'Star' which carries on an anti-reciprocity campaign picks out the words of any man in the United States whether he is responsible or irresponsible, and publishes those words if they bear in the most remote degree upon the question of political

union between the countries. But that is not the sentiment which actuates the statesmen of the neighbouring republic. Let me quote a representative American, Mr. Root, who, speaking to an American audience upon American soil, and in the presence of His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, said:

Canada has become the home of a great people increasing in population and in wealth. The stirrings of a national sentiment are to be felt. In the relation to England, one can see that while still loyal to their mother country and a loyal part of the British Empire they the growing up, and, as the boy is to his parents when he attains manhood, they are a personality of themselves. In their relations to us they have become a sister nation. With their enormous national wealth, with their vigour and energy following the pathway that we have followed,——

And I think I have here the meaning of the reference to the parting of the ways which has been so often quoted:

—following the pathway that we have followed.

Protecting their industries as we have protected ours, proud of their country as we are proud of ours, they are no longer the little remnant upon our borders; they are a great and powerful sister nation. And the people of America look with no grudging or jealous eye upon this development. We bid them Godspeed in their growth in greatness and in power, in their capacity to do their part for civilization, for peace and justice, for liberty and righteousness among the nations. . . . But with us, eighty-nine years ago, by simple exchange of notes, the British and American governments agreed upon the disarmament on the great international waters between Canada and the United States, and to-day millions of people, thriving cities, wealth beyond computation, are free from wars, from alarms of wars, as safe without a cannon or a fort as if they were in the centre of this great land. Long may this condition continue. Never may it cease. It will not cease.

This is the kind of language that is found in the mouth of more than one statesman of the American Union. Did the Conservative party ever do the slightest thing to foster British trade? When they were in power, they taxed British goods more than they taxed the goods coming from the United States. Hon. gentlemen on this side must be amazed to know that hon. gentlemen opposite, who boast so loudly of their loyalty, when in power and in a position to help old England, imposed more taxes on goods coming from England than they did on goods coming from the United States. Under Conservative rule our imports from Great Britain amounted to $43,000,000 and they taxed $9,576,000. At the same time we imported $52,000,000, from the United States, and they were only taxed $8,220.-000, a discrimination against England. But they did more; they opposed a British preference. When this government proposed in 1897, to give, and did give, a British preference to England, hon. gentlemen opposite opposed the resolution. The hon. leader of the opposition, speaking in this House—his words are to be found in 'Hansard' of 1897, volume 2, page 2900—said:

Either it—the preferential clause—is bound to bring this country into direct conflict with the mother country on this point, or else it is bound to bring the mother country into direct conflict with Germany. One or other of these results must follow.

Mr. McGREGOR. Let us have it, then, and we will know where we stand.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend opposite says: Let us have it. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that it is a fitting contribution to Her Majesty in her jubilee year that we should bring ourselves into direct conflict with the mother country, &c.

He was not answered; and the hon. member for North Toronto, speaking immediately afterwards, chided hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for not answering what he termed the unanswerable argument of the opposition.

Mr. GOODEVE. Might I ask the hon. gentlemen if he is aware that during the last six years the average rate of duty on goods imported from Great Britain was 18.64 per cent as against 13.4 per cent on goods from the United States, greater than it was in the years he speaks of.

Mr. DEVLIN. That rate of duty was not that.

Mr. GOODEVE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I will give the figures.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman is wrong in his calculation. This country is doing greater trade to-day than it did prior to 1896. Not to go as far back as that, I will tell the hon. gentleman that our total export trade for twelve months ending November, 1901, amounted to $203,966,038; in 1910 it amounted to $309,647,124, an increase of over $100,000,000. The hon. gentleman has not taken the exact rate of duty. He has imposed duty upon the total imports into the country, and then he has divided up.

Mr. GOODEVE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. In either way the duty is greater. If you take the average duty on the dutiable goods it is 24·78 per cent for Great Britain as against 24·26 per cent for the United States; but if you take the dutiable and free goods together, it is 18·64 per cent for Great Britain, against 13·4 per cent for the United States.

Mr. DEVLIN. That must depend on the quality of the goods. What do the Conservative newspapers of this country say

in regard to the cry of annexation? I do not believe in quoting newspapers, but let me just quote one for which I have the greatest possible respect—the Ottawa 'Citizen,' which is generally found supporting hon. gentlemen opposite. In its issue of February 16, 1911, it had an editorial entitled, 'Saving the empire again,' in which it said:

'Save the Empire' appeals are now being made in Britain by the prominent newspapers opposed to the ratification of the agreement between Canada and the United States. The situation is not altogether novel nor is it so in its relation to Canadian affairs. No study of Canadian fiscal history is necessary to show that appeals to patriotism in Britain is one of the favourite methods of stirring up popular enthusiasm in support of a cause lacking more substantial claims to consideration as a matter of public policy.

All the arguments or, rather appeals, which did service a year ago are once more being put forward as earnestly and as persistently as at that time. The whole thing is a little discouraging because of the poverty of imagination revealed in this harking back to old disguises to alarm the Conservative Britisher who, however, refuses to be terrified to any appreciable extent. Even a more gloomy forecast, introduced by reasons more convincing than those based on foreign machinations, would be welcome because of its freshness. As it is, the skeleton in Punch and Judy has been thrust out from behind the curtain so often of late that it has lost all its terrors, if it ever really had any, even for those irrepressible characters.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Canada is to-day in a position to grant reciprocity because Canada's surplus production of agricultural products for exportation is constantly increasing, whereas that of the United States is decreasing. In 1900 there were 2,495,466 acres of wheat under cultivation. In 1910 there were 8,395,400. In 1900 there were 833,390 acres of oats under cultivation; to-day there are over 4,000,000 acres. In 1900 there were only 162,000 acres of barley under cultivation in our northwest provinces; to-day there are over 1,000,000.

In 1900 those 2,495,000 acres of wheat yielded 23,456,859 bushels; in 1910 our yield of wheat was 128,891,000. In 1910 the yield of oats in the Northwest was 126,753,000 bushels, and of barley, 21,377,000.

When we consider that the wheat field of Canada is four times that of the wheat field of the United States, when we consider the rapidly increasing production in Canada, may we not ask whether we are not in a position to compete for all time to come, not only with the United States, but with any other country?

Professor Frank T. Shutt, in his bulletin of August, 1910, says:

It is not our intention to burden this bulletin with statistics, but it will be of interest here to make one or two statements respecting the extent of these western lands and the possibilities that exist for expansion in wheat production and general farming. It is estimated that there are in the three western provinces about 180,000,000 acres suitable for cultivation, the greater part of which is adapted to wheat growing. Of this area, probably not more than 6 per cent is at present under cultivation. A further territory to the north of Alberta and Saskatchewan, within the boundaries of Mackenzie, Keewatin, Ungava and Yukon, contains more than 6,000,000 acres, and it has already been shown that wheat can be successfully grown at several points within this immense area.

We find also in the report of Professor Ruddick, dated 6th December, 1910:

The export of cream continued to the United States, and the quantity shipped from April 1 to November 30 last represents a value of about $1,000,000. The writer was across the border in northern New York lately anl learned that the dairymen there are beginning to agitate for an increase of duty to stop the importation of cream from Canada.

What is the lesson to be derived from this? Canada's agricultural production is constantly on the increase, but what about the production of the United States? Two recent bulletins of the United States Bureau of Statistics show that in 1907 the farm products in the United States were 43·7, in 1898, 45·2, and in 1899, 48·7, of the value of the total imports. The exports of domestic farm products from the United States in 1909 were valued, in round figures, at $903,000,000, a decrease compared with 1907 and 1908 of $151,000,000 and $114,000,000, respectively. The total exports in 1909 were valued at $1,638,355,593, the exports of farm products being 55·1 per cent of the total. The ratio of farm products to total exports has been gradually decreasing for many years. These facts I have taken from two recent bulletins of the United States Bureau of Statistics. I do not see, therefore, why hon. gentlemen opposite should dread the coming into force of this part of the agreement with the United States.

To those who have little faith in their country, let me say that Canada is becoming one of the great nations of the world. No one can estimate what the future has in store for our Dominion. When we consider that Canada is the size of thirty United Kingdoms, twice the size of British India, almost a Europe in itself, and larger than the United States, when we consider that she has the largest consecutive wheat fields in the world, the greatest extent of sea fisheries, and the largest grain mills in the British Empire, can we not say that our farmers, who possess the wealth of this great nation, need not fear competition from any corner of the globe. If by an interchange

of products with the United States wealth should flow into this country, as it inevitably will, then our government will have done something for which it will be blessed by future generations. It will have added to the wealth and development of this country, and our progress will be more rapid than it has been even since 1896. Canada will become the foremost nation within the British Empire. She will not merely be the sister nation of the United States, as she is to-day, but is bound to become a greater nation, and will for all time be the proudest gem in the British Crown.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). Perhaps no similar international proposition has ever attracted such wide attention as that which we are now considering. That is not surprising because it involves not merely the price of wheat, cattle, butter, flour and other agricultural products, but because, in the best judgment of many capable statesmen and experienced businessmen, it involves the commercial and political future of this great continent. It raises the question whether republican institutions are to compass the whole, and one flag float from the Pole to Panama, or whether two peoples sprung from a common stock, speaking the same language, reading the same literature, worshipping at the same altars, living under institutions founded on like ideals, shall share this almost illimitable territory, each people working out their own destiny in their own way, in independent friendliness, and rivals only in the arts of peace. This is not a time for the phrase-monger, it is no time for declarations of discourse; it is a time for earnest thought and plain speech. Between the Gulf of Mexico and the Arctic ocean, a hundred millions are thinking and talking about the proposals now being considered by this committee but with this difference: That the ninety-two millions living in the United States, during the last two years and six months have, on two occasions at the ballot box, demanded a general and substantial reduction in their customs duties, and to that extent expressed their approval of the reciprocity agreement, while the eight millions living in Canada have during the last ten years, on three several occasions at the ballot box, declared that they do not want reciprocity with the United States, or, at least, did not declare that they did want it. Let us, for a few minutes, follow the circumstances in which the respective parties reached negotiations which ended in this agreement.

It will be remembered that the Democratic party in the United States for a great many years advocated a material reduction in their tariff. And they had so impressed the people of the United States that the Republican party deemed it prudent, in their national convention in 1908, to declare for a revision downward of their tariff. They said to the people of the United States: We, the authors of this system of protection are better qualified to revise it than can be our opponents. Well, the people of the United States took them at their word, in November, 1908, they elected a Republican president and a Republican Congress. That Congress met in 1909, and passed what is known as the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Bill, assented to by President Taft, and justified by him on many platforms in the United States. That tariff Bill provided for a minimum and a maximum tariff. That minimum tariff provided about double the rates which our tariff provides. But, in addition, there was provided 25 per cent, but, authorized the President to strike off that 25 per cent as applied to any country which did not in any way discriminate against the United States in favour of a third country. At that time Congress passed that Payne-Aldrich Bill in August, 1909, the President of the United States was aware that there was in existence a treaty between Canada and France —not of a very extensive character—and the Congress of the United States also knew of the existence of that treaty. That Act passed in August, 1909, was to come into effect, if I remember rightly, on the 1st of March, 1910. A few days before that date the President of the United States sent a message to the government of Canada to say: The Payne-Aldrich tariff enacted by the Congress of the United States, and assented to by myself places me in an awkward and embarrassing position, I shall be unable to strike off that maximum duty unless you give me an inducement to do so. What was the position taken by this government at that time? Did they take the position that a proud and self-respecting people would desire them to take?

What did we do? We became alarmed, rushed off to Washington, after having a trip down to Albany, bowed our head beneath the big stick that was held over it, agreed to put thirteen classes of articles upon the list advantageous to the United States over and above other countries if they would withhold the coming down of that big stick and strike off the maximum tariff of 25 per cent. We did more than that. We gave the President of the United States at that time a promise that we would consider later a broader trade deal with the government of the United States. If I remember aright, when our representatives who went to Washington on that occasion returned, they did not tell us that they had given that promise.

It transpired later that that promise was made. That, it seems to me, was a humiliating position in which to place the peo-

ple of Canada. Mr. Taft should have been reminded that the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Bill was the work of the Congress of the United States, approved and justified by him before his own people, and he should have been informed in a firm but friendly manner that if that Act placed him in an embarrassing and undesirable position he should seek relief at the hands of its authors, and that Canada's laws are enacted at Ottawa, and not at Washington. Such a stand and statement given by a proud and self-respecting people of 8,000,000 would have commanded the respect and admiration of a proud and self-respecting people of 90,000,000. But to meekly yield to the threat presented was a humiliating spectacle to the people of Canada.. In approaching us, as he did a year ago, Mr. Taft was not acting the part of a national philanthropist. Under a smooth exterior, he was laying well and deep the plans for the aggrandizement of his own country. Whoever knew an American to enter into a bargain for the benefit of the other party to it? Let us not allow ourselves to be flattered into a false security in that way. In the autumn of 1910 there was another election in the United States, a large number of Republicans contended that the Republican Congress that had been elected in 1908 had not, by the Payne-Aldrich Bill, fulfilled the pledges given to the people prior to the election, and a number of Republican senators and others became what were known as the insurgents in the Republican party and they, together with the Democrats, in the general election of 1910, elected a Democratic Congress. These negotiations which had been talked of between our Finance Minister and Mr. Taft in February, 1910, were initiated by the President of the United States by sending representatives here to this government in November, 1910. What should the answer of our government have been to these people at that time? What were the facts? The Republican party in the United States had been defeated; the electors in the United States had expressed their want of confidence in that party, and this government might very properly have said: Your party has lost the confidence of the people in your country, you have been defeated at the polls, your party is not in a position to negotiate with us now, and we will wait until the Democratic party are in a position to enact law, and we will deal with them, and not with you, the defeated party. But instead of saying that, they seemed to jump at the suggestion that they should go to Washington, and endeavour to negotiate a treaty there.

So much for the course of events on the other side leading up to the beginning of these negotiations; let us look at the events in Canada. For three or four years prior to 1878, the people of Canada had suffered a very severe depression. All sorts of industrial institutions were tumbling to pieces, factories were closed or running short hours, artisans and labourers were out of labour, no industry was thriving in this country except the soup kitchen. Sir John Macdonald promised a remedy for that. He proposed that there should be introduced into out tariff system the principle of protection, and on September 17, 1878 the people of Canada, by an overwhelming majority, said: We approve of your suggestion. In 1879 that principle was introduced into the tariff of Canada. Of course it was objected to then by the Liberal party, and they continued to object to it until 1896, when they substantially accepted it, and they have been substantially administering it ever since. No fair-minded, moderate Liberal will contend for one moment that when they came into power in 1896 or since they have eliminated from our tariff the principle of protection. It has been in the tariff ever since 1879, for 32 years, and what has been the result? Under that system we made great progress, more than we ever made before. Every class of our people is in a prosperous condition to-day, and none more prosperous than our farmers. They are enjoying abundant crops and high prices. Manufacturers are doing a thriving and profitable business. Merchants are doing a profitable business. Artisans and labourers are employed full time at large wages. There never was a time in the history of Canada when our people were so prosperous as they are to-day. What is the proposition now? The proposition now is to make us better. We will take a homely illustration. Supposing that a couple of old friends, both distinguished physicians, met a third friend whom they had not seen for a number of years, and one of them said to him: How are you getting along, John? Well, for three or four years prior to 32 years ago, I was in a very bad condition, I was getting weaker day by day, I lost my nerve, I was getting weaker all the time. A distinguished physician prescribed a new diet for me, which I began 32 years ago. I have been getting stronger every year on that prescription, I can run faster than I could 32 years ago, jump higher, sleep better, and my nerves are better; I am better in every way. One of his friends says to him: Oh, I can make you even better than that; you can lift only 200 pounds now, you are in a healthy condition, but I have a remedy that will enable you to lift 300 pounds. Change the old diet, and take the new. John asks the other physician: What do you think about that proposition? Don't on your life, make a change, it will kill you if you do. We both admit that you never can get back to the old diet if you change. Now, what

are you going to do about it? What would a wise man do about it? Would he take his chance, and change that prescription? Swap a certainty for an uncertainty. It seems to me it would not be the part of wisdom to do so, but that is what it is proposed to do now in this country by those who are at the head of affairs. The last speaker referred to the will of the people, and all that sort of thing, as many others have done. It will be remembered that when the Liberal party came into power in 1896 they did make an effort to secure reciprocity with the United States. What was known as the Joint High Commission was appointed. They met several times, but did not succeed in securing any arrangement with the government at Washington. We have heard many times what the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said in this House in 1899 when he used these words which have become familiar, I have no doubt, to every member of the House:

If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling of Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with the hon. gentleman himself, would have given many things to obtain the American market. There was a time not long ago when the market of the great cities of the Union was the only market we had for many of our products but thank Heaven these days are past and over. We are not dependent upon the American market we were at one time. It is possible they may come to us, if they do, we will teach them the lesson they have taught us.

What is the fair translation of that speech delivered in this House in 1899? The people of Canada are not in favour of reciprocity, the right hon. gentleman said. There was a time when we were in favour of it, but now we have another market; now we are not dependent upon the American market and we no longer want reciprocity. These words cannot have any double meaning. The general feeling in Canada is no longer in favour of reciprocity; we were in favour of reciprocity because we had no other market than that of the United States; we are not in favour of it now because we have become independent of the American market. There is no getting away from that. Mr. Chairman, are we less independent of the people of the United States to-day than we were twelve years ago? Are we not infinitely more independent of them than we were then? The Prime Minister said then that we did not want reciprocity because we were no longer dependent on the American market. Do we want it now when we are infinitely more independent of the American market than we were then?

Our friends went down to Washington and they are not willing to let well enough alone. The right hon. First Minister told us that the only one who desires to let well enough alone is the Chinaman. You will remember the words that he used in that regard. He said on the 7th March in this House:

Well, what is this country? What are we? Is this Canada, or is this China?

The Chinese have left well enough alone for 4,000 years. 4,000 years ago they were probably the first nation on earth, and so satisfied were they that they refused to move. They let well enough alone for 4,000 years. If a reformer showed his head among them he was ruthlessly put down and told to let well enough alone.

The hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), was interviewed in Boston on the 28th October last and he is reported in the Montreal 'Herald,' the Liberal organ in that city, as saying:

The attitude of the Canadian people now is to let well enough alone.

On the 28th October last we had at least one Chinaman in the holy of holies right here and I am not sure that we have not some more in the cabinet. I have already read the remarks of the Prime Minister when he said:

The people of Canada do not want reciprocity because we have become independent of the American market.

I think the free translation of that is, that the people of Canada to-day want to let well enough alone, so that not only the Minister of War is a Chinaman, but the right hon. gentleman himself is a Chinaman and, according to his statement, the great majority of the people of Canada are Chinamen because they want to let well enough alone, as he then stated. But, as I said, our friends went down to Washington. Did the hon. Minister of Finance seem to think that it was necessary to have any information at all down at Washington? Why, the very mention of reciprocity was sufficient to induce him to jump at it. Did he not say to this House on the 6th April:

There is a sufficient movement on that question in the United States to call for a variety of information and for that purpose a tariff commission was appointed about a year ago. That commission has been conducting investigations not only here but in other countries, and the information was probably necessary for our American neighbours, when they were entering upon a new and radical departure from their past fiscal policy. No such tariff commission and no such information was required to enable this government to deal with the question of reciprocity in natural products. There was no need of statistics to satisfy this government

that reciprocity in natnral products was a good thing.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was not Canada's departure from her fiscal policy just as radical as that of the United States from hers?

Mr. FIELDING. No. What we have done is no departure from the policy of Canada; it is in accordance with the policy of Canada for forty years. . . .

There is an important difference in the position of the United States government then and now. They were proposing a radical departure from the policy of the country, and they may have needed information of that sort to support their case, but we certainly did not . . . .

We had a definite knowledge obtained from the history of the question, and we have brought down some statistics that we used at Washington, and they are already before the House. Our point of difference is that I do not agree with my hon. friend that those statistics were necessary for the consideration of what was the settled policy of the Dominion of Canada for the last 40 years. . . .

We founded our belief in reciprocity in natural products upon our faith in the resources of Canada, the conditions of our soil and climate, the intelligence of our people.

So we have the Minister of Finance saying in this House on the 6th April that reciprocity had been the settled policy of both political parties in this House for the last forty years. The hon. gentleman on the other side (Mr. Devlin), who preceded me in this debate, made the statement. This statement is inconsistent with the statement made by the Prime Minister in 1899 when he said that the people of Canada did not want reciprocity, and gave as a reason that they were independent of the American market. So, when the Minister of Finance says that both political parties in this country, for the last forty years, have been in favour of reciprocity with the United States he is not speaking by the book. He has told us that it was not necessary to have any facts, any statistics, it was not necessary to have any information when they went to Washington. Why, the mere statement of reciprocity in natural products was in itself quite sufficient. He seemed to regard reciprocity as if it were like the law of gravitation, or the precepts of the decalogue, an immutable truth dictated to us by Providence, away above and beyond the possibility of question or criticism. That is the way he seemed to regard reciprocity when he went to Washington—no information necessary, not necessary to make an inquiry as to prices, not necessary to ascertain what effect it would have upon interprovincial trade, not necessary to discover what effect it would have upon the hog industry, not necessary to make any inquiry as to how it would affect the milling industry—no information necessary, the offer of reciprocity in natural products, jumped at immediately without any information whatever. That was the position that the Minister of Finance took when he went o Washington. Not only did they agree to a free exchange of natural products, but they agreed upon a lower duty on more than one hundred manufactured articles.

Then, it has been said over and over again that the Prime Minister promised to appoint a commission of investigation before making any radical change in the tariff. He said in this House at the beginning of the session:

> I stated that we would have a commission of investigation before we undertook a revision of the tariff. Does any member on the other side of the House take issue with the promise I make. Would any of them advocate rushing into a revision of the tariff without previous investigation. Honourable members laugh at that but they will not dare to say they would favour such a course.

Let us look at the course of events. The Minister of Finance had been down at Washington in February, 1910. He had promised President Taft that later he would enter into a discussion with him with the view of establishing some such agreement as we have to-day. I think it is fair to assume that the Minister of Finance communicated to the Prime Minister what he had promised the President of the United States, that the Prime Minister knew, before he went on his western tour, that the Minister of Finance had promised the President of the United States to at least enter into a discussion respecting our trade relations. Knowing that, the Prime Minister, on his western tour, told the people that he would make no general change in our tariff without having first appointed a commission to inquire into and consult the various industries of this country. Has this been done? Why was it not done? We have no answer to that. The right hon. gentleman admits that he made the promise and he admits that he has not carried it out. Why? No reason given.

What is the agreement that these hon. gentlemen who went to Washington made with the government of the United States without any information? Those who were negotiating the treaty on the other side had any amount of information. They had books published. The government of the United States had taken great pains to provide their representatives with all the information which might be necessary. They had the president's message with statistics of trade, they had the evidence before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, they had the evidence of the Senate Committee, they had Senate document No. 849 of the world's prices, and so on, they had tariff series No. 26, published by the Department of Commerce

and Labour describing Canadian prices and they had the advance sheet of the American census. They had all that information; we had not any. Our representatives knew the whole thing intuitively. We had been in favour of reciprocity for forty years; we did not require any information. The people of the United States did not enter into it in that way.

What have we? We have, speaking generally, a free interchange of natural products, all kinds of grain, live animals, dairy products, fish, salt, cheese, butter, and eggs. That is not all, Mr. Chairman; it is not confined to natural products. There are about a hundred manufactured articles that are included in this agreement in addition to natural products. This is a bargain that we have made not only with the United States but with thirteen countries because twelve others come under this agreement as proposed automatically. These other countries have been named before, but I shall name them again; The Argentine, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, and Venezuela. We permit the products of thirteen countries to come into Canada to compete with our farmers and we get the right to send our products into one country. That seems to be a jug handled policy. I have never met a farmer yet, since this treaty was suggested, who approves of it when you tell him that these thirteen other countries will come into our market and we have only the right to get into one. This agreement may be approached from two points of view: the economic and the sentimental. Gentlemen who advocate the agreement say that it should be approached from the business view point only, and in that they follow in the footsteps of their leader who many years ago said that business and not allegiance or blood was the foundation of trade. In order to get at what the Prime Minister's ideas really are on this agreement, I call attention to what he said in this House, just after an election on the 1st of May, 1891: ('Hansard,' 1891, page 27):

While they commit the mistake of basing their trade policy upon uniformity of allegiance and a mere sentiment, we of the Liberal party maintain that the policy of this country must be based not upon sentiment but upon business principles; and, fresh as we come from the people, I say that the only policy which will benefit this country is unrestricted reciprocity and continental freedom of trade. Sir Charles Tupper says in an article published a few days ago in the 'North American Review,' that the delusion, as he calls it, of unrestricted reciprocity was dead and buried. I am as good an authority on this subject as is Sir Charles Tupper, and I say it is more alive than ever.

Let me say in passing that it seems to me it is about to be resurrected if this agreement be adopted. At page 28, 'Hansard,' the Prime Minister is reported as follows:

Shall we be so diffident of our manhood that we dare not do what we think best for our interests, because, forsooth, some one might be dragged away from his allegiance to his country in favour of American citizenship.

That is exactly what he is saying to-day, and that is what gentlemen on the other side are saying. They say: Are we to lose the benefit of increased prices in horses and eggs, &c., because it may affect the allegiance of this country in favour of American citizenship? At page 29, 'Hansard,' Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

The right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) said that this policy was hostile to Great Britain. Again I deny it; but, Sir, I am free to admit that I, for one, when I made up my mind in favour of this policy, looked up first and last to the interest of Canada and not to the interest of England. . . The hon. gentleman must have foreseen since this was to be a nation, that some day or other the interest of this young nation would come in contact with the interest of the mother land. It is absurd to suppose that situated as we are the interest of Canada will always be identical with the interest of Great Britain. Some day must come when the interests will clash and, whatever the hon. gentleman may be, for my part whenever it comes to that, and however much I must regret the necessity, I will stand by my native land. . . Now, Sir, we are agitating and we have agitated this policy of unrestricted reciprocity because we believe it is in the best interest of the country and not because we love England less, but because we love Canada more.

At page 1136, 'Hansard,' the right hon. gentleman said:

He (referring to Mr. Foster) speaks as if Canada were to remain for ever a colony, but I say that Canada is not always to remain a colony. Light as our dependence may be on the mother country that dependence is not to remain for ever. If we were to admit that, if we were to say that we were always to remain in a dependent condition, we would be the scorn of the world, and it would be scorn well deserved. . . We have self-government, we have a constitution of our own, we have interests which are separate and distinct from these which we hold in common with the empire of which we form a part, and our energies must seek wider fields abroad. Perhaps the next step may be said to be complete independence, but there is no desire to have complete independence in Canada to-day. Even with those who like myself look to independence as the supreme goal, there remains a love for the mother land and a desire to remain in connection with it, but in the nature of things our relations must be compatible with our interests. . . There is no desire to change our allegiance, but the conditions of our relations with the empire must be changed.

It is the destiny of the colonies to become nations as it is the destiny of a child to be-

come a man, and while no doubt the idea of separation from the mother land causes a pang in the heart of every one, yet there is not a child who leaves his father's house who does not do so with a pang if his heart is in the proper place. There is a grander idea yet. John Bright truly said that England is the living mother of nations, and we may yet hope to see British communities dotting the earth's surface which I hold to be a grander idea than that of welding together a gigantic British Empire on the face of the earth. For my part that is the view I favour. I say, as I declared in Boston, that I should like to see a commercial alliance of all nations sprung from England. This is the policy I have favoured. But the fact remains, however, that our colonial citizenship is inferior and must be reformed. . . For, in the opinion of all, what Canada wants at this moment is foreign markets. . .

There is not a country on the face of the earth which ever achieved its independence except at the cost of blood and war and enmity with the parent state. I hold out to my fellow countrymen the idea of independence, but whenever the day comes it must come by the consent of both countries, and we should continue to keep the good feeling and the good will of the mother land. If we are true to our record we will again exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree.

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy —British diplomacy so far as Canada is concerned has been a record of failure and of surrender and sacrifice.

I said that allegiance could not be the basis of trade. My hon. friend takes exception to that. He pretends that allegiance ought to be the basis of trade, that business is not to be the consideration, but that the consideration is to be the blood between the two countries. The hon. gentleman no doubt would prefer an English shilling to a Yankee dollar; but for my part I am differently constituted. I am ready any day, whether I am charged with annexation or not, to take a Yankee dollar in preferenec to an English shilling. That is the extent of my annexation. . . I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspirations is the independenec of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in due course of time.

That is what the right hon. gentleman says to-day. He says that he is simply looking at enhancing the price of the commodities of this country, and in a speech delivered by him on the 7th of March last he used these words:

I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made is simply to get better prices for the products of the Canadian farmer.

That is the whole object he had in view. That is the way he talked in 1891. Allegiance had nothing to do with it, it was a matter of trade, if allegiance suffered, so much the worse for allegiance. The hon. gentleman from Wright (Mr. Devlin) referred to the British preference, and I said a moment ago that those who advocated the adoption of this agreement say that it should be approached from the economical viewpoint, and that alone; that it should not be approached from the sentimental viewpoint, that there is no such thing as sentiment in business. Well, we find hon. gentlemen opposite boasting of the British preference. Whenever they desire to point to something that they have done to illustrate their loyalty—and I am not questioning their loyalty at all—they refer to the British preference. I remember the hon. the Postmaster General—and I was surprised to hear him do so—in a speech which he delivered in this House on the 3rd of February, 1910, referring to the British preference as an evidence of the loyalty of the Liberal party. He said on that occasion:

Were we disloyal when in 1897, of our own free will, as the first act of the Liberal administration, we granted to Great Britain what is called the British preference? At the time of the South African war were we disloyal when in spite of varying circumstances, we sent to South Africa the young men of this country to fight the battles of Great Britain?

So that the Postmaster General referred to the British preference not merely as a business transaction, but as an evidence of loyalty, as an evidence of sentiment. Why claim any loyalty for the British preference if the basis of trade is solely business? Now, let us look for a moment at this British preference to which our hon. friends on the other side of the House refer as if it were a sort of sacred sacro sanctity which it would be absolutely profane to discuss or criticise or question. I do not think there is any British preference about it at all; I do not think they are entitled to any credit for it at all. They never intended to give Great Britain any preference in that regard, and they are only entitled to credit for what they intended to do. I remember hearing of a couple of men who were at church one day, and one of them by mistake put a half-sovereign on the collection plate instead of a halfpenny, and when he got out of church, on his way home he discovered the mistake he had made. So he went back to the sexton and offered to give him a halfpenny and get back the half-sovereign. 'Oh, no,' said the sexton, 'you cannot do that; you put the half-sovereign on the plate, and there it must remain.' The man consoled himself by saying: 'Well, keep the half-sovereign; I will get credit for it on the judgment day.' 'Oh, no,' said the sexton, 'you will only get credit for the halfpenny you intended to give.'

Our hon. friends on the other side of the House take credit for the British preference; but they never intended to give a British preference, as I will endeavour to establish. Our friends came into power in the early part of July, 1896. They did not do anything by way of tariff revision that year; but in the session of 1897 they passed the Act which they now call the British preference, and let me read the section of the Act which bears upon it. 'An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the duties of customs,' assented to 29th June, 1897. Section 17 is in these words:

When the custom tariff of any country admits the product of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in schedule D to this Act.

Schedule D is in these words:

On all the products of countries entitled to the benefits of this reciprocal tariff, under the provisions of section 17, the duties mentioned in schedule A shall be reduced as follows:

On and after the 23rd of April, 1897, until the 30th day of June, 1898, inclusive, the reduction shall in every case be one-eighth of the duty mentioned in schedule A, and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be seven-eighths of the duty mentioned in schedule A.

On and after the 1st day of July, 1898, the reduction shall in every case be one-fourth of the duty mentioned in schedule A, and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be three-fourths of the duty mentioned in schedule A.

I have read the whole Act, and British preference is not mentioned in it at all; there is no reference in it to any preference to Great Britain. The offer is made to all countries of the world, and in introducing the tariff the Finance Minister took pride in saying that they were not giving anything to Great Britain. Here is what he said of the customs tariff of 1897, as reported in 'Hansard' of that year:

We do not by our resolution offer anything to Great Britain alone. We make our offer, not to Great Britain, but to every nation that is prepared to accept it. We make it to every country which is willing to establish fair and reasonable trade relations with Canada.

So that when they passed what is known as the British preference Act, or the section of the Customs Act in 1897, they had no intention of conferring any preference on Great Britain, but it was an offer made to all the nations of the world. But before the next session of parliament they found that they had got into difficulties owing to certain treaties that were in existence, and then they amended the Act, compelled to amend it by reason of those treaties, other countries claiming the right to come in under the provision as it stood in the Act of 1897. They amended that Act in these words—was assented to on the 13th June, 1898, section 2:

On and after the 1st day of August, 1898, section 17 of the said Act shall be repealed and the following shall be substituted therefor:

Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of any of the following countries——

Not of any countries of the world, as the Act of 1897 said:

—may, when imported directly into Canada from any such country, be entered for duty or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada at the reduced rate of duty provided in the British preferential tariff set forth in schedule D to this Act.

It goes on to specify the different countries, and then says:

Any other British colony or possession the customs tariff of which is, on the whole, as favourable to Canada as the British preferential tariff herein referred to is to such colony or possession.

So that these hon. gentlemen did not intend to give Great Britain any preference whatever when they passed the Act in 1897. They opened out the offer to the whole world, but a year afterwards, when they discovered that they had blundered, they were obliged to repeal that Act of 1897 and confine it to British possessions. So I hope our hon. friends will never again refer to the British preference as a manifestation of their loyalty. They are not entitled to any credit whatever for it, because they did not intend to confer any favour on Great Britain.

As my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) pointed out, it is no preference whatever. Why? Because we are permitting goods from the United States to come into this country at an average rate of 13 per cent and a very small fraction. I am speaking now of all the goods that come in from the United States, both dutiable and free. The average duty paid on all these last year was 13 per cent, while those that came from Great Britain were charged nearly 19 per cent on an average, taking both dutiable and free, and last year we imported from the United States free of duty $106,000,000 worth, and from Great Britain $23,000,000 worth. Still hon. gentlemen opposite will boast of the British preference and of their loyalty. But, with all that preference, there was a difference in favour of the United States last year of over 5 per cent and there has been that difference during many years. It is no answer to say that a large portion

of the goods from the United States are brought in as raw material. What difference does that make to the country from which we import them? What difference does it make to Great Britain whether we allow these goods to come in from the United States free? What she is interested in is in getting her goods into Canada at a lower duty. But instead of charging a lower rate of duty on the average on goods imported from Great Britain as compared with goods imported from the United States, we are charging between 5 and 6 per cent higher, so that there is no British preference whatever. All these years there has been a difference in favour of the United States, and we are now asked to increase that preference by voting for this proposed agreement.

What will be the effect of adopting this agreement? Nobody can tell us what it will be because nobody knows. The whole thing is mere theory. We often hear the Reciprocity treaty of 1854 referred to as evidence that the pact now proposed will be beneficial to both countries. But we get no comfort whatever from history. The old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was in force some twelve years. In the first place, I deny that we were prosperous during the whole of that period; and in the second place I deny that the measure of prosperity which we did enjoy came to us by reason of that reciprocal agreement. What was going on in the world in 1854 when the farmers of this country were getting as high as $2.50 per bush for their wheat? An old gentleman in Elgin county told me that in those days he got $2.50 per bushel for his wheat in Port Stanley. Why did our farmers in those days get that high price? Was it because we had reciprocity with the United States? No, it was because two of the greatest nations on earth were at war in the Crimea. That is why we in Canada were prosperous in those years; but when peace was concluded between Russia and England in March, 1856, wheat dropped to 70 cents per bushel. What was the cause of that tumble? It was due to the fact that the war was over; and there are hon. gentlemen within the sound of my voice who know that the severest depression Canada ever suffered was in the years 1857, 1858 and 1859, during which we had all the benefits supposed to flow from this beautiful treaty of reciprocity. Banks were then tumbling to pieces, factories were closing, the farmers were selling their pianos to buy necessaries, and every one was suffering, yet these were the years when we had all the benefits of trading with the United States. Then there were other conditions prevailing during the last five years of that treaty which must not be lost sight of. Hundreds of thousands of American farmers, instead of sowing wheat and planting corn in their broad acres, were sowing death on the battle field, and consequently the United States were in absolute need of everything the farmers of this country could produce. In those days they bought everything we had to sell. Therefore, I have abundantly shown not only that we were not prosperous throughout the whole of the period during which the old reciprocity treaty lasted, but enjoyed only a measure of prosperity, and that measure of prosperity was not the result of reciprocity with the United States, but of the war between Great Britain and Russia in the first part of that period, and the civil war between the North and South in the latter part. So that we get no help whatever from history.

Who stand to benefit by any trade treaty? It is no advantage to two farmers to trade with each other, because they are both producing the same products. Each one has more wheat and corn and cattle and other agricultural products than he knows what to do with. To whom does the farmer look to trade with? He looks to the man who is making coats and shoes and binders and other things which the farmer requires, and who is prepared to buy in return the things which the farmer grows. I regret that there are some hon. gentlemen in this House who seem desirous to set up class against class. They appear to lose sight of the fact that the farmer requires the manufacturer, the artisan, the labourer, the merchant and the professional man, and that all these require the farmer. We are all dependent the one upon the other, and he is an enemy of his country who tries to set class against class, whether religious, racial or industrial. The prosperity in this country depends upon all these classes, and we require the whole of them; and in order to secure the best interests of this country, all these different classes must work together, and he is no friend of his country who attempts to set the one against the other. If we had a country like England lying alongside of us, it would be a great benefit to us to make trade as free as possible between the two, because the people of that country are manufacturers and consumers of our agricultural products. But it would be no advantage for two countries lying alongside of each other, both farming countries, to trade with each other. But of what class are the men with whom we are talking about making this agreement? Are they all manufacturers? No, they are farmers like ourselves. They export hundreds of million dollars worth of the very same kinds of produce that we grow.

The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) told us of the great quantities of hams that England bought from the United States. Then, of course, it is going to be a great benefit for us to get our hams into the United States. Logical, isn't it? In the year 1909, the United States exported immense quantities of the very sort of

material of which we have a surplus—animals to the value of $22,645,000; breadstuffs $159,929,000; eggs, butter cheese, pork, &c., $166,000,000. Of what benefit is it to us to get into a country like that, where they produce more than they require, and are sending their surplus to the same market to which we are sending ours? The Finance Minister, the other day, said that our farmers would have three markets instead of two—not only the home market, and the British market which they now have, but the United States market as well. It does not necessarily follow that the opening of an additional market is a benefit to the farmers. Take the adjoining counties of Elgin and Middlesex—Elgin with about 40,000 and Middlesex with about 80,000; in Elgin we have a city of 15,000, while they have the city of London with 40,000;—would it be of any advantage to the farmers of Elgin to go into the chief market of the county of Middlesex? Why, they get as good prices in St. Thomas as they can get in London. The Elgin farmers come to their county town and the Middlesex farmers go to their county town. It would be no advantage to either of us to have two markets instead of one. The question of whether it is better to have two markets than to have one depends altogether upon circumstances. So, it is a mere theory that this market will be of great advantage to us. It never has been so far, and there is no evidence that it will be now. Of course, we have the opinion of the two very able gentlemen who went down to Washington. Well, an observant person learns something with the passing years; and one of the things he learns is that you never find the aggregate wisdom of humanity under one hat however enlarged by flattery or success. Another thing you learn is that a very intelligent and sincere opponent may differ from you in opinion, and still be right. Of course, we have the benefit of the judgment of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson); but I am not prepared to submit my individual judgment to that of these gentlemen. I have watched the record of the Minister of Finance very closely for thirtv years, and more especially for the last three years; I have watched it very especially for the last three or four months; and I have never found anything in it to warrant the people of Canada in falling down before him and worshipping him. A few years ago, it was his best judgment—and I am speaking now only of his judgment—that it was in the interest of this country to tear up the British North America Act, and for the province of Nova Scotia to secede from the Dominion. Was his judgment good? Twenty years ago both he and the Minister of Customs were just as enthusiastically zealous for the unrestricted reciprocity doctrine preached by the present leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as they are to-day for this agreement. Well, I think the consensus of opinion in Canada to-day is that it is a good thing that we did not adopt unrestricted reciprocity twenty years ago. I believe the consensus of opinion among the people is that if we had adopted unrestricted reciprocity twenty years ago, we should be to-day—as the Hon. Edward Blake then said he expected we would be if this doctrine were adopted — both commercially and politically a part of the United States. Was the judgment of the Finance Minister good on that question? The Minister of Finance made a speech in this House a few years ago in favour of the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, and figured out that that road could be constructed from Winnipeg to Moncton for $51,300,000. This was his estimate for a road equal to the Intercolonial, but he told us—and I want to be perfectly fair with him—that to make a first-class road in every respect would cost about $3,000,000 more. I think it will be admitted by every one to-day that that road will never be completed for $200,000,000. Then we had him dealing, in 1906, with the manager of the Farmers' Bank. Were his dealings with the manager of the Farmers' Bank such as to cause any hon. gentleman in this House to have confidence in his judgment? So, I say, we cannot safely rely upon the judgment of the hon. Minister of Finance with reference to this compact. Of course, the Minister of Finance did not go down to Washington alone; he took with him the Minister of Customs. Well, poor Uncle Billy! No one ever supposed for a moment that he would ever lose sight of the biscuit box. We can imagine what occurred when these gentlemen were figuring this out. What do you think, Mr. Paterson, about putting fruit on the free list? Yes, put fruit on the free list; if the fruit growers can't make money growing fruit let them destroy their apple-trees and raise mangolwurtzels. And fruit was put on the free list.

What about biscuits, Mr. Paterson? Oh biscuits, it was necessary in the interests of the plain people that they should bear 32½% and so they remain at that rate. So I say it is a mere matter of theoretical speculation, as to whether this agreement would prove beneficial to the people of this country or not. As I said a few minutes ago, the United States have a great surplus of the very same kind of goods that we desire to export, and under the agreement we admit the produce of the Argentine republic as well as that of eleven other countries. I was surprised at the magnitude of that country when I

came to look into it. It has 14 provinces, and 10 territories, and is making even more rapid progress than Canada. I do not know whether or not they have a Sir Wilfrid Laurier there, but they are getting on faster than the Canadian people. Their population has doubled in the last fifteen years. Their trade in 1909 was larger than ours. Their imports amounted to $302,756,000 and their exports to $397,000,000, a total trade, import and export of $700,106,623. They exported of live stock and products of live stock in 1909, $153.548,356. They exported of agricultural products, $230,503,996. They exported of chilled and frozen beef and mutton and sundry meats frozen, 296,376 tons of a value of $29,000,000. Their exports per head are nearly twice as large as those of the Canadians. The Argentine republic exported per head of population during 1909, $61.10, while Canada exported per head in that year $39. In that year the countries of South America that are admitted to the Canadian market under this agreement, The Argentine, Venezuela and Colombia exported to the United States and paid a high duty on goods to the value of $37,554,095. If this agreement goes into force and the Argentine republic have the right, as they admittedly would have, to send their produce into Canada free, these large quantities that they are now sending into the United States under a very high duty would likely be diverted to Canada where they would have no duty to pay, and would compete with similar Canadian products. This produce of the Argentine republic that is now shipped to foreign countries could easily be sent to Canada, as the freight rate by water is very low. They could put frozen meat into the market at Halifax and Montreal at a lower rate than our farmers are getting for that sort of produce now. So far as figures can prove anything I think we may reasonably suppose that the competition of The Argentine would injure rather than benefit the farmers, would reduce the price rather than enhance it.

On March 29, of this year, my hon. friend from Leeds asked a question about the quantities of meats that were imported into Canada during the months of October, November, December, January and February. The Minister of Customs in reply gave the imports of bacon and ham, shoulders and sides, for the five months. Assuming that the same rate of imports would keep up for the whole year as for the five months, there would be imported from the United States 4,238,022 lbs., and of beef, salted in barrels, for a year, 2,266,296 lbs., at an average of 6-7/10 cents a lb. Of fresh mutton and lamb from the United States we got at the rate of 805,274 lbs., at an average of 9 cents a lb., and from Australia 2,067,175 lbs. at an average of 6 9/10 cents. Of pork barrelled in brine, from the United States, 9,133,545 lbs. at an average cost of 9 cents. Of other meats 469,060 lbs. at an average of 13 cents. Of cheese large quantities came from the United States, although the imports are mostly from Switzerland and Italy. Fresh meat from the United States amounted to 360,271 lbs. at 14 cents. The total meats from the United States coming into Canada for one year at the rate given here for the five months would be 17,272,468 lbs. In one month (February, 1911) we imported into this country from the United States 719,-315 dozen eggs. For the year that would amount to 8,631,780 dozen of eggs, over 8,-000,000 dozen in one year. These figures give us some idea of the conditions that we would be up against. These meats are now paying 3 or 4 cents a pound, but under the proposed arrangement the duty is reduced from 3 or 4 cents to 1¼ cents. If these large quantities come in at the comparatively very high rate of duty now imposed, how much more will come in when the duty is reduced to 1¼ cents a pound. It is reasonable to suppose that the quantity will be largely increased, and of course the same thing applies to eggs.

I remember the Minister of Customs going up and down western Ontario years ago and seting forth one of the theories of free trade, that is that the consumer always pays any duty that is placed upon an article. He used to say that if a duty was placed on any implement required by the farmer it would enhance the price of the implement by that amount. With an article of clothing it would be the same, the consumer simply had to pay that much more, as he always paid the duty. The free traders in England even go so far as to say that when a man owned two farms, bofh growing hay, one on either side of the river, on one side of which was a city, on the hay from the far side of the river the people of the city would have to pay the 50 cents toll charged the farmer for hauling that hay over the bridge. They argue that even in a case of that kind the consumer pays the duty.

The theory of these free traders has been that the consumers always pay the duty. But, our opponents have all at once discovered that it is not the consumer at all that pays the duty, but that it is the producer in Canada that pays the duty on stuff going into the United States. That is what they are telling us now. They are telling us that the fisherman gets less for his fish by reason of the duty on it when he sends it into the United States. They are telling the farmer that the farmer gets less for his products that he sends into the United States because he has to pay the

duty. They have discovered all at once that it is the producer that pays and not the consumer, although they have been telling us for forty years that the consumer always pays the duty. What are those on the other side of the line who are in favour of this agreement telling the people there? They are telling the people: You are paying the duty on the stuff coming into this country from Canada; if the duty is taken off you will get it so much cheaper. The supporters of this agreement in the United States are telling the people that the consumers are paying the duty, and the supporters of this agreement in Canada are telling the people that it is the producer that pays the duty. Who is right? We do not pretend to be free traders on this side of the House. We say that sometimes it is the consumer who pays the duty. If you put a duty of fiftv cents a pound on tea coming into this country the producers will pay every cent of it, but if a man were foolish enough to send a thousand pounds of tea to Japan, and Japan had a duty on tea the consumers would have to pav the whole of it to get it into the markets of Japan. Sometimes the producer pays, sometimes the consumer pays, and sometimes it is divided between them. That is our doctrine, but the doctrine of the free traders, I repeat, is that the consumer always pays the duty. Now, all at once, they discover that it is the producer who has to pay it, and pays the whole of it. The Toronto ' Globe ' of the 16th March, in a short paragraph, proves to its own satisfaction that under this agreement the producer would get more for his stuff, and the consumer would pay less for it. It is going to benefit both producer and consumer. The farmer will get more for his butter, and the mechanic will get it cheaper. That is a nice doctrine. Can you ride two horses at the same time going in opposite directions? That is the impression that hon. gentlemen opposite are striving to produce in this regard.

But, in addition, over and above this question of price, and this is the unimportant part of it, it would seem to me to be perfectly clear that if we enter into this agreement we will therebv sacrifice our fiscal independence. I understand very well that it is said in the agreement that either party can at any time abrogate it. That is all right in theory, but in practice it would not work. It would be regarded by our great neighbours as an act of unfriendliness to abrogate it, just as they regarded, while the Elgin treaty was in force, our action in increasing our tariff for the purpose of enhancing our revenue, as an unfriendly act to them. The gave that as the reason why they abrogated the treaty.

Now, what about our fiscal independence? We had an example of it a few weeks ago when 1,000 fruit-growers came to this building to lay their grievances before the ministers, and every one who heard them must admit they made out a strong case. Under ordinary circumstances the Prime Minister would have said to these gentlemen: We are very much interested in your remarks; there seems to be something in what you have said, and we will consider it, and if we can grant you relief without prejudicing the great masses of the people of this country we will do so. But, Sir, Canada no longer has her fiscal independence, and the Prime Minister was obliged to say to them: You have come too late, we have entered into an agreement with the people at Washington, and we cannot do anything for you however desirous we may be to help you. Is not that true? And suppose 12 months from now, 1,000 farmers, not fruit-growers, should come from Ontario and say to this government: Under the old duty of 3 cents a pound on pork we made the hog industry a paying one, but you have reduced it from 3 cents to 1¼ cents, and owing to the cheap production of hogs in the western states, and owing to the reduction of duty on beef coming from the Argentine and Australia and New Zealand, we are unable to compete in our home market, and we desire you to restore the old duty of 3 cents per pound. What position would the government be in, tied as they are by this treaty? Would not the Prime Minister have to say to the farmers as he said to the fruit-growers the other day: You have made out a good case but we are tied up by this agreement with the government of Washington. I am sorry, but we can do nothing for you. Is not that the truth? So, in theory, while we may retain our fiscal independence, in practice we would lose it if we entered into this agreement, and this government would have to consult Washington from day to day if it proposed to revise our own tariff. Is that a position that a self-respecting people should place themselves in? It seems to me not. Now, Sir, we have been endeavouring to cultivate, and we have succeeded in cultivating a national sentiment in this country. We remember that there was no such thing as a national sentiment prior to confederation, and there was very little national sentiment for some years after confederation. But for years every good citizen of Canada has been striving to cultivate a national sentiment from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and we have been told that one of the ways to cultivate a national sentiment is to cultivate trade between the different provinces of the confederation. Is there anything that contributes more directly to the spread of national sentiment than trade between

the provinces. Surely, if this agreement goes into effect we will be trading north and south instead of east and west, and if you divert the trade from east and west to north and south the tendency would be to separate these provinces rather than to weave them together. A few years ago the Prime Minister gave as a reason for the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, that it was essential to the existence of this country, that we should have a railway to carry the products of the western provinces through Canadian territory to the sea-board, and we have been spending hundreds of millions of dollars to construct these east and west lines of traffic. I do not say that the rails would rust on these lines if this agreement be put into force, but I do say the tendency would be to diminish national sentiment, to cultivate trade from north to south instead of from east to west, and eventually to cultivate sentiment in that direction also.

Sir, it was unwise for the government to enter into this agreement, and it would be unwise for parliament to ratify it for the following among other reasons:

1. All men agree that we are enjoying unprecedented prosperity as we are, with almost absolute certainty of a continuance thereof—

(a) Abundant harvests and high prices amply reward the tiller of the soil, whose income increases much more rapidly than his outgo.

(b) The manufacturer thrives with large orders and satisfactory profits.

(c) Artisans and labourers are fully employed at good wages.

(d) Commerce is rapidly expanding and accounts are promptly paid.

(e) Transportation facilities are increasing to meet the growing demand therefor.

(f) Interprovincial trade is active and strengthening the bonds of commercial friendship and national unity.

(g) Trade with the mother land is growing and adding to the vitality of the empire.

(h) We govern ourselves and enjoy all the rights and privileges incident to British institutions without the cost of monarchy.

(i) That, for the upbuilding of its various parts, it is desirable to establish a system of preferential trade within the empire which this agreement would retard or prevent.

2. All moderate men, I think, agree that the effect of the adoption of this agreement upon these various conditions is, to say the least, absolutely uncertain—that it might be adverse to many if not to all of them.

3. That probably one-half at least of our most capable, experienced and patriotic citizens, of all classes, regardless of race, creed or political affiliations, sincerely believe that many, if not all, of these laudable aspirations and happy conditions would be thwarted and injuriously affected, respectively, were the agreement enforced. They have a conscientious conviction that its adoption would tend to the separation of our provinces rather than to their unity, would work a practical surrender of our fiscal independence, would be followed by an irresistible demand for the free admission of all manufactured goods with its inevitable accompaniments, political as well as commercial union.

In these circumstances, admitted by all, where is the man bold and reckless enough to assume the responsibility for the adoption of this agreement. Nothing short of omniscience can foresee the consequences, near or remote, of a change so radical. Who possesses it? Surely not my right hon. friend, whose sins of omission and commission are already too grievous to be borne, surely not the hon. Minister of Finance, whose errors of judgment have often led him into paths bestrewn with the wrecks of political fads; surely none of the rest of my hon. friends opposite, whose potency on this question counts only on a division.

I do not mean to say dogmatically that these disastrous consequences would necessarily follow the adoption of the agreement, although with many, perhaps with a majority, I verily believe they would. Would prices to the producer be higher while to the consumer they would be lower? Impossible! Would a large diversion of trade to north and south channels lessen that in east and west courses? Surely! Would the national sentiment which we have been anxiously and successfully cultivating for forty years, largely through interprovincial trade, be strengthened? Most assuredly not! With 92,000,000 on one side and 8,000,000 on the other which would be the dominant partner and dictate terms? Undoubtedly the former! Would misunderstandings arise which could be settled only by our yielding or by a rupture of the pact with all the unfriendliness incident thereto? In all probability! Was Sir Wilfrid Laurier right when he said: 'The best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them? Certainly he was! Would our fiscal independence be sacrificed? Probably, but we do not know. Would unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union follow? Probably, although we do not know! If so, would that lead to political union? Probably, but we do not know. These are unsolved problems. Would it be wise to risk our present prosperous condition for the mere chance of bettering it, while disasters most momentous might follow? Surely that would not be the part of wisdom. Shall

we swap certainty for uncertainty? Common sense answers 'No.'

The government proposes to stake the country and take the gambler's chance. And that, too, when every passing breeze is laden with gifts for Canada.

The people should have an opportunity to speak. Let the whole people speak. They have not spoken. They have not had an opportunity to speak. If the majority be favourable the minority will yield as gracefully as possible and hope for the best. It is idle; it is unfair to the people; it is the trick of a crafty politician to urge the enforcement of the pact for a year or two and then go to the people. During that time injuries might accrue which would be irreparable. Let us have the voice of the people—of the whole people—at the proper time which is before the adoption of the arrangement. I appeal to my fellow members to stop, to, think, to refuse to take the risk of sacrificing our all for the mere uncertainty of mercenary gain. I appeal to my fellow members not to throw upon the table of chance all we hold most dear—not to entrust our all to this get-rich-quick device which cannot guarantee even a mercenary return. I appeal to my fellow members either to take the responsibility of rejecting this measure entirely as involving the sacrifice of certain prosperity for unknown consequences which may prove tremendously disastrous, or at least to insist upon the people's having an opportunity of expressing their judgment before it be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, on the 30th of November last, before we had any report from the two gentlemen who went to Washington, when the right hon. leader of the government said that we desired that they should eschew the commissioners from Washington as we would a pestilence, I suggested, in the course of some remarks that I made, not that we should eschew them as we would a pestilence, but that we should first ascertain from the government at Washington what we could get and what it would cost us to get it, and then we should submit the proposition to the people of Canada and get their opinion upon it before making it law. Of course, it is said that it is perfectly constitutional to submit the question to the people's representatives in this House; but if the government were to take that position at all, they should have submitted it as a non-party question. What did the president of the United States do in this agreement? He did not undertake to secure the necessary legislation. He undertook simply 'to recommend to Congress the adoption of such legislation as may be necessary on the part of the United States to give effect to the proposed arrangement.' Our representatives did not undertake to recommend to the parliament of Canada. They undertook to see to it that that legislation should be passed, in these words:

> The Canadian government will communicate to the parliament of Canada the conclusions now reached, and will thereupon take the necessary steps to procure such legislation as is required to give effect to the proposed arrangement.

And they come into this House and submit the arrangement as a party question. They do not say to their followers: Gentlemen, the people of this country have never expressed their judgment on this question; you have never expressed your judgment on it; we want your judgment on it; it is not a party question; we do not propose to make it a party question; we ask you to get all the information you can on the question, to exercise your best judgment on it, and then vote as you think the interest of the country demands, without regard to party. That would have given us an opportunity to get the best opinion of the members of this House on this question, unbiased by partisanship. I have no doubt that if the two gentlemen who went to Washington had made an agreement to exchange Ontario for the Hawaiian islands, a majority of the gentlemen on the other side of the House would have backed them up. This question ought to be considered without any regard to the ties of party. Each man in this House ought to give to the people of this country the benefit of his unprejudiced and unbiassed judgment in regard to this great question. My own idea, as I said last November, is that we ought to go to the people, that the people ought to have an opportunity of discussing this question. It is too important a matter to be decided by the representatives of the people in this House. There are thousands of men in the country who know just as much about this question, and perhaps more than the majority of the members of this House. I know that there are business men in my constituency whose judgment on this question is just as good as mine, perhaps better. How are these people to get an opportunity to express their judgment on this question? I cannot express it. I have no means of ascertaining how the majority of my constituents think on this question. The only way we can ascertain that is by means of the ballot box. If we desire to get the judgment of the people on this question, let us hang it up for six months or twelve months; there is no hurry about it; let us have the census taken and a redistribution afterwards; and then let us have an election, and let the people say what they think about this great question; and to whatever they decide the minority will submit as gracefully as possible. To put the arrangement in force for six months or twelve months, and then to go and ask the people how they like it is

not fair to the people of this country. I submit once more that the fair and proper thing in these circumstances is to give to the people of Canada, the whole people of Canada—the farmer, the artisan, the manufacturer, the labouring man and the merchant—an opportunity to express their opinion on this great question, and in that general consensus of opinion we are more likely to reach what is right and in the best interests of this country than we are by adopting the ipse dixit of the two men who went to Washington, or the opinion, biased as it is by partisanship, of the hon. members of this House.

On motion of Mr. M. Y. McLean (South Huron) committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fisher, House adjourned at 10.58 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 11, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUEBEC BRIDGE CONTRACT.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) if the contract for the Quebec bridge has been awarded and do the plans provide for a driveway and foot bridge? If not, why?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the contract has been awarded for the construction of the superstructure of the bridge at Cap Rouge, west of Quebec. It does not provide for roadways. The decision to construct only a railway bridge was not arrived at without very serious consideration. In a way it would have been more satisfactory to the government and those connected with the work, as well as the residents of Quebec and vicinity, had the original idea been carried out. The engineers, while expressing the view that a bridge on the design including roadways, tramways, as well as railways, could have been successfully constructed and erected, were still of the opinion that serious difficulties could be obviated in the carrying out of this gigantic enterprise if the design on which the contract has been let were adopted. Add to this the great difference in cost, and it will appear evident, I hope to every thoughtful man, that the wiser course was pursued. The Board of Engineers brought to the attention of the government the fact that over several large bridges electric lines use the same tracks as the steam railways, and they expressed the belief that this could be done on the Quebec bridge. Here are the figures:

With roadways, &c.—	
Weight of metal..	132,200,000 lbs.
(This does not include weight of material used in making of roadways.)	
For railway bridge only.	95,900,000 lbs.
Difference in weight.. ..	36,300,000 lbs.
Cost as per estimated quantities—	
With roadways, &c..	$11,171,100 00
With road material..	75,000 00
Rails for tramways..	5,000 00
Approaches for roadway..	200,000 00
Total..	$11,451,100 00
Cost of design adopted for railway only, on estimated weight..	8,650,000 00
Difference in cost..	2,801,100 00
The government has suggested that the sum of $550,000 contributed by the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec for roadway purposes on this bridge, can be handed back to them and still there will be a saving of	$2,251,100 00

WRECK OF STEAMER IROQUOIS.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), if he has received any official report of the foundering of the steamship 'Iroquois' in the Gulf of Georgia?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, late last night I got a report from our agent that such a wreck had occurred. We immediately gave instructions to give all aid possible and at the same time to make a preliminary investigation.

Mr. HUGHES. Is that a government steamer?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

CUSTOMS DUTIES 1906-1910.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to mention a circumstance which was brought to the attention of the House yesterday by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who called attention to an unfortunate change in two columns of figures. In some way or other, incomprehensible to me, the children got badly mixed up and the resultant harmony is not exactly what I had expected. However, I was able to catch the revised edition before it left port and——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The result will appear.

Mr. FOSTER—it will be arranged.

COAL STRIKES IN THE WEST.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to inquire of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King), if there is any change in the situation regarding the strike in the Crowsnest Pass, in British Columbia?

Mr. KING. I may say in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Herron), that I received this morning, from the Western Coal Operator's Association, a wire which concludes by saying that:

Should the miners make application for a board, we would welcome the same. Failing their doing so, we court the fullest investigation in any board you may appoint.

I received from the secretary of District Union No. 18 of the miners the following wire:

Will you withhold appointing Royal Commission for a few days, have been endeavouring to arrange board meeting, but owing to the members being scattered in district it has been impossible.

Expect to be in session on or before Thursday morning, will then be able to give a decided answer to your communication handed to me on Saturday by Mr. McNiven. Kindly wire reply.

(Sgd.) A. J. CARTER.

It seems to me, in view of the wire which Mr. Carter sent that he was endeavouring to get the miners together to consider the whole matter, that the industrial peace would be promoted by the delay which had been requested, and therefore I answered as follows:

Ottawa, April 11, 1911.

A. J. Carter,
Secretary District Union No. 18,
U. M. W. of A.,
Fernie, B.C.

Your wire April 10th received. At your request and in view of circumstances mentioned, government will withhold further action pending meeting of miner's board on or before Thursday.

(Sgd.) W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
Minister of Labour.

In view of the statement of the operators that they will be willing to have a board, I hope that the miners will also see their way clear to request a board on Thursday.

CORONATION CONTINGENT.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), when it is probable the names of the officers and men, as far as possible, who are to constitute the coronation contingent may be available. Are there any cadets to go? By cadets I mean cadets of the ordinary civil squads. Will any cadets of the Royal Military College be selected to go?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the list of officers will be ready to-morrow. and it will be published immediately, cadets are not invited. We were invited to send a contingent of about 700 of the active militia which, of course, would not include the cadets. I think twelve cadets, however, are going over to take part in rifle shooting. That is an entirely different thing. As to the men who have been selected, I think the names have been already published but if not I will see that they are.

Mr. HUGHES. Any of the Royal Military College?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), not to forget the request that I made to him the other day about the quantities of fish that were transhipped from the maritime provinces under the arrangement he has for paying part of the freight.

Mr. BRODEUR. I called the attention of my officers to it, and they are preparing the figures. It will be ready very soon.

WAYS AND MEANS—NEW POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House again go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, befor you leave the chair, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), to a question I placed on the order paper on the 16th March regarding a design for new postage stamps. On that date I asked the following question:

1. Is the government aware that the governments of Australia and South Africa have offered substantial prizes for the best designs for new postage stamps, emblematic of the present reign, for those portions of the empire?

2. What steps is this government taking to secure a set of postage stamps for Canada which will be characteristic of the country and of artistic merit?

3. Is it the intention of the government to offer prizes for the best designs in order to encourage Canadian artists? If not, who will prepare the designs?

4. Will an opportuuity be afforded to the members of the House to inspect whatever designs may be submitted to the Post Office Department, before the selection is finally made?

To which the hon. Postmaster General made the following reply:

We are not aware in the Post Office Department of what is being done in this matter by the governments of Australia and South Africa. What we have done is this: We have written to our High Commissioner in London, Lord Strathcona, and he is in communication with the home government in order to arrange for a postage stamp in Canada similar to the one which will be issued at the time of the coronation for the United Kingdom. We have not yet received the design, but as soon as received, I shall have no objection to laying it on the table.

Last Friday the Postmaster General stated that he had already received a design from the Imperial authorities, but it has not yet been laid upon the table of the House. It would appear to me that the government of Canada should encourage home talent and give Canadian artists a chance to compete. I quote the following from the London 'Times' of February

AUSTRALIA'S NEW STAMPS. DESIGNS INVITED FROM ARTISTS.

It was stated in the 'Times' of February 10, in an article on 'The Empire's new stamps,' that the federal government of Australia would probably offer a handsome prize for competitive designs of a series of Commonwealth stamps. The Australian High Commissioner in London has now received the terms of this offer, and is taking steps to bring it to the notice of the public, in the hope that it will be well responded to by artists. The conditions of the competition are set forth as follows by the Hon. Josiah Thomas, Postmaster General of the Commonwealth:

Skilled artists are invited to submit competitive designs for a uniform postage stamp for the Commonwealth.

The size of the stamp for which designs are invited will be one and one-eighth inch by seven-eighths inch oblong.

Designs must not exceed four times the measurement specified for the stamps and should be accompanied by photographic reductions to the sizes required for the stamps.

Two premiums, one of £100 and one of £50, will be paid for the designs which are adjudged by a board to be appointed for the purpose of adjudication on the designs submitted by competitors, to be first and second, respectively, in order of merit, provided such designs are deemed worthy of being awarded a premium.

In selecting the designs preference will be given to those which best lend themselves to engraving on the reduced scale.

The designs must contain features characteristic of Australia, and also the words 'Australia' and 'postage,' as well as the stamp value in Arabic figures or in both figures and letters.

The treatment of the designs should not be made too photographic or realistic, and it must be in accordance with the more formal designs to be found in the best postage stamps.

The premium designs will become the sole property of the Postmaster General.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

Designs will be received up to noon on May 31, 1911, and must be addressed to the Secretary, Postmaster General's Department, 51 Spring street, Melbourne. They must be endorsed, 'Designs for Commonwealth postage stamp,' and if sent by post must be registered and the postage thereon prepaid.

The designs should not be signed with the name of the designer, but should bear only a nom de plume or private mark for purposes of identity, and the accompanying letter containing the designer's name and address, as well as a copy of the nom de plume or private mark on the designs, should be inclosed in a separate sealed envelope, which will be opened after the designs have been adjudicated upon.

The Postmaster General does not bind himself to select any design and designs not selected will be returned.

Until the new Commonwealth stamps are issued, the stamps of the various states have been made interchangeable, as in South Africa, Messrs. Whitfield, King & Co., the stamp dealers at Ipswich, calling attention to this fact, write to the 'Times,' saying: By every mail we receive letters from one state prepaid with the stamps of another state. For example, the last mail brought us letters from Sydney, New South Wales, bearing stamps of Queensland, South Australia, West Australia, Tasmania and Victoria.

I believe that South Africa, as well as Australia, has offered to artists living in that colony prizes for designs. I think that Canada, as the first dominion of the empire should encourage home talent, and that our Postmaster General should see that his department will offer prizes, as the other colonies have done. There is an interesting article in the London 'Times,' of February 10, 1911, on 'the empire's new stamps,' which, however, is quite long, and I shall not detain the House by reading it. I am sure the House will be glad to have the assurance of the Postmaster General that he will offer prizes to Canadian competitors.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have practically nothing to add to my answer to this question put by my hon. friend (Mr. White) on the Order Paper on the 16th of March last. On my way home from England last winter, I was made aware that Canada should accept, so far as possible, the design prepared by the home authorities for the coronation stamp. We do not intend to issue a series of stamps, as was done on the occasion of the Quebec tercentenary. The postal union is opposed to frequent changes in the designs of stamps in the different countries, and the special stamp for the coronation will represent as faithfully as possible features of our new king. The Post Office Department has agreed, if it meets with approval, to accept the design prepared by the home authorities. A few days ago I received that design, but the department has not yet passed judgment

on it. Even if we did not accept the design I do not think we should have to offer prizes to secure one, because we may rest assured that the American Bank Note Company at Ottawa, with which the government has a contract, is quite able to cope with the situation. We have the testimony of the highest authorities in the world to the efficiency and the ability of the designers of the American Bank Note Company. When the Quebec tercentenary stamps were issued a few years ago, I had the great honour of presenting a complete collection of those stamps to one who is known as one of the highest authorities in the world, no less a person than His Majesty the King. His Majesty is known as a great philatelist, and he declared that the collection was one of the most beautiful he had ever seen. If it happened that we could not accept the design sent to us by the home authorities, and had to provide one for ourselves, I think we can give the contract to the American Bank Note Company feeling confident that they will be able to cope with it successfully.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The stamp I refer to is not the coronation stamp, but a stamp emblematic of the reign of our present King.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is mistaken there. The stamp to be issued by Great Britain and by Canada is a stamp which will represent the head and the features of His Majesty, and we must of course produce a representation which will give as much satisfaction as possible, first to the King, and then to his subjects.

Mr. SPROULE. While on this subject of stamps, might I ask the Postmaster General whether the Quebec Tercentenary stamps can be used on mailable matter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they purchasable in lesser quantities than a full set?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. They have been purchased in large quantities by collectors, but I think there are some still on sale in the various post offices.

Mr. SPROULE. I made inquiries at the Ottawa post office, and they refused to sell less than a full set.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know that there are half sets, but if my hon. friend wishes to get a stamp of any denomination detached from the set, he is entitled under the rules of the department to get it.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN (South Huron). Mr. Chairman, important and interesting as this question which is now before the committeee is, I think I would not have ventured to intrude any remarks on the House at this advanced stage of the discussion were it not for the fact that the constituency which I have the honour to represent is almost exclusively an agricultural constituency. Indeed, my good friend from North Bruce (Mr. Tolmie), who is quite conversant with my constituency, who has travelled over pretty nearly the whole of Canada, and who always speaks the truth, has frequently said to me: 'South Huron is the best agricultural constituency in Canada.' Perhaps my native modesty would not permit me to go quite that far; but I will say this, that for fertility of soil, for careful, intelligent and scientific cultivation, for neat, comfortable and commodious homesteads, it would not easily be surpassed, Under these circumstances, Sir, I feel that I would not be doing my duty did I not voice what I believe to be the opinions and views of a very large majority of my constituents by placing myself on record as being in favour of a proposition which will so immensely advance the agricultural interest of this country; and, Sir, we know that, the agricultural interest, being the basic interest, we cannot benefit that interest without also benefiting all other interests which are more or less dependent upon it.

Now, I listened very attentively last night to the address delivered by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers), and it may be due perhaps to my obtuseness, but I failed to recognize one single new argument or one single new sentiment in that address. In fact, he spoke all around the subject, and on all manner of subjects except the one which was before the committee; and the thought passed through my mind, surely he must have a weak case when so able a man and so practised a speaker could make so little of it. But, Sir, there was one matter which my hon. friend alluded to, and to which I think I shall have to refer also He spoke of the preferential tariff towards Great Britain; and. lest I should not correctly interpret the hon. gentleman, I will read his remarks on that subject. This is what he said:

So that these hon. gentlemen did not intend to give Great Britain any preference whatever when they passed the Act in 1897. They opened out the offer to the whole world, but a year afterwards, when they dis-

covered that they had blundered, they were obliged to repeal that Act of 1897 and confine it to British possessions. So I hope our hon. friends will never again refer to the British preference as a manifestation of their loyalty. They are not entitled to any credit whatever for it, because they did not intend to confer any favour on Great Britain.

Now, I will read to the House an extract from the speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, delivered when he was introducing the resolutions on that subject, and leave the House to judge of the accuracy of my hon. friend's statement. On April 22, 1897, in the Budget speech, the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), when introducing these resolutions, concluded with these words:

'But why should we wait for England to take action? England has dealt generously with us in the past. England has given us a larger degree of liberty perhaps than is possessed by any other country on the face of the earth. She has given us liberty to tax her wares even when she admits our goods free, and we have taxed them to an enormous degree. Why should we wait for England to do more Somebody must make a move in this matter, and we propose that Canada shall lead the way. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that our project of freer trade with England is a delusive one.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER. Hear hear.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Is it delusive. When I place these resolutions on the table of this House tonight, they go into effect, and I speak with pride, in the name of the liberal party, and the hon. gentlemen around me will share that pride, when I say that to-morrow morning, at every custom house in Canada from ocean to ocean, the doors will open on terms of freer trade with the mother country. I cannot doubt that this tariff will commend itself to this house and country, and when this policy shall have passed its various stages, when it shall have passed into law, then the members of the parliament of Canada may feel that, in this glorious year of Jubilee, they have made a noble contribution to that splendid parliamentary record which Tennyson had in his mind when he pictured the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria:

And statesmen at her council met,
Who knew the seasons when to take
Occasion by the hand; and make
The bounds of freedom wider yet.

These words of the Finance Minister demonstrate clearly and conclusively the idea which was in the mind of the government and the Liberal party in granting this preference to Great Britain; and in my opinion the statement I have just read fully justifies every pretension made by the Liberal party regarding the advantages which we have given to Great Britain, and the reasons which induced us to give them.

I do not intend to go at any length into figures of statistics, nor do I propose to quote many extracts. I purpose rather simply laying down certain principles and from these endeavour to prove to this House and country the benefit which this proposed agreement will be to Canada. But before doing so, I desire to congratulate the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) on the great and grand work they did for Canada while in Washington. When these negotiations were first spoken of, the doubt was very generally expressed throughout the Conservative press and also, I think, by opposition members in this House that our Canadian commissioners would not be able to cope with the keen, shrewd, sharpwitted, farseeing, experienced American politicians, that our commissioners would be sure to get the worst of the deal, and that our better plan would be to leave the matter in abeyance, turn our backs on any proposition from the United States, and not deal with them at all. Well, I think we can say that the results have shown that our Canadian commissioners have not only been able to hold their own with the American negotiators but have got the best of the bargain all along the line. Certainly it is a fact which cannot be gainsaid that the Americans have made the larger and by far the greater number of concessions. But it is not a matter of very great importance whether the United States or Canada has got the best of the bargain. The important question for us to consider is whether this proposition will be beneficial to Canada. If we can convince ourselves that it will, we should be only too glad if it will also benefit our neighbours. I remember also that when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke on this subject, he thought it worth his while to go a good piece out of his way and embellish his speech by very derogatory remarks concerning our commissioners. Now, this was not the first commission that went to Washington for the purpose of endeavouring to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Preceding Conservative governments sent a good many such delegations to Washington for a similar purpose. Some of the ablest men in the Conservative party went to Washington on a similar errand. At one time even Sir John Macdonald, himself, went there to endeavour to obtain a treaty of reciprocity with the United States. Sir Leonard Tilley also went to Washington for that purpose, and Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John Rose, and if I remember right so also did the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). All the delegations, composed of these able men, possibly some of the ablest men we ever had on the Conservative side, went to Washington and returned empty-handed as they went. But the commissioners appointed by this gov-

ernment returned with an agreement, signed and sealed, which, if ratified by the parliaments interested, will confer inestimable benefits on this country for a great many generations to come. But here is another striking contrast between the two parties. On past occasions when Conservative governments sent their emissaries to Washington, their emissaries went with their hats in their hands to beg of the United States to give them a reciprocity treaty. Since then, however, circumstances have changed. The United States, in the present instance, took the initiative, and sent their emissaries to Ottawa to ask this government to negotiate a treaty. You will see, therefore, that there is a vast difference between the two positions, and I want to ask the attention of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) to that fact. I would ask him where is the club which he last night told us was held by President Taft over our commissioners? It seems to me that all the circumstances indicate that the club was on the other side.

My hon. friend (Mr. Crothers), in his peroration, shed a great profusion of crocodile tears because this question has been brought into the realm of politics. But who brought it into the political arena? Why the very first speech delivered in this House on this subject by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) made of it a political issue. It was the ablest deliverance I have ever listened to in this House from that hon. gentleman. But I also venture to say that my hon. friend has regretted many times since bringing this matter into the realm of politics, because I believe that, had he left it an open question, that course would have saved him many uneasy moments, and would have prevented many of the dissensions that have occurred in his own party within the past few weeks.

Notwithstanding that we believe that this proposition will be inestimably beneficial to this country, none of us are foolish enough to claim that it is absolutely perfect. So far as I am personally concerned, I would have been better pleased had the arrangement gone a good deal further. There are many, I dare say, who would wish that certain articles which are not on the free list had been added to the free list under this arrangement. As an example, it would have been very pleasing to the people of this province if coal had been made free; and I think possibly this may be due to this province, in consideration of the large amount that its people contribute to the revenue, that that article should have been placed on the free list. I am sure the people of Ontario would have been glad if our American friends had seen their way to grant us that, and some other concessions. But it is an old saying that it takes two to make a bargain, and, on that principle, any bargain that is made must of necessity be, to a certain extent, a compromise. We must give and take, even when we seek to get as much as we possibly can, and under this proposition we get a very considerable deal. We must remember also that it is very difficult to arrange a fiscal policy for a country like this which will be satisfactory to all sections. Canada is a large country, and of widely diversified interests, and a policy that may be quite satisfactory to one section would not suit so well another section. In a case of this kind the best we can possibly expect is a policy that will be moderately satisfactory to all parties. And I think I am justified in saying that the proposition now before the committee is moderately satisfactory to all parties. It is especially difficult to build up a protective tariff—and in saying that I do not forget that all tariffs are more or less protective—the great reason for this difficulty being that in building up a protective tariff we are endeavouring to dam the natural channels of trade, and divert trade into channels artificially which it would not otherwise seek. And the individual or party who will enter into a conflict with nature will find a mighty hard wall to butt against. That is one of the great reasons why the old National Policy failed so lamentably to accomplish the object of its promoters. And it is because the proposition now before the House, and the country conforms more closely to natural conditions than any other policy we have had in this country for a great many years that leads me to believe that it will be so immensely beneficial to the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a little departure, and in doing so, I speak entirely on my own responsibility. To use a sporting phrase, I wish to cast a ball off my own bat. I know from expressions used by my hon. friend the Finance Minister that he and the members of the cabinet are not prepared to follow as far as I would like to lead, and also that many of my hon. friends on this side would not agree with the sentiments and ideas I am about to express. However, I believe those ideas to be in the best interests of the country, and therefore that it is my duty to give them utterance. I believe that the best fiscal policy for this country is absolute free trade, the public revenue to be collected by the simplest, and most inexpensive method of direct taxation that can possibly be devised. Under such a policy many leaks which now exist, and which will always exist under the present policy, no matter what government, or party may be in power, would be stopped. But I am also free to say that I do not think, at the present time, such a policy is practicable. There is a peculiar feature in human nature, which induces most peo-

ple to prefer to pay a dollar and a half through the circuitous methods of the custom house to paying a dollar directly into the public treasury, or to the tax collector. So, even were the Finance Minister willing to make so revolutionary a change as I have suggested, I do not think that the people would support him in it. So that the policy, however correct it may be, is not practicable at the present time, and it is not necessary for me to discuss it further. But what I believe is practicable, and what I believe the country would approve of is this: That Canada should make as free, open and full fiscal arrangements with every other country as that country will make with her. If, for example, the United States would agree to reduce their tariff to a ten or twenty per cent basis, then, I say, Canada should reduce her tariff to the same basis. If the United States would even go further and agree to lay down their tariff wall entirely against Canada, then, I say, Canada should lay down her tariff wall against the United States. And I am going to go a step further than that. And the proposition I am about to make, I think, should receive the endorsation of some of our friends opposite, for these gentlemen are never weary of talking about their loyalty to the mother land, and to the old flag, in fact, they claim a monopoly of loyalty in this country. A few weeks ago we had a beautiful exhibition in this House of flag-waving.

If I remember rightly, my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) and my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) were leaders in this very pretty by-play, and I am sure that they, at any rate, if they are sincere, will endorse the proposition I am about to make. It has been stated by several members on this side of the House that they would feel better pleased if the government would increase the British preference to 40 or 50 per cent. Now, Sir, I am prepared to go a long step further than that. I say that Great Britain admits our products into her market free, and that we should admit her products into our market free. I am afraid that my hon. friends opposite do not approve of that, showing that their loyalty does not extend very much beyond their pockets. Now it may be said, and it no doubt will be said, that a policy of this kind would injure or ruin our manufacturing industries. Sir, I would be sorry indeed to do anything, or to say anything, or to advocate anything that would injure our manufacturing interests, because I believe that they are of paramount importance to this country. But I do not believe that any such policy as I have indicated would injure our manufacturing interests. I believe that our manufacturing interests require a fair field but no favours. Give them this fair field, and I believe that they have the experience, they have the ability, they have the ingenuity, and they have the capital to compete with the manufacturers of any other country in the world, and they are now on the eve of getting the cheapest power of any country in the world. It is not wet nursing and spoon feeding, by protection, that our manufacturers require. What our manufacturers require is an enlarged market, and that market as near to the base of operations as possible. Such a policy as I have indicated would give them this enlarged market, it would give them that market at their very doors, right at the base of production, and would save to the producer and to the consumer hundreds of thousands of dollars annually that now go into the coffers of the railways and other transportation companies. It would do more than that, it would give to the people of this country a cheap market, it would make this country a cheap country to live in, it would give us cheap raw material, and it would benefit every interest in the country except perhaps the plutocratic interest. It goes without saying that it would immensely benefit the farmers.

Now I remember that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), in his somewhat memorable speech in this House a few days ago, stated that the farmers of this country were enjoying more than their proper share of prosperity, and he gave a considerable array of statistics to buttress his argument. Well, that shows how statistics can be used for almost any purpose, if you only use them in the right way. I think that in this, as in many other instances, observation and knowledge are much more reliable than any statistics that can be given. Now I am a considerably older Canadian than the hon. member for Brandon, and I have never known, nor have I ever heard of, a farmer who became a millionaire from the proceeds of his farm; but I have known a good many manufacturers, a few merchants, and perhaps one or two politicians who commenced life in a very humble way thirty years ago—and I am not saying this to their discredit—who are now ranked as millionaires. This shows that the good things of this life are not evenly distributed under existing conditions. I can tell my hon. friend from Brandon, and all who think as he does, that the farmers of this country are waking up to their condition, they are becoming alive to their importance, they are becoming alive to the powers they possess, and they have decided that they will no longer be hewers of wood and drawers of water to the monopolistic and capitalistic interests of this country. I can tell my hon. friend, moreover, that when they put their hand to the plough they will not look back, until they have finished their work, and when they have finished their work,

there may be fewer millionaires, but the wealth of this countrty will be more equally and equitably distributed among the people.

Now let me go back to the main question which is before the House, and let us inquire what this proposed arrangement will do for the benefit of this country. In the first place, it will give us a free and open market to ninety millions of people, a people who are the largest users and the most liberal spenders per head of any people on the face of the earth. At the present time, and under existing tariff laws, the tariff of the United States is on an average about fifty per cent higher than the Canadian tariff. You will readily recognize that this is a tremendous handicap, a tremendous bar to business between the two countries; and yet notwithstanding this handicap and notwithstanding this bar, Canada does more business with the United States than with any other single country in the world. Now why does Canada do business with the United States? Surely not out of love of the people, or out of respect for their institutions; but because, by doing business with the United States, they can make more money than by doing business with other people. At the same time, while such an arrangement would place us in this enviable position, it would not shut us off from any of the markets which we already possess. We would still be at liberty to deal in our own local markets, we would still be at liberty to deal in the markets of Great Britain, if we found it to be our advantage to do so. If at any time our farmers or our shippers found that it would be more advantageous to sell an animal or an article in the United States, if they could get a better price for it, and they would be under no disadvantage in availing themselves of that market if they found it more profitable to trade there. If they found that they could get a better price for a horse, or a lamb, or any other article they might have to sell, at home or in Great Britain, these markets would still be open to them as they are at the present time.

I remember that Sir John Macdonald, when he was advocating reciprocity, and when he was pleading with our neighbours in the United States to grant reciprocity to Canada, used to say that it would give us two strings to our bow instead of one. At that time, under the Conservative regime, our local home market did not amount to very much. Of late years, under the present government, under the benign influence of the Liberal party, the home market has become of enormous importance to us, consuming the larger proportion of our product, and consequently we have now two markets that are open to us, but by this arrangement we would have three, giving us three strings to our bow, following up Sir John Macdonald's analogy, instead of two as we now have. I ask any sensible, reasonable, rational man if an arrangement of this kind would not be eminently beneficial to every interest in this country and more particularly to the farming interest?

On the products which will be made free under this agreement there is paid in duties annually, in round figures, $2,000,000. Every cent of that large amount of money goes into the American treasury. If we remove those duties the greater portion of that money will remain in the pockets of the Canadian producers. We have thus had an additional inducement and an additional advantage under this agreement. Hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted voluminous statistics to prove that the American markets are very much lower than the Canadian markets, and that under this arrangement American products would come into this country and swamp the products of Canada. As I said before statistics are not always reliable. They can be made to prove almost anything that the person using them desires to prove. I am not prepared to say that the prices of these products in the United States are always and at all times higher than they are in Canada. Sometimes they are higher, sometimes they are lower, but the only way in which our friends opposite can maintain their contention of the danger which threatens our own products by reason of competition from American products is to pick out certain dates when certain products are lower in the United States than they are in our own markets. That is not a fair way of making a comparison. The only fair comparison that possibly can be made is to take the market quotations on both sides of the line for each day for a given period, add all up and strike an average of the whole. I know that if our friends opposite will adopt that method, they will find that there is a considerable percentage in favour of the prices in the United States as compared with the prices in Canada. But, we do not need to go into the statistics. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance the other day said that we did not need to quote statistics to prove anything which we know, of which we are cognizant which our everyday experience teaches us. We know that the prices of lambs, for instance, are invariably higher in Buffalo than in Toronto, and we do not need to hunt up statistics for the purpose of proving that fact. We also know that the markets of New York and Boston are the best that we have for the best class of heavy draught horses that we produce in Canada. We know that, our farmers know that, our dealers know that; it is not necessary to resort to statistics in

order to prove a proposition of that kind. In years gone by the markets of Great Britain—London, Liverpool, and Glasgow—were the principal markets for our horses. Of late years, however, the local demand has been very heavy, and very few horses have been shipped to Liverpool or the old country. Our own Northwest has consumed a number of them but not so many of the most valuable and best class of heavy horses, because these are used most largely in large centres of population. They are used in Winnipeg, Brandon, Calgary and other places like that, but not so much in country districts. This arrangement would give us an open market in the large cities of the United States for the very best quality of horses we have. We must remember that the western provinces, which have for several years furnished us a market for a large number of horses, are very rapidly supplying their own demand. Large breeding farms are being established throughout many sections of the west, in which they raise the very class of horses that they need in that country, and in a short time that market, like the British market, will perhaps not be available to us. It therefore behooves us to look ahead and search for markets which will be beneficial to us. This arrangement would provide for us, I believe, a splendid and an almost inexhaustible market for the very best class of heavy draught horses as well as the very best class of gentlemen's driving and saddle horses that we can produce.

I notice that of the articles which would be made free by this arrangement we export to the United States annually, in round numbers, nearly $6,000,000 worth. We import from that country of these articles very little over $1,000,000 worth. So, you will see that the competition of American products with Canadian products amounts to very little or nothing at all worthy of consideration. But beyond and above all that, we know that by reason of the superior quality of the products of Canada, at the great shows and fairs in the United States where Canadian bred animals and Canadian products have come into competition with those of the United States, Canada has beaten all along the line the best the United States can produce. In horses, in cattle, in sheep, in swine, in butter, in cheese, and in other products of the farm Canada has beaten the choicest products of the United States at show after show held on the American side. Even so late as the great Chicago show held in January last the Canadian horses, the Canadian sheep, the Canadian cattle, the Canadian swine, there exhibited beat all hollow the best the United States could produce. And, if we can do that on their own soil why in the name of all that is sacred need we fear competition from them right here at home. Sir, that cry is simply a bugaboo raised by the opposition, and it has no foundation in fact or reason. Another fear expressed by our opposition friends is that the products of certain favoured nations will successfully compete with the products of Canada and will swamp the Canadian farmers right in their own home market. Well, I have no fear. In the first place I think considerable doubt exists as to whether these favoured nations will be allowed to participate in these benefits.

Mr. BLAIN. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). Be that as it may——

Mr. HENDERSON. Don't spoil your speech by putting that in.

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). I think that is perhaps the best part of it. Be that as it may, we find that the products made free by this treaty, from the British colonies and from the favoured nations, not including Great Britain and the United States, amount to a little over half a million dollars worth out of a total importation from these countries of nearly $14,000,000 worth. Where does the competition come in respect to a comparison of that kind, and more particularly when we consider that our total imports amount to over $475,000,000. But, Sir, we have competed for years with the products of these countries, and we have more than held our own with them in the British market. And, if we could compete with them in the British market why should we not be able to comepte with them in our home market to which they have to send their perishable products a much further distance and under unfavourable transportation conditions. Why should we be afraid of their competition in our own home markets where we can place our products in the best and freshest and most saleable condition. Why, Sir, to my mind one of the great advantages of this proposal is that it will give us a market right at our doors to which we can send our perishable products in a fresh and sweet and wholesome condition. and receive for them the very highest prices. So far as competition from these favoured nations is concerned, it cannot amount to anything. It is also objected, by the opposition, that this arrangement will ruin the fruit industry in Ontario and in British Columbia, and of course we all admit that the fruit industry in Canada is a growing and important one. I do not know anything about the fruit conditions in British Columbia, but I do know that the Conservative government and the Conservative legislature of that province not very long ago passed a resolution condemning this agreement on the ground

that it would be injurious to the province, and I have also noticed that this same British Columbia government passed an order in council only a few days ago doubling the price of their Crown lands, thus showing that the fears of that government as to the injury which this agreement would inflict on the province are not so very sincere after all. I think I do know something about the fruit conditions in Ontario. It is universally admitted that this agreement will be advantageous to the apple growing industry, and the apple product of this country represents a value of 70 per cent of our entire fruit crop. It is, therefore, self evident that the agreement must be exceedingly advantageous to the Canadian fruit industry as a whole. But, let us consider the industry in small fruits which we are told by some will be ruined by this agreement, on the ground that the Canadian growers of these fruits cannot compete with the Americans. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, did you ever know of an instance where the Canadian people came into competition with people of any other country in the world in any pursuit of life whatsoever, that the Canadians did not at least hold their own. That is one statement which I know will not be contradicted, and it is a statement which I make with the greatest pride being myself a native-born Canadian. Not only that, but we all know that owing to climatic differences the American fruit is ripe for the market before our fruit is in season, and when the Canadian fruit is fit for the table the American fruit has practically disappeared from the market. Even if this were not so, the fruits grown in Canada are of such a superior quality that no sensible man, or woman either, would ever think of purchasing American fruits in preference to Canadian fruits. My point is, that because of the reason which I have indicated American fruits will not come into competition with Canadian fruits at the same time on the market, and that Canadian fruit will not only have the benefit of the home market but also of the immense markets provided by the populous centres of the United States. Therefore, instead of this trade arrangement injuring the fruit industry of Canada it must of necessity be of inestimable benefit to it. I noticed that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and I think also the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Harris), accused the Liberal government and the Liberal party of departing from their policy and their party position. They said that the Liberal party had years ago abandoned reciprocity and had adopted protection. Now, Sir, as a Liberal I deny most emphatically that statement, and I say with all due reverence, God forbid that the great Liberal party of Canada should ever adopt such a fallacy as protection. These hon. gentlemen must have forgotten that at the last Liberal convention held in Canada a resolution was unanimously adopted making reciprocity with the United States a leading plank in the Liberal platform. Up to this minute that resolution still stands as a plank in the platform of the Liberal party, and if my hon. friends from Brandon and Brant were not content to remain under that policy, they should have moved for the removal of that plank from the Liberal platform.

It is also said, in opposition to this proposed agreement, that the government, before adopting it, should consult the people either by a plebiscite or by a general election. I entirely disagree with that proposition. Any such proposition is antagonistic to the genius of our representative institutions. Last session, it will be remembered, we had a very important question before this House, and hon. gentlemen opposite then took up weeks of the time of the House in arguing that we should not adopt the proposal then before us until we appealed to the people. This session they put forward the same argument. Next session in all probability there will be another important question before this parliament for consideration, perhaps equal in importance to either of these questions, and what would the natural result be? The natural result would be that there would be an appeal to the people, a general election, in every year or perhaps twice a year, disorganizing trade, creating dissension, discontent and excitement in the country, and doing a great deal more injury to the country possibly than would be compensated for by any of the benefits we might receive.

I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite, what are we sent here for by the people? Are we not sent here to transact the business of the people? Are we not sent here to find out what the views of our people are on these important subjects and to crystallize those views into legislation? If we do not do that, we fail in our duty. I have no hesitation in saying that if a vote were taken in my constituency next week on this reciprocity agreement, dissociated entirely from political considerations, 80 per cent of the people would vote for it. I believe that if a vote were taken throughout Canada on this question dissociated from political consideration, a very large majority of the people would vote yea. But, Sir, it has been stated, and I have no doubt it is the case, that we shall have in the natural course of events to appeal to the people possibly within the next eighteen months, and then, if we have not correctly interpreted the wishes and views of our people on this question, they will have an opportunity of turning this government out

of power and bringing into power the hon. leader of the opposition and his friends; and two days after they have been installed in power they can repeal this agreement or any part of it they choose. There is the test, so far as it is necessary to exemplify it, in respect of the fallacy of the doctrine that on all these questions we should appeal to the people before parliament takes action.

It is said again that we have no mandate from the people to make any such arrangement. Why, Mr. Chairman, this subject, to my certain knowledge, has been before the people of Canada for thirty-five years. To my certain knowledge, it has been discussed in the country, and more or less at every session of this parliament during that time; it has been discussed more or less at every general election during that time. Even at the last election my honoured leader discussed this question from almost every platform from which he spoke. In his own province——

Mr. LANCASTER. What do you mean by his own province?

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). The province of Quebec.

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought he represented the Dominion.

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). He does, but he belongs to the province of Quebec. He represents a constituency in that province. Speaking in the province of Quebec on the 18th of October, 1908, the right hon. gentleman is thus reported:

> Sir Wilfrid pointed out that the people of the constituency in which he spoke were close to the border, and pamphlets had been circulated amongst them blaming the Liberals for not enforcing the reciprocity plank of the 1893 platform. Sir Wilfrid proceeded: 'We had great prosperity under the old reciprocity treaty. We would like to renew it. We have not done so because our American friends were too hard to bargain with; they asked too hard terms, and we said: Good-bye, we shall make no more pilgrimages to Washington, and we have no reason to regret that.'

Now, mark these words:

> 'I would be ready at any time to make an arrangement with them on a reciprocal basis, but as leader of the government, I have made my course, and if we are to have any more treaties of reciprocity with our friends across the line the overtures must come from them and not from us.

I do not know where you could get a stronger statement in favour of reciprocity than that. The overtures have come from the other side. The country took my hon. friend at his word. The country returned him to power and gave him his mandate, and now, in this agreement, he is carying out that mandate. Yet forsooth hon. gentlemen opposite will say that we have no mandate from the people to enact this legislation.

Mr. LANCASTER. In what paper was that?

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). I do not recollect the name of the paper.

Mr. LANCASTER. Nor does any one else. No one ever heard of it. It was some hole and corner meeting which was never published.

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). My hon. friend does not read all the papers, and it is just possible that I read as many as he does. It is just possible that I have heard my hon. leader as often on the platform, and I can say that I never heard him on any platform where he did not give expression to similar sentiments. And I venture to say that if my hon. friend's prejudices would permit him to admit as much, he would admit it because he knows it to be true.

I have spoken at greater length than I intended, but there is one other matter to which I wish to refer and that is the loyalty cry. Surely that is the silliest, the most childish cry ever raised in this House or elsewhere. Our hon. friends opposite say that if we should be permitted to trade more freely with our neighbours to the south, that will endanger our national and imperial sentiment. One scarcely knows how to characterize a charge of that kind made against the people of this country; but if the United States desired to annex Canada by increasing the trade between the two countries, all they need do is lower or remove their tariff. But we must not forget that we cannot have annexation with the United States without the consent of our own people. Give us free access to the American market, give us the benefit of the United States market, and what earthly incentive would the people of Canada have to become annexed to that country. Surely no one will pretend that the institutions of the United States are perferable to ours? Surely no one will say that their laws are better administered. Why, we have in this country the best and the freest institutions of any country in the world. We have all the liberty under the British Crown that any country could desire. Then why in the name of all that is sacred should we desire to annex ourselves to this great republic? The idea is simply preposterous. It is an insult to the Canadian people to say that because we sell a horse or a cow or a pig across the border free of any incumbrance, therefore our loyalty is bound to be tarnished. So great and important a man as Sir Wm. Van Horne has said that he was sick and ashamed of this proposition. Sir Wm.

Van Horne is no doubt a very able man, but there are many men in Canada just as capable of coming to a correct decision on this question as he is. He, I believe, is a native American; he came to this country a poor man and is now very rich; he got his money in Canada; some of it he got from the Dominion Treasury, quite legitimately I have no doubt, but the whole of his money he made in Canada.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman name one dollar that Sir Wm. Van Horne ever got from the Dominion treasury?

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). Does my hon. friend forget the enormous sum taken from the Dominion treasury to construct the Canadian Pacific railway? Is not Sir Wm. Van Horne, a leading shareholder in that railway? Does he not profit by those millions which disturb the waking dreams of my hon. friend's colleague from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean)? And is it not due to the money taken from this Dominion treasury to a very large extent that the stock of the Canadian Pacific railway is now worth two and a half times its face value? But to revert to Sir Wm. Van Horne, what is he doing with the money he made in Canada? Is he endeavouring to develop the resources and interests of Canada? No, verily, he is constructing an immense railway on the Island of Cuba. That island is now under the tutelage and protection of the United States.

We have another patriot, Sir Edmund Walker. He is also sick and ashamed of this proposition. He headed a manifesto signed by a few disgruntled Liberals in Toronto protesting against this agreement. Sir Edmund Walker is at the head of one of the most powerful financial institutions in this country and he did not think it disloyal to assist Sir Wm. Van Horne with the resources of this financial institution in order to construct this railway system in Cuba. Not only that, but the institution over which Sir Edmund Walker presides has hundreds of agencies throughout the United States. He takes moneys from our farmers and artisans and distributes them throughout these agencies to the people of the United States to assist them in developing and marketing American products, and yet forsooth these are the gentlemen who have the audacity, I might say the indecency, to insinuate that the loyalty of the farmers of Canada will be tarnished if they are allowed to sell a horse or a pig or a lamb to the United States. Why I have no hesitation in saying that such cant and hypocrisy is well calculated to make any one sick and ashamed. It is calculated to make even a horse sick, if he could comprehend the situation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). We all remember that in years gone by a great many of our young men went from Canada to the United States. They went there in the formative period of their lives. They became associated with the people of the United States and accepted the institutions of that country, and many of them achieved positions of honour and trust and affluence in their new home. We also remember that when the South African war broke out, who were the first to offer their assistance to Canada to fight for the mother country? Was it not those Canadians who had gone from Canada and were located in New York, in Buffalo, in Detroit, in Chicago, and in other places? Notwithstanding their associations, and notwithstanding that they had all their interests in the American republic, notwithstanding that they had associated and traded and worked with the people of the United States, yet these noble men, Canadians, were willing to sacrifice all and to come to the assistance of their native country and the mother land. And, when such is the case, is it not absurd, is it not ridiculous, to say that the loyalty of the Canadian people will be endangered if they are allowed to trade liberally with our American friends? There never was a time in the history of our country when we did more business with the United States than we are doing to-day; and I venture to say that there never was a time in our history when national and imperial sentiments were more firmly imbedded in the hearts of the people of Canada. Never before were the people of Canada so strongly determined to build up on this American continent a great, powerful, populous and wealthy nation under British auspices than at the present time; and, Sir, my firm belief is that this proposition which is now before parliament will greatly, amazingly, help to achieve this great result.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Chairman, I rise to address the committee labouring under a very serious disability. For an hour and a half I have faced the most lugubrious-looking set of gentlemen it has ever been my lot to face, and have listened to one of the most lugubrious, anarchic, socialistic speeches it has ever been my misfortune to hear. The peroration of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean, Huron) comes with bad grace from the man who uttered these words only a year ago. At page 4419 of last year's 'Hansard' will be found credited to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean, Huron) who has just taken his seat, these words:

> But, Sir, the most silly contention I think I have ever heard made in this House is that she has protected our shores from invasion by foreign foes. Now, I ask when, in the

memory of living man, have our shores been even threatened by a foreign foe? The only occasion I remember is what was known as the Fenian raid, and that was not inspired by any dislike for Canada but by a dislike for Great Britain, because she denied to a certain portion of her subjects the rights and privileges which they thought, and which I think, they were justly entitled to.

I have no hesitation in saying that these words, to use a mild term, and one which, I think, is allowable, border very close on treason. The hon. gentleman spoke of Canadians in the United States coming to Canada to volunteer for service in South Africa. There were a lot of noble men, not only Canadians—very few Canadians living in the United States came to South Africa—but Americans who volunteered to go and fight for the British Crown. And they did so because they knew they were fighting in a just cause. But the only time when gentlemen in any numbers came back from the cities of the United States to Canada to do duty for Queen and country was on an occasion, the occasion of the Fenian raid. To their credit be it said, many Canadians in New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Buffalo, Detroit and other cities of the United States paid their own expenses and came back to Canada to fight against the gang of men who, this gentleman (Mr. McLean, Huron) said, were justified in invading Canada. It came with very bad grace also from the hon. member to refer to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) in the way he did. At page 1132 of 'Hansard' of 1897, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), speaking in answer to Sir Charles Tupper, who had pointed out that this preferential trade applied to all the nations, said:

Meantime, Sir, recognizing the difficulties, recognizing the possibilty that our judgment may be mistaken, and recognizing the obligations we may owe as part of the empire, we intend for the present to take the view that inasmuch as we offer these conditions to other nations, if they do not see fit to accept them, the responsibility rests upon them and not upon Canada.

Therefore, the hon. member for West Elgin was absolutely speaking by the book when he stated that these favoured nation clauses were not offered to Great Britain alone, but were offered to other nations as well. But, Sir, the question we are supposed to deal with on the present occasion is the discussion of reciprocity. A good deal has been said about reciprocity. But it is a misnomer, to my mind, in this case; the term to be used here is 'free trade in natural products,' and not 'reciprocity.' It is also my intention to point out and to endeavour to prove that the manner in which this Bill was brought down is objectionable in many ways. In the first place, it is not in accordance with the principle of responsible government, for responsible government is supposed to mean that when any great new measure is to be presented in the country, the people shall have an opportunity to decide upon that measure by their voice and vote at the polls before it becomes law. This is not reciprocity, for reciprocity in political science is the principle of securing under commercial treaties between nations mutual advantages to the same extent, that is, the admission mutually of certain goods—not the same goods—supposed to be practically equivalent to each other, duty free or at equal duties of importation. The man who is practically the Prime Minister of the United States to-day, occupying the honourable position of Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. Champ Clarke, said, (as will be seen at page 2624 of the Congressional Record) in answer to a question whether he would be willing to give reciprocal terms similar to these to other nations:

'Why, of course, wherever we can get the better of the bargain.'

Again, at page 2625, the same hon. gentleman says:

It is my judgment that we are getting the better of the proceeding in this treaty.

It is my judgment that we get the better of the proceedings in this treaty.

Further on he says:

The intelligent farmers of America know that the agricultural products of Canada are inconsiderable when compared with the agricultural products of the United States; to use a common phrase they do not constitute a drop in the bucket. They also know that wages are as high in Canada in many lines as in America and higher in labour pertaining to the production of lumber; so they know too much to be scared by the overworked cry of 'pauper labour.'

In a recent address at Holyoke, Mass., Governor Foss, of that state, said:

The United States have much to gain and nothing to lose by this reciprocity movement.

Therefore I take the position that this is not reciprocity, but is merely free trade in agricultural products. I desire to point out that it is not in the interest of Canada, it is not conducive to the best interests of the nation, to the upbuilding of manhood in Canada; and I desire also to point out that it is inimical to the best interests of Canada from a national point of view, as a part of the great British Empire. This government has treated the nation to a number of novelties in statesmanship. In 1903 those of us who had the honour of sitting in this House, will remember the day when the First Minister stood up and enunciated his proposal concerning a national transcontinental railway, and sitting

only three seats away was his Minister of Railways, who then for the first time heard those proposals enunciated; he was never consulted. In 1905—I regret the Minister of Finance is not present—we had another instance where the leader of the government stood up and proposed his autonomy Bills shackling the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta, without having consulted his Minister of Finance or his Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of the Interior was supposed to represent important interests in that country. And now, in the year 1910-11, we again find the government enunciating a revolutionary trade policy on the strength of the trip of two gentlemen to Washington, two very decent members of the Cabinet, but whom no one would charge with being experts in matters of this kind. And on an agreement that these two gentlemen made in Washington a Bill is brought down with the instruction that no one word is to be changed, not so much as the dot of an 'i' or the cross of a 't' is to be altered, but parliament is invited to swallow this document holus bolus. If this is responsible government, then I fail to understand the basis of responsible government. In 1903 the cry was: Cox can't wait; in 1905 the cry was Sbaretti can't wait; and in 1910-11 the cry is: Taft can't wait. It is noteworthy that both in 1903 and 1910-11 the storm centre of the two great movements, the National Transcontinental railway and this free trade in natural products, was at the same spot, the great city of Minneapolis, and the genius behind the whole matter was our good friend J. J. Hill, of the Great Northern Pacific railway. Our two ambassadors who went to Washington to negotiate should have had dinned into their ears before they went, that old proverb concerning the Dutch: 'In the making of treaties the fault of the Dutch is in giving too little and asking too much.' Some one should have notified these gentlemen that in the making of treaties the fault of the Yankees is in giving too little and in asking too much. If they had had this lesson before them, and they had chosen to avail themselves of it, the chances are that they would not have made this treaty. It is not many years since the people of this country, at the behest of this government, were given free trade in binder twine. I had the honour of predicting, in a campaign before that unfortunate legislation was enacted, that in case free trade in binder twine was enacted, the farmers of Canada would pay largely through their nostrils to the combines and trusts of that community in the United States, and from that hour to this, binder twine has never been so low as it was in the old days before it was made free. The Canadian farmer has been paying thousands and tens of thousands of dollars to the American trusts on binder twine, on fence wire, and on agricultural implements. The same thing with petroleum, for every petroleum industry in Canada is controlled by a gigantic trust in the United States, and the people of Canada never paid so high prices as they are paying to-day for petroleum, owing to these American trusts.

Now one of the greatest geniuses that ever graced a nation was George Washington. I propose to quote a few sentences from George Washington to show that this proposition is not in the best interests of Canada or of the United States. On page 3281 of the 'American Congressional Record' of this year is the farewell address of George Washington to the people of the United States of America, and I take the liberty of reading a few extracts to this House, because it is a document that will stand reading many times:

> The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave.
>
> It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest.

Proceeding, he says:

> Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur . . . .So, likewise a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favourite nation, facilitating the allusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favourite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favourite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearance of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference of public opinion or a laudable zeal for public good the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption or infatuation.

I hope these words will sink deep into the mind of the Minister of Customs.

> As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practise the arts of seduction, to

mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils. Such an attachment of a small or weak towards a great or powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

In other words, this arrangement condemns Canada to be the satellite of the United States of America. I have changed 'Republican' government to 'free' government. These words apply specifically to the present situation. Canada, under this arrangement, as George Washington, with prophetic vision, pointed out, will be the slave of the United States the moment this law is enacted.

And it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens—who devote themselves to the favoured nation—facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearance of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference to public opoinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base of foolish compliances of ambition, corruption or infatuation.

I would not like to charge that this had anything to do with inspiring this action, but the position is there, and this statement can readily be applied to it. The Hon. Mr. Borland, at page 2857 of 'Congressional Record,' speaking upon this matter, says:

It is apparent that the principle of reciprocity and the principle of the maximum and minimum tariff are totally irreconcilable. Under the maximum and minimum tariff plan we must demand of a foreign nation the most favourable terms that it gives to any commercial nation or we must enforce the penalty of the maximum tariff so high as to cause a total cessation of all trade intercourse.

I would refer briefly to the spirit that has been shown by the United States throughout her entire history in dealing with the Dominion of Canada. In 1864-5 they abrogated the treaty which had been enacted in 1854. They knew that during the period of treaty, especially during the later years of it, when the American civil war was on, and times were good in Canada, we were selling everything that we had to sell to the United States, and getting for it two or three prices. The Americans were angry because Great Britain, in order to get cotton to keep the mills in Lancashire going, had encouraged the blockade runners to carry arms and ammunition into the southern states, and supply themselves with cotton to put bread and butter in the mouths of the workingmen at home. There was also a little friction over the Trent affair. The Americans saw that Canada for six months in the year had to ship her goods through United States ports because we had no Intercolonial railway built, and our own waterways were not available except in the summer season. They saw that the provinces were scattered, and not combined into one harmonious whole as they now are. They saw that the great plains of the northwest were then barren prairies. British Columbia was practically unknown and traded only around by Panama or Cape Horn with the east. They saw all this, and they decided that this was their time to force Canada into annexation with the United States. But, Sir, they forgot the kindnesses of Canada to them. They forgot that 100,000 Canadians, 58,000 from Ontario alone, had fought in the war, and had helped to preserve the old Stars and Stripes floating over that nation. They forgot the services that Canada rendered to them at that time when men went across the border to fight in order to liberate the slaves. That was the cry throughout the country. I well remember as a little boy, men leaving Ontario to cross the border to fight to liberate the down-trodden slaves. Then, the United States displayed the spirit of coercion. The poet, Kernahan—the Khan—very aptly describes Uncle Sam's wooing of Miss Canada at that time in this way:

Supposin' I undertook to make you?
I'm kinder 'customed to makin' free;
Supposin' I undertook to take you?
'I'd scratch your eyes out, sir,' said she.

On that occasion the answer of Canada to the United States was the confederation of 1867. Following the exclusion policy pursued by the United States from 1867 onward, when we allowed their goods to come into this country at nominal rates, and they refused to allow ours into their country except at exorbitant rates, came the great National Policy of Sir John Macdonald in 1878 and 1879. The country was carried in 1878, and Sir John Macdonald carried out every plank in his platform to the letter and enacted the National Policy in 1879. Then, Sir, industries were planted—so to speak, orchard trees were planted all over the Dominion of Canada. Most of these trees were planted in good soil, they were trees bearing the right kind of fruit, and they took root and thrived despite the attempts of hon. gentlemen opposite to pour the bitter waters of non-confidence on their roots. These hon. gentlemen attacked them with the weapons of non-confidence and hypocricy, they barked the roots, they broke off the branches, they nipped off the buds of the splendid trees that were planted, and which were rapidly growing up in the form of flourishing industries. They did their best to destroy these industries, but they failed. Never in the history of any land have industries prospered as have those in the Dominion of Canada. These gentleman knew right well that the keynote of human life, business life, political life, national life, is confidence. They knew that, and from the right hon. the First Minister down through every man of them to

the last backbencher they passed up and down through the country, and endeavoured to create in the minds, not only of their own friends, but in the minds of the business men of Canada, the idea that the moment they got into power they would attack these industries, they would root them up, lop them off, stem and branches, and expose our people again to the tender mercies of the United States. But, in spite of that these industries prospered. Then they played the game that they are trying to play to-day. Point in the entire history of the Liberal party to one instance where they have ever appealed to the higher or nobler instincts of manhood. Can the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) point to one plank in the platform of the Liberal party, that they ever proposed in opposition, or carried out in practice with regard to which they have risen to an appeal to the higher instincts of manhood? It has all been the almighty dollar; they cannot rise above the basswood ham, and the wooden nutmeg. In 1887 we find this gentleman coming to us with these basswood hams, and wooden nutmegs, we find Uncle Sam coming to court Miss Canada, and we can hear him saying:

'Twas me invented the basswood ham,
With wooden nutmegs I made my pile;
You can't do better than Uncle Sam
In this here world—well I should smile!
In course, I've got considerable gall,
She drew herself up with dignity,
'Dare to come over the garden wall
And I'll loosen the bull dog, sir,' said she.

After a bitter fight these hon. gentlemen dropped their commercial union, they dropped their unrestricted reciprocity, they dropped their continental free trade, they dropped their free trade as they have it in England, they got into power, and they dare not touch protection.

In other words, the mandate of the people of Canada given to them both publicly and behind the scenes in that campaign of 1896—when they obtained power not through their own virtues or the strength of their policy, but through the dissensions and the fool policy of the Liberal-Conservative party—was in respect to protection:

Woodman (Liberal party) spare the tree,
Touch not a single bough,
In youth it sheltered me
And I'll protect it now.

And up to the present hour they have not dared to lay a finger on it and this reciprocity agreement is the first material threat they have made against it. I happen to have amongst my archives a lot of very interesting relics, one of which I dug out the other day. It is a copy of the Detroit 'Evening News' of Thursday, August 11, 1887.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is old.

Mr. HUGHES. It is old, but it is new. It contains about the same old stuff the Liberals are preaching and tooting to-day. This item in it is dated from Lindsay. The Detroit 'Evening News' at that date sent a reporter up and down the towns of Canada, and being more interested at that time in the town of Lindsay than anywhere else, my attention centered on this piece of news. It is a statement from the Hon. J. A. Barron, now county judge for Perth—I may say that I have had the distinguished honour of making a couple of judges for the Liberal party—and it says:

From Hon. John A. Barron, member of the Dominion parliament for North Victoria Riding, I have secured a most interesting and important sequel to the recent public declaration of Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the Liberal leader, on commercial union. It seems, after all, that Mr. Laurier's straddle of the question was merely a clever coup d'état. He is, in fact, at heart for commercial union, and when the proper time comes, will wheel his ranks into line for the movement. He believes it unwise, however, to take this pronounced stand at present, for fear of arraying the Conservative ranks, farmers and all, against him. This is no mere speculation, for I get it from the Hon. Mr. Barron in person. He is one of the vigorous young colleagues of Laurier in the Commons, and has been in correspondence with the leader. The latter's letter deals with the union question.

'Oh, Laurier is not against commercial union,' said Mr. Barron. 'You may be sure of that. I know it from a letter I have received from him, but he does not think it expedient to take up the matter too quickly. That would have a tendency to concentrate the opposition to it. At heart I believe Mr. Laurier is for commercial union, and at the proper time he will come out strongly for it.'

Then it goes on to say that Mr. Barron tells of how enthused the farmers are. Why, Sir, you would actually think it was this gang of leaders; this grain growers association from the northwest that came down here, the same sort of fellow we find popping up in blacksmith-shop statesmanship.

Mr. LANCASTER. Grit organizers.

Mr. HUGHES. Every one of them a Grit organizer and heeler; not the rank and file of the farmers of Canada, but the men who try to push themselves to the front and whose wives are at home wearing long boots and cleaning out the cow stables and the horse stables, while these fellows are hanging around the blacksmith shops spouting statesmanship for the world over. It is the same type of chap we find then as we find to-day. I may say that then as now I have always had the warmest sympathy and affection and admiration for the better instincts and elements that we find in the constitution and the people of the United States. This newspaper says:

But the local Conservative paper here, the Victoria 'Warder,' makes a proposition which knocks the spots off annexation——

I want you to note that the Detroit reporter interprets 'commercial union' to mean annexation just the same as this thing means to-day:

But the local Conservative paper here, the Victoria 'Warder,' makes a proposition which knocks the spots off annexation. It would have to annex between Great Britain, United States, Canada and Australia, the whole to be called the British Empire with Queen Victoria ruling over all. The 'Warder' even prints the details of what it calls 'Imperial Federation' as follows, etc.

It is a little astray about that; my position then was and it is to-day: a full partnership union of Great Britain and all her colonies first, and then an alliance offensive and defensive with the United States for the advancement of humanity and peace the wide world over. Well, the Liberals failed in their commercial union cry of 1887-1891, and they got into power in 1896 only by the folly of the Liberal-Conservative party in bringing on that remedial legislation in reference to Manitoba. Then, in recent years, when they see a spirit abroad for closer union between Great Britain's colonies and the mother land we find these gentlemen in the United States, and unfortunately there are some of them in Canada, who do not like to see any closer union between Canada and the mother land. I refer among others to my friend Dr. Macdonald of the 'Globe,' this gentleman who has openly over his own signature pronounced the mandate that he is opposed to any closer union between Canada and the mother land, although he does not deny that he would not object to closer union between Canada and the United States. We find this gentleman crossing over and coquetting with Uncle Sam until at last he comes back to Canada with a proposition, which is described by the poet thus:

UNCLE SAM TO MISS CANADA.

'Gee Whittaker, Christmas, ain't you sassy
To turn up your nose at a duck like me?
Get onto my shape, why, lor a massy,
A foolisher girl I never did see.
Supposin' I undertook to make you?
I'm kinder 'customed to makin' free,
Supposin' I undertook to take you'
'I'd scratch your eyes out, sir' says she.

'"Twas me invented the basswood ham;
With wooden nutmegs I made my pile;
You can't do better than Uncle Sam,
In this here world, wa'll I should smile.
In course, I've got consid'able gall.'
She drew herself up with dignity,
'Dare to come over the garden wall,
And I'll loosen the bull dog, sir,' says she.

I'll dress you up like a daughter of Zion;
Your choice, my beauty, you'll never bewail;
You'll help pelt mud at the British lion,
An' assist the gang at twisting his tail.'
Miss Canada grabbed at a kettle of water,
Fresh from the stove, and as hot as—well,
He was warm before, but he was hotter
When the seance closed and the curtain fell.

That is the best way I can illustrate the ending that is going to come to these approaches by our good friends? in this matter. These gentlemen tell us that the United States came knocking at the doors of Canada to offer reciprocity. I deny it. I maintain from my place in this House as I have maintained from my place on the platforms of this country, that Dr. Macdonald of the 'Globe'—the man I again repeat who is in receipt or has been in receipt of emolument from the peace society of the United States and the rest of his pay he gets as editor of the Toronto 'Globe'—either as personal agent representing himself or as secret agent representing this government went to Washington a year ago and began negotiations which resulted in this abominable thing that is now before the country. Dr. Macdonald I am told—I had not the privilege of reading or seeing the letter—takes one of my alternatives where I said that he either went as his own personal representative or as the secret agent of the government, and he says that the statement about his going as a secret agent of the government is a falsehood. Well, the meanest kind of a liar is the equivocator. The most contemptible class of creature is the man who dodges the truth, and I put Dr. Macdonald in that category here, and I will tell him it to his teeth any time I shall meet him in public. Dr. Macdonald went to Washington a year ago. He says he started for Atlantic City. How did he shift off to Washington; they are not on the same line at all. He shifted off to Washington, and I find it stated in the 'Woodstock Express' that he found himself at once the centre of attraction. The newspaper men gathered around him, Mr. Bryce the British Ambassador got wind of him, and they all threw their arms around him, and before he knew what happened him he was ushered into the presence of Mr. President Taft. I am not going to say anything concerning President Taft. I have every reason to believe that that gentleman is sincere in his desire to upbuild the best interests of the United States, the best interests of the Dominion of Canada, of the British Empire, and of humanity the wide world over. But, Sir, unfortunately President Taft is not all the people of the United States. He is one, and only one of the people of that great nation. And the point I want to ask the government here is: By what authority did Mr. Bryce, representative of Great Britain at Washington, introduce to the President of the United States this man Macdonald who

began, admittedly, the negotiations which resulted in this reciprocity arrangement, and which were brought about one year ago, regarding the maximum and minimum tariff. Is the ambassador of a great nation at Washington at liberty to introduce to the President of the United States every Tom, Dick, and Harry that struts along with a bee in his bonnet. What mandate had Macdonald to give? Was he commissioned by this government to go to the United States, and had Mr. Bryce the authority to introduce this man to President Taft and talk this mission over with him. I ask that question en passant, and I trust we will get an answer in due course.

Following up the reciprocity of a year ago regarding a maximum and a minimum tariff, we find this agreement for free trade in natural products brought in to-day. I want to read to the Minister of Customs a statement made by Mr. Gardener, of Massachusetts, in a speech delivered in the House of Representatives, to be found at page 3414 of the Congressional Record of this year. He said:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a statement to which I challenge contradiction. I assert it to be the fact that the negotiations for this agreement which were inaugurated last summer were not based on any expectation that the price of food production would be reduced to the consumer in this country. I assert that the motive for their inception was the desire of the President to be relieved of the necessity of imposing the maximum duties against the Dominion of Canada. Under the law of 1909, he was compelled to impose additional duties on the products of the Dominion unless Canada yielded to us as low rates as she yielded to any other nation. But Canada refused to grant us her low rates unless we entered into a reciprocity agreement. This, then, was the situation last summer: Either a reciprocity agreement must be made or we must impose additional duties on Canadian products.

Is that true? That is the statement made by Mr. Gardener. He challenges contradiction, and he is not contradicted, that this government is responsible for pushing this movement for free trade in natural products on the people of the United States. Some time ago the Minister of Finance said that Canada was in the position of a young maiden being wooed. I pointed out that it was not a case of Canada being wooed, but being tied up, and I said that Canada did not want to be tied up to one fellow. I understand human nature somewhat, and I never saw any girl yet who wanted to have two old gentlemen do the courting for her. I never saw any girl yet who did not want to have a say in the disposal of her hand, and that is just what Canada wants to-day. Canada wants the opportunity of being proposed to. Miss Canada objects to having two old gentlemen, even such amiable persons as the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, doing her courting. Miss Canada wants her hand sought in the open market, and that is why we ask the opportunity of testing this question at the polls. Miss Canada had before her the record of this subtle old wooer. Uncle Sam might be capable of winning these two old gentlemen down at Washington, where everything is lovely; but Miss Canada had seen where this same old fellow had wooed and won Cuba, had wooed and won Alaska with his golden dollars, had wooed and won the Hawaiian islands by a reciprocal arrangement for sugar, identical with this one with Canada for natural products. She had before her the object lesson of Porto Rico being wooed and won by Uncle Sam. And to-day the Yankee flag flies over all these countries. Canada had the object lesson of the Philippines being wooed and won by Uncle Sam. She had the object lesson of Louisiana and Texas being bagged in the early days, and a large slice of Mexico being added to California and brought under the Stars and Stripes. Miss Canada had all these object lessons of the wooing of Uncle Sam; and yet these two old gentlemen threw themselves into his arms. Miss Canada is a little more coy than they were, and will not so easily be tied up to Uncle Sam. I have always been friendly to the United States of America, recognizing them as of the same race and lineage as we are. As dear old Whittier says:

Thicker than water in one rill
Through centuries of story
Our kindred blood has flowed, and still
We share with you its good and ill,
The shadow and the glory.

I agree fully with that sentiment. I recognize the great good the United States has done in extending liberty and civilization; but all this was accomplished in the early period of her history, before she fell under the power of the trusts and other evil influences that prevail to-day. So far as I personally am concerned, my life-long ambition has been for a full partnership union of Great Britain and Ireland and the various colonies of the empire, with every part in full and absolute control of its own local affairs, and a central government dealing with imperial affairs, the British flag floating over all, and each of the parts having a voice and a vote in everything that concerns the union as a whole. That has been my policy, and I am glad to find that policy extending to such an extent that even the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean), had not the hardihood to-day to contradict that spirit as he did a year ago when he made a speech justifying the Fenian invasion of

Canada, but is now compelled to declare himself in favour of drawing closer together Great Britain and her colonies. My aspiration is to see Great Britain and her colonies, including Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and India, federated; but in the meantime I desire that we should live in the closest friendship with the United States of America, and let each of the great nations on this continent go on in the work of up-building humanity. But we want no free alliances. Free-love societies have never yet prospered. It is always found that the big chap captures the whole bunch, and the little fellows become the slaves of the bigger one. So in this free-love, free-trade arrangement between Canada and the United States that hon. gentlemen opposite are bragging about, Canada would get the little end of the business. But, Sir, once Canada and the other colonies are federated with the empire, we shall realize our true aspirations—

> When closer strand shall lean to strand
> Till meet beneath saluting flags,
> The eagle of your mountain crags,
> The lion of our mother land.

But I want to see the two flags—the Union Jack over Britain and her colonies and the Stars and Stripes over the United States of America. I want to see the two emblems—the lion for the British Empire, and the eagle for the United States; but I do not want under any consideration to see the eagle's nest softened or lined with the beaver's hide.

We hear these gentlemen talk of the mandates they have received. One of them, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McLean) said something about their having had a mandate from the people away back when the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) were children. That is the latest he can find in the way of a mandate from the people. There was a platform promulgated by the Liberal party in 1893, not one plank of which was ever carried out or pretended to be carried out; and when my hon. friend from Huron spoke of a mandate which the government had received from the people, he reminded me of a story my hon. friend from East Grey told me, as the hon. gentleman from Huron was discussing this matter. He reminded me of a mill which used to be in operation in the early days of East Grey. It was situated just at the cross roads, and at the intersection of these roads there was a big board on which was printed this legend: 'Cash paid for wheat here.' The years rolled on, and in time the mill was destroyed by fire and never replaced; but for 20 years afterwards that sign board stood unharmed near the ruins and still bore the legend: 'Cash paid for wheat here.' That sign board reminds me exactly of the reciprocity plank in the

Liberal platform. Neither in 1896, when these gentlemen ran an election, nor in any election since have they made reciprocity a plank in their platform. Never since 1896 have they spoken of free trade in natural products with the United States as being their policy. And let me here point out that reciprocity is not at all the same thing as free trade in natural products. Reciprocity is the securing in commercial treaties between nations of mutual advantages. It is not a lobsided arrangement such as the one now proposed. It is the admission mutually into each country of certain goods which are supposed to be practically the equivalent of one another, whether duty free or at equal duty. In Sir John Macdonald's time I remember distinctly his explaining to us what he meant by reciprocity. By reciprocity he said he meant not free trade in natural products, but that if the United States would admit our barley free, which they wanted, we would let in something from them in return free which we required. They would let in free of duty what they wanted, and we would allow in free of customs what we required. There was no intention in the slightest degree—and I knew Sir John intimately from 1885 onwards—on his part to have free trade in natural products, but what he wanted was reciprocity in natural products and not free trade. There was no such question before the country in the elections of 1900 or 1904, as the right hon. the Prime Minister knows right well, nor was there any question of reciprocity in the election of 1908. This reciprocity deal was consummated last session and sprung on the country a year ago.

But why should we adopt this legislation now proposed to us? Is it according to the principles of responsible government? The basic principle of responsible government is the development of the individual. It means that the day of the divine right of rulers has gone by; it means that the free men of the country, the men who labour, the hewers of wood and drawers of water, must be consulted. It was amusing to hear my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McLean) talk about their being oppressed; but where are the toilers, where are the men who pay the taxes, where are the hewers of wood and drawers of water to-day? Why, the right hon. the Prime Minister will not trust them; he does not think that they are fit to be consulted at all. Even the members of the party opposite were not considered worthy of being consulted. There is not an hon. gentleman on the Liberal side who can say that he was consulted with reference to this proposed agreement before it was negotiated. They are treated by the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister as so many pawns on the chess board to be moved hither and thither as

these gentlemen dictate. Is that responsible government? No, responsible government means that the divine right of rulers in church and state no longer exists. It means instead the development of the individual. It means the privilege which the tax payer has of going to the polls and registering his assent or dissent with regard to any of the great questions of policy which must be submitted to the country, and let the result of the voting decide who shall rule. But the course taken by this government is not in accord with that principle. It is not government by the people, through the people, for the people, but government by the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs, through Ambassador Bryce and President Taft at Washington, and for the trusts of the United States. That is the kind of government which we are now asked to support. It simply reduces parliamentary control to a farce. Every member of parliament on the Liberal side has the right to stand by the principles of his party and not merely by the label; and I admire heartily my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Harris) and my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Germain) and a number of others who, I am sure, will be found when the time comes stepping out and declaring boldly: You are not acting along the lines of responsible government in forcing this thing through without first submitting it to the people. Even though it should have merits—which I deny—the government has no right to force it on the people in this way.

There is another matter which calls for some comment. Why this indecent haste in forcing this thing through? This House has been in session five months and this matter has taken up a great portion of that time. An attempt was made to rush it through the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, but that attempt was balked. Why then this mad rush to put it through here? What is the motive? Are the government afraid that at the coming imperial conference, arrangements may be made for a still closer drawing together of Britain's oversea colonies in one harmonious whole? What can be the object of President Taft and Mr. J. J. Hill, because they are the prime movers in this scheme? The others do not count for anything. Mr. Taft and Mr. Hill simply play with them as a cat plays with a spool of thread. What is the motive of bringing this thing on with such a rush now? Forty-five years have passed since the old reciprocity treaty was abrogated and nothing has been done. For thirty years we have held out an offer of reciprocity. Why this rush to get it now? Let us pause a little. Let us see how we came to be dragged into this thing last year; and now that the Finance Minister is back in his place I wish to read for his benefit a statement made by Mr. Gardener, of Massachusetts. Mr. Gardener said:

I am going to make a statement to which I challenge contradiction. I assert it to be the fact that the negotiations for this agreement which were inaugurated last summer were not based on any expectation that the price of food products would be reduced to the consumer in this country. I assert that the motive for their inception was the desire of the President to be relieved of the necessity of imposing the maximum duties against the Dominion of Canada. Under the law of 1909, he was compelled to impose additional duties on the products of the Dominion unless Canada yielded to us as low rates as she yielded to any other nation. But Canada refused to grant us her lowest rates unless we entered into a reciprocity agreement. This, then, was the situation last summer. Either a reciprocity agreement must be made or we must impose additional duties on Canadian products.

I would ask the hon. the Finance Minister if that is true?

Mr. FIELDING. A number of reasons are given there, and I am sure my hon. friend cannot expect me to answer them all at once.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. minister say if this statement is true:

Canada refused to grant us her lowest rates unless we entered into a reciprocity agreement.

Mr. FIELDING. It is true that Canada refused to grant the lowest rates.

Mr. HUGHES. Unless we entered into reciprocity?

Mr. FIELDING. That is not so.

Mr. HUGHES. I shall have the pleasure of communicating the hon. minister's reply to Mr. Gardener.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know the gentleman, but have no doubt he will be delighted to hear from my hon. friend.

Mr. HUGHES. But what are we to think of the excuse put forward: Oh, well, we cannot expect to be very particular, they are too slick over there, and we must gradually build ourselves up, and look after our own interests; little by little severing the tie that binds us to the mother land ; little by little drawing closer to the other nation; so that, for a short time we may be able to hoist our own flag—they have never yet told us what the designation of that flag is to be—making Canada an independent nation, but ultimately to form part of the United States of America. Some hint of a return on the part of the Minister of Finance to his first love. Though he is too shrewd to go openly in favour of annexation to the United States—he has not advocated that directly or indirectly—but the

record shows that he has come out in favour of secession. He has claimed the privilege of Nova Scotia to secede from the Dominion of Canada at its own sweet will. Whether that be the cause or not, I do not know. Some hint at a policy to put a quietus on the national and the naval movement in the province of Quebec. That this is a movement in the direction of annexation is Mr. J. J. Hill's view. A week or two after this arrangement was announced, Mr. Hill, unable to contain himself—like Mr. Champ Clarke; and yet they are two gentlemen who, one would think, were old enough, and experienced enough to know better than to go duck-hunting with a brass band—proclaimed the one that this meant annexation, and the other that it meant annexation through the severing of the ties that now bind Great Britain and her colonies together. And this is what the strongest men of the United States generally are saying. I have read their arguments; I have discussed the matter with many of them, and I have read their newspapers. And, Sir, from the northern boundary of Mexico, to the 49th parallel, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the leading newspapers, the leading men, the ordinary business men of the United States, view this in one aspect, and one aspect only. and that is as a question of annexation. The annexation question, therefore, is not raised by the Conservative party in this House, it is not raised by those opposing this pact, but by those who are favouring it in the United States of America; and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to find more than two speakers in the whole Congress of the United States, taking the Senate and House of Representatives together, who stated that they did not mean, or did not want annexation. Nearly every other man has come out openly in favour, declaring what they honestly believe, and what any man with an ounce of sense will see this means—the annexation of Canada to the United States of America. The motives which impel these gentlemen are many. The old, historical Republican party has gradually fallen into the power of the trusts, and has been breaking up. Various reasons are assigned for that. One prominent man, quoting from Milton, thus describes the condition of the Republican party:

> Which way I fly is hell; myself am hell;
> And in the lowest deep a lower deep still
> threatening to devour me.

That represents the position, not only of the Republican party and of President Taft. but, judging by the lugubrious expression on the countenance of hon. gentlemen opposite, they are satisfied that it represents, and fully represents, the position of the First Minister and his colleagues on this question. There are several causes alleged for this position of the Republican party, Duplicity of Roosevelt is charged. Taft's action in relation to the control of Philippine lands is charged. Then there is the fear of many about hard times, and the desire to get as cheap products as they can. It is found that the poor are growing poorer and the rich are growing richer. It may startle our friends on the other side to find that the United States is not the great country they think it is. When you consider that, in the city of New York, one out of every nine of the people, on the average, of that monstrous city is in receipt of public charity, besides the tens of thousands who are in receipt of private charity, you get a different light on the position. I have here an extract from the Toronto 'Star' of 28th January, 1911. Speaking of the proportion of poverty in New York, it says:

> Toronto 'Star,' January 28, 1911.
>
> High rents caused by congestion of population and the high cost of living are the chief causes of extensive poverty in New York city, according to a report prepared by Alderman Callaghan, chairman of the committee on charities of the city congestion commission. The report deals at length with the charity work now being carried on and endeavours to point out wherein funds are not being used to the best advantage. The document has been submitted to Mayor Gaynor.
>
> One person in every nine of the total population is receiving public charity in some form, either from the city or a semi-public institution. The committee has examined nearly all the important public and private charity institutions, and places the number of persons receiving aid at 500,000. The daily assistance ranges from twenty-five cents a family to $2 a person. Seven of the large relief societies in Manhattan and Brooklyn are giving assistance to 50,431 families, numbering 325,995 persons. The committee does not consider medical care as charity.

There is the condition of that great city, and, while it may be more severe than that of some of the other cities, yet I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, and this House and the country, that poverty is rampant throughout the United States of America in all its great centres. The recent elections were fought on the basis of cheaper food for the people, and that position as much as anything else had to do with the defeat of the Republican party in the recent election.

Mr. CARVELL. Due to protection?

Mr. HUGHES. We will reach that later on. That is the country, that is the system and these are the conditions; and my hon. friend and his friends are seeking to bring us under the same conditions as exist yonder. Then, the newspapers of the United States, especially the Democratic newspapers, openly charge that the trusts are responsible for the break-up of the Repub-

lican party. Mr. Davis, of Wisconsin, at page 3434 of the 'Congressional Record,' says, with regard to this reciprocity Bill:

In all my legislative experience I have never known a proposition which conferred greater benefit upon special interests, the meat trust, the milling trust, the lumber trust and the newspaper trust than the one upon which we are about to vote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the First Minister wish the farmers of Canada to be brought under the meat trust, the milling trust, and the paper trust of the United States? I shall convince him before I am through that that is what he is bringing us to—no, I need not convince him, he knows it already. On this question of the trusts leading Americans are on record. Mr. Graham, one of the members of the House of Representatives, says at page 3438 of the 'Congressional Record'—he is speaking of the American farmer:

He pays about double prices for all the woollen goods he buys. He pays a price and a half for all the cotton goods he buys. He pays a bonus of about 35 per cent to the Rubber Trust. He pays exorbitant profits to the Harvester trust. He pays exorbitant profits to the Steel trust and the other trusts which are based on protective tariffs. He pays freight on his products hauled over steel rails which cost the railroad $28 per ton, whereas the president of the Steel Trust testified the trust could make them at less than $12 per ton.

These are the conditions to which these hon. gentlemen opposite are going to subject the people of Canada if they have their way. And, as in the case of the binder twine trust and others to which I referred, so the Canadian industries will fall under these trusts, and Canadians will be controlled as Americans are controlled to-day. Mr. Steenerson, of Minnesota, said:

In the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means that have recently been held it is shown that even on the matter of milk there is a difference often of 200 per cent between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays, so that the conclusion is inevitable that the combinations of middle men that the gentlemen from Pennsylvania referred to do exist and do influence the prices of commodities in this country.

And, on the same Bill, the Carthage Board of Trade of New York, said:

The Beef Trust to a small extent, local conditions to a greater extent, have been responsible for the high prices of meat to the consumer rather than the price that the farmer is paid.

The same thing is true in reference to the Milk Trust and milk distribution. The farmer on the average obtains less than 3 cents a quart for his milk. . . .

Our farmers in Ontario get higher prices than do these farmers who are near the great cities of the United States. Farmers in remote parts of our country send to Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal and receive higher prices for their milk than do farmers within ten miles of the capital of the United States.

Insufficiency in distribution, combinations in restraint of free distribution, exorbitant express charges and freight rates have more to do with the high price of living than do the original prices paid to the farmer.

Then Mr. McCumber, of North Dakota, explains how the trust controls the prices of beef:

According to this table an 800 pound carcase will retail at $120.90. Add to this about $12.00 for hide and by-products, and the retail price would be about $133. The farmer probably received from $50 to $60 for this beef. The retailers gross profit would be about 125 per cent.

If you would then follow the same beef, as I have on another occasion stated, into what would be called a first class restaurant in this city, the percentage of increases would be enormous.

I gave you a table, I think, about a year ago in which I showed that the steer that the farmer sold for about $80 would realize about $2,500 at your best restaurants.

Mr. Jones, producer and consumer, page 2518 of the Congressional Record, says:

As the result of a careful investigation of the increase of prices of farm products in their transfer to the consumer, Secretary Wilson shows that the difference between the price paid the farmer and the cost to the consumer is in many cases from 40 to 50 per cent.

For instance, it was found that the poultry grower received only 55·1 per cent of the price paid by the consumer; that the dairyman receives a scant 50 per cent of the price paid for milk; the apple-grower 55·6 per cent; that beef cost the consumer 38 per cent more than the price paid the great slaughtering houses; and other farm produce from 41 to 50 per cent over the original cost. The conclusion of this section of Secretary Wilson's report is:

'From the details that have been presented in regard to the increase in prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays.'

The point I want to make is this, that the farmer in the United States does not benefit, the prices paid by the consumer are higher, but the prices the farmer receives are lower, as I will prove before I am through. Mr. Boutell gives figures of the price of milk.

Right on that matter of the cost of distribution, we had a witness here yesterday, representing the farmers of northern New York, and he gave these figures:—Price of milk to the farmer, 3 cents in his county.

Price paid by the consumer in New York, 9 cents, or an advance of 200 per cent; a much greater advance than any of those figures pointed out by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Jones, president of the United States Association of Dairymen, says:

It is not the tariff on farm products that is responsible for the high cost of food, but the excessive freight charges of the railways, and the exorbitant profits of the commission houses, wholesale dealers and retailers, through whose hands farm products must pass to reach the consumer.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

REVILLON FRERES TRADING COMPANY, LIMITED.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 158) to incorporate Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—Mr. Devlin.

Mr. GERVAIS. I think this Bill should be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. The difficulty is to know just to what committee the Bill shall be referred. It refers to the Railway Act and the Telegraph Act. I see that it has some clauses out of our Standard Telegraph Act and Railway Act. If it were a railway Bill the Railway Committee would not allow these other clauses in.

Mr. FIELDING. It seems to have three purposes. It is a general trading company, the Bill gives the company power to engage more or less in financial operations and it also gives it power to construct telegraphs and telephones. It is that latter part that seems to bring it rather under the purview of the Railway Committee.

Mr. GERVAIS. I think that the main features of the Bill refer to the incorporation of a banking and trust company, and that is why I think the Bill should be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee. Finance is the main object of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In some cases the course has been pursued of referring a Bill to one committee with respect to one part of the Bill and afterwards referring it to another committee with reference to another part. I think the committee to which it is referred recommends that it shall be transferred.

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec county). This Bill came before the Standing Orders Committee, and they thought it ought to be referred to the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. HUGHES.

Mr. FIELDING. Was that the judgment of the Standing Orders Committee?

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec county). Yes.

Mr. GERVAIS. The most important feature of the Bill relates to finance, a banking, security and guarantee company. The promoters would like also to be incorporated as a mortgage bank as well as a bank of issue. This parliament does not wish to incorporate another Hudson Bay Company.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no reference to a bank at all.

Mr. GERVAIS. I know, but in several paragraphs of section 7 they want to be authorized to issue notes. That is what is actually said.

Mr. FIELDING. Any corporation can issue a note.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). In view of the number of subjects in the Bill I think it ought to go to the miscellaneous Private Bills Committee.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps, as the hon. member (Mr. Devlin) in charge of the Bill is not here, it might be courteous to him to let it stand.

Bill allowed to stand for second reading.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 164) for the relief of Walter Kirkland.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 168) to incorporate the Ontario and Michigan Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon (Nipissing).

Bill (No. 175) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour of Toronto. —Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Association.—Mr. Geoffrion.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED. STATES.

(House in Committee of Ways and Means).

Mr. HUHGES. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was endeavouring to give some of the reasons why the people of the United States are anxious for this reciprocity agreement. I had explained that the recent United States elections were run on the price of bread and on the plea of lowering the cost of the necessaries of life, it was proposed among other things that they should have free trade with Canada in natural products. It, however, has been exposed again and

again by speakers in the United States that the prices in Canada for these products are considerably higher than those which prevail in the United States, and that reciprocity will consequently not cheapen the price of food for them. Another interest in favour of reciprocity is the trusts in the United States; and if the trusts cannot be controlled in that country where the laws are stringent against them, how can they be controlled when they are operating in both countries. The outcome would seem to be that the trusts in food products will operate successfully in both countries, just as the binder twine trust and the gigantic petroleum trust are operating now. Another strong element in favour of reciprocity is the advocacy that comes from the city of Boston and from the New England states. For a number of years Boston has been practically cut off by the New York interests which control the railways. The railway systems of the United States which formerly centred in Boston are now directed from New York, and for years past the city of Boston has been unable to increase its export trade. The people of that magnificent city see in this reciprocity movement an opportunity to revive their former trade, and hence they are in favour of it. The present governor of Massachusetts, Mr. Foss, a very capable man, speaking recently at Holyoke, Mass., on reciprocity, is reported by the Boston 'Herald' to have said:

> What reciprocity with Canada means to us here in New England, in fact to the whole country, is, I think, plainly apparent to a body of progressive business men like the Holyoke Board of Trade, located as you are at the very gateway of the trade that would flow in a mighty torrent from Canada to New England's greatest seaport, Boston.
>
> The United States has much to gain and nothing to lose.

Again, speaking in Boston, Mr. Foss said:

> There are two essentials to successful industry. First, that you must have your raw materials on as favourable basis as possible. This includes not only what goes into the industry, but also includes the food and necessities of life to the workingmen.
>
> Second, you must have the broadest possible markets.
>
> These are the two requisites and these are what reciprocity will give to Boston.
>
> Reciprocity will command a greater Boston, for our increased industrial and commercial interests will compel it. Real estate values will increase materially owing to this increased business development, and the increased population which will follow.

Now, here is the essential point of the whole business, and here is where Canada is going to be struck most materially by this reciprocity arrangement. Mr. Foss continued to say:

> New factories in all lines will be established here, for with these conditions our capital will no longer seek Canada for the purpose of building up those factories which it is now forced to build in Canada by unnatural tariff conditions.

Let me point out that millions upon millions of dollars of American capital have been expended on industries established in Canada, and if this reciprocity goes through, Mr. Foss is the authority for saying that no more American capital will come to Canada. A friend of mine in Colorado Springs, Colorado, writes to me under date of February 19, last. He refers to a meeting addressed by Henry George, jr., who is following in his father's footsteps, and has inherited his father's economic fads. Mr. George was giving reasons why the people of the United States should support reciprocity, and my friend writes to me:

> Last night I listened to an address given by Henry George, jr., before 'The Winter Night Club,' of this city, of which I am a member, and while not holding his extreme views as to single tax, I realize that he is a sincere student of the science of political economy, having recently been elected as a 'Free Trader' to Congress, from the State of New York. He is, of course, opposed to all tariffs, but in the course of his remarks, he expressed the hope that the pending reciprocity arrangement would be carried out, saying: 'Then we can get Canada's supply of pulpwood, make it into paper and place it on the English market at a lower price than the English manufacturer can produce it, and the London papers will have to use our product, even those dailies that are opposing the reciprocity movement strongly at this time.' He struck right at the centre of Uncle Sam's desire for better trade relations with Canada, but I notice the newspaper report of his address this morning omits this portion of his speech entirely, as you will see by looking it over.

These extracts show the tenor of the line of action that these gentlemen are pursuing. The Americans want our pulp wood and they want our raw materials to develop their industries and, so far as possible, to prevent these industries being developed in Canada. Why should Mr. Foss, and why should Henry George, jr., want the pulpwood of Canada to be manufactured into paper in the United States? Why should not the provinces of Quebec, of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick, of Ontario, which have vast areas of this pulp wood, manufacture it within their own borders instead of having it milled in Massachusetts. A cord of pulp wood will cost to produce all the way from 40 cents to $4, and what these gentlemen want is that Canada shall only have the chips; their desire is that the 40 cents or the $4 (as the case may be) worth of labour shall be expended upon the pulp wood in Canada and that the thirty odd dollars required to turn that into

paper, shall be expended in the United States. Sir, the policy of the Conservative party is exactly the reverse of that. Our desire is that Canada shall develop her own natural products, and that these natural products instead of being shipped out as raw material, shall leave the country in the shape of the manufactured finished article. An additional reason in the United States why this reciprocity deal is to be engineered through is to be found in the cupidity of the United States capitalists. We are told by these gentlemen who are now hawking around Canada, that this is a great struggle between the horny handed sons of toil on the one hand, as against the capitalist on the other. Well, when I hear these gentlemen talking of advocating the interests of the farmer in this matter I wonder how it comes to be that they are in alliance with the greatest trusts that ever ground down a nation. The trusts of that nation have brought the United States almost to the verge of civil war, and their tendency is to disintegrate that great republic. I shall not charge them with being in the employ of these organizations, but whether they are or not, these men who parade up and down the country talking of the struggle of the farmers against the capitalists are in fact the agents of the trusts of the United States, and are working for them. They see in the great forests of Canada, in the mines and minerals of Canada, in the fisheries of Canada, aye, in the manufacturing industries of Canada, as well as in our broad and fertile plains in the Northwest, avenues for the investment of their capital. As Mr. Beveridge, formerly senator, but no longer so, his state having gone Democrat in the recent election—as Mr. Beveridge, who was here a few days ago, said in a recent speech, which will be found at page 2340 of the 'Congressional Record':

> We have used up our natural resources so rapidly that the belated policy of conserving them has become one of our greatest national anxieties.

He goes on to point out the great advantage that it would be to the capitalists of the United States to have free access to our great industrial centres. This is the keynote of their great interest in the Dominion of Canada in recent years. It is also pointed out by Senator Beveridge that in France there are 200 people to every square mile, in Germany 300, in England 400, in Canada 2, and in the United States 35. He also points out, as do many other statesmen of the United States, that the United States can, for the next hundred years, aye, for all time, by successful farming, produce more than they can possibly consume, no matter what the population may grow to. A few days after this compact became public, Mr. J. J. Hill said that with this tariff measure enacted, Britain would not be in a position to carry out her policy of preferential tariff within the empire, as the United States had handicapped her; in other words, they had prevented imperial federation and the giving of preferential trade by Britain to her colonies. Then, Sir, we have speaker after speaker, not in Canada, but in the United States House of Representatives and in the United States Senate, standing up and boldly proclaiming their intention to see the annexation of this country to the United States of America. These gentlemen must be seriously lacking in courtesy or in that dignity which should pertain to a man occupying the high position of a representative of the people. The idea, for instance, of a member of this House standing up and talking of annexing the New England States to Canada or that part of the United States which lies north of the 40th parallel, or of disrupting the United States through our action. I would regard it as the height of impertinence on the part of any member of this House, and yet we find in the United States—not backbench members, but gentlemen occupying the highest positions—President Taft, J. J. Hill Champ Clark, &c., doing this very thing. Every one of these gentlemen has openly pointed out that this measure means the annexation of this country to the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. gentleman quote President Taft's words?

Mr. HUGHES. I will quote them all before I am through. The policy, Sir, of the Liberal-Conservative party is to leave the United States to control their own tariff in their own interest, and have the Dominion of Canada control its tariff in its interest. We have had some talk about free trade as they have it in Britain. There are peculiarly-minded people in the world. It is said that three-fourths of the people of the world are crazy on one point or another. We have gentlemen who happen to get in their bonnet the bee of free trade as they have it in England. Let me point out to any free trader—I care not whence he comes, whether he has been shipped out from England and by a freak happens to enter the halls of parliament at Ottawa or not—that free trade has been the bane of England. England's greatness is neither directly nor indirectly due to free trade. On the contrary, England's greatness began with the very antithesis of free trade; it began with her declaring many years ago that the wool and the hides of Great Britain should not be sent to the continent to be manufactured, but should be manufactured in England. It began with Cromwell's navigation laws, when he said that the trade with England should come in British hulls to British ports; that was the beginning of Britain's naval greatness. It began when steam be-

came a commercial commodity. It began with Britain's control of the engine and boiler building of the world. These were the things that lay at the foundation of Britain's greatness, and not the curse of Cobdenism or free trade. Britain's greatness is due to the fact that in the old days she had an export duty on wool and hides, and brought in exiles from France and other lands, skilled artisans, who laid the foundation of her industrial development. These are the reasons for Great Britain's greatness, and the gentlemen who talk about the benefits that free trade confer on England remind me of the fable of the bluebottle fly that lighted on a team which was climbing up a hill. When the team reached the top, the fly which rested on one of the horses said: 'Didn't we pull the load up the hill? That is the way with these free trade faddists in England. It is a plausible cry—reciprocity. Suggestion is a very plausible means of approaching a man. There comes along a chap with a stand-up collar, representing Mr. J. J. Hill or some other magnate, and he tells the horny-handed sons of toil how he sympathizes with them, and prates about the greatness of the farmers, and labels them grain growers' association or something of that kind, and in that way gets the farmers under the control of the Yankee trust. The farmers of my part of the country are used to the Sheldons, the Bill Miners and the other hold-up men of the United States. Let us not be taken in by any free-trade Sheldons or Bill Miners, no matter in what shape they may come to us.

These grain growers are right in the business. We have been accustomed to lightning rod agents and hay fork pedlars and goldbrick men trying to gull the farmers along that line and failing in their efforts. But, Sir, hope springs eternal in the human breast, and we have these gentlemen going to the farmers and telling them that they are going to improve their condition. Well, although far away hills always look green, yet our farmers are not going to be taken in by any such sophistry. They have had the experience of the days of 1887 when this commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity and patron business swept the country for a time, but our farmers were not to be taken in then, and they will be just as staunch and firm to-day as they were in those days.

Last December this parliament hill was graced by the presence of as fine a class of men as you could gather in any part of the world. I allude to the farmers of the west. I shall not speak of them as the Grain Growers' Association, because I wish to draw a distinction between the leaders of that association and the splendid men who constitute its rank and file. Last winter I paid a visit to the west and gave an interview to the 'Free Press' of Winnipeg. In describing what splendid looking lot of men were the rank and file of this association who visited Ottawa, I was asked what sort of impression they had made. I said the rank and file made a splendid impression. But what of the leaders, I was asked. As far as the leaders were concerned, I replied, that impression vanished as soon as they spoke. They treated us to the same old hurdy gurdy grind that we were accustomed to hear in days gone by from Joe Haycock and his associates. But these men we had fought and downed, we know them well and no doubt will down them again. The farmers of these days were not to be caught with chaff, and the farmers of to-day are neither to be caught with a second dose of chaff of the same description. All the platform oratory which we used to have from Joe Haycock and his gang in those days was reproduced here by the leaders of this Grain Growers Association; and I could easily imagine the right hon. the Prime Minister exclaiming: Why, that is the stuff that I used to prepare long ago and I must hear it all over again. And that old warrior, Sir Richard Cartwright, as he sat listening to all that frothy declamation, must have smiled sardonically and have thought: What a lot of donkeys these must be, these are the songs we used to sing when in opposition and which we never wanted to hear since. And, Mr. Chairman, should there be another appeal to the people, these songs will never be heard again.

Speaking of the Association of Grain Growers, I wish to say a word about the leaders of that association. I may be possibly a little too ardent, but I know the gang and they are the same as those we fought long years ago. I do not believe that one of them is honest at heart. They are to-day, as they were formerly, in the pay of the Liberal party. It will require more than the declarations of that gang to convince me that they are not either in the pay of Jim Hill and the Yankees or of the great Liberal party of this Dominion. At all events their actions are along those lines.

Let me now give the history of this Grain Growers' Association in the west and show where those so called leaders stand. I have here an instructive article from the Winnipeg 'Saturday Post' of April 8, 1911, which, although it is very long, I propose to read as it throws some light on the characters of these men:

Some months ago I had occasion to refer to certain rumours then current in Winnipeg to the effect that the Grain Growers' Grain Company, which is the grain handling end of the Grain Growers' Association in Manitoba—though, of course, technically a separate body—was speculating in the grain market, in-

stead of confining itself to the legitimate purposes for which it was organized. During the past few weeks I have secured evidence that this practice has not been abandoned, but, on the contrary, that these rumours were well justified. By way of introduction to what I shall have to say a little later, however, permit me to quote the following article which appeared in the 'Free Press' on Saturday last:

'Regular meeting of the directors and officers of the Grain Growers' Grain Company was held yesterday morning. There was a large attendance of out-of-town directors and much special as well as general business was transacted. It is felt by the directorate that these gatherings from time to time serve the useful purpose of keeping the men actively engaged in the transaction of the business of the company more in touch and in sympathy with the members and shareholders in the country and that the business of the company is less likely in this way to drop into the rut of the ordinary speculative trade in grain.'

That delightful little gem, I am informed, was handed in to the 'Free Press' for publication by the Grain Growers' Grain Company. Please carefully note that charming touch in the last two or three lines—'and that the business of the company is less likely in this way to drop into the rut of the ordinary speculative trade in grain.' The irony of this little masterpiece will best be revealed by the following statements of facts:

For some time past the Grain Growers' Grain Company has been the only heavy buyer of oats on the trading floor of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. It is freely reported, not only in Winnipeg but in Montreal and New York, that this company has set out to attempt to corner the market in oats. It has been buying this grain in huge quantities on a falling market—and individuals connected with the management of the company have stated that the company has bought in the neighbourhood of five million bushels all the way down. If this is not speculating or gambling, what is it? Is this the purpose for which the Grain Growers' Grain Company was organized? Is this the purpose for which the government granted it a charter? Did the government intend that this company should attempt to do that for which Mr. Patton has been so roundly denounced and for which he was hooted off the floor of an exchange in England? Is it by speculating in grain that the interests of the farmers—more especially of those who are stockholders in the company—are likely to be protected and advanced? Is it by resorting to the methods of a Patton 'that the business of the company is less likely to drop into the rut of the ordinary speculative trade in grain'? Or was the company organized for the purpose of discouraging such things as are mentioned above? Was the company not organized for the purpose of giving the farmers of Canada protection against gambling methods and devices, and to establish the grain business upon a fair, honourable, safe and sane basis, that would protect the purchaser from the wildcat schemes of manipulators and tricksters? Can it be that the Grain Growers' Grain Company has been seduced by the seductive wiles of a speculative institution into a bold attempt to excel the old hands at the gambling game in their own line of business, in which they have become expert by years of exciting experiences? Let us see.

Here is what a New York grain broker has to say under date of March 17th:

'We were figuring up this morning what the Grain Growers are doing. They are certainly selling oats delivered in London at one and three-quarter cents under cost. They are offering oats to Montreal on exactly the same terms. They chartered quite a chunk of freight and paid about half a cent a bushel over what it can be obtained for now, which would show a loss to them of over two cents a bushel. But these people are not hurt any by the trades. The farmer pays the bills. You know the old story about the negro and the cord of wood, where he gave fifty cents over his contract price so as to be able to boss the job. Pretty much the same thing with the Grain Growers.'

Now, there seems to be just one reason why a firm speculating in grain and desiring to corner the market would sell oats for export at prices below what the goods would cost. That reason would be to get the oats out of the country, so that there might be a scarcity here, which would assist in the making of the corner. But if a firm is selling oats below cost, it is naturally and inevitably losing money. In this case whose money is it that is being lost, if these detailed reports that I give are correct? It must be either the company or the farmers who ship their grain to that company on consignment. If grain is shipped to be sold at the market price, certainly the best market price should be obtained for the producer, instead of one and three-quarter cents a bushel less, which it is charged that the Grain Growers' Grain Company is selling for in Montreal, seemingly for the purpose of getting oats out of the country as rapidly as possible.

If the farmers are losing the money by getting a less price for their oats than they could obtain by selling for Fort William delivery, those farmers are entitled to know it. If the Grain Growers' Grain Company is losing this money, every stockholder in that company is entitled to the facts, that it may be seen whether or not they approve of this form of speculation, which, like all other forms of speculation, may end either favourably or disastrously.

I should like to ask the Grain Growers' Grain Company executive if at this 'regular meeting of the directors and officers,' held last Friday, this alleged attempt to corner the market in oats was discussed in detail, and if the secretary was instructed to inform the shareholders—who are farmers scattered over the country—of the methods said to be employed in working this alleged corner. Seeing 'that the business of the company is less likely in this way to drop into the rut of the ordinary speculative trade in grain,' I venture to suggest that it would be an excellent idea for the officers and directors to see that their stockholders receive the fullest information on this point at the earliest possible date—of course, merely for the purpose of ascertaining their views concerning the legitimacy of such methods as are suggested above.

Now comes a matter that may interest the Minister of Finance—another Farmers' Bank case possibly:

In connection with the foregoing, it is interesting to note that of six chartered banks that make more or less a speciality of handling the grain trade, the Home Bank—a very large percentage of the stock of which is held by the same people who own the Grain Growers' Grain Company—was one of two banks that showed on February 28th an increase in current loans, as compared with the crop handling season, September 30th, 1910. The six banks referred to with their loans on the two dates mentioned, with the increases and decreases indicated by plus and minus signs, respectively, are as follows:

	Sept. 1910.	Feb. 1911.	
Union..	30,299,724	30,717,151	– 1·3
Commerce..	83,271,151	89,045,613	+6·9
Dominion..	38,898,024	37,390,711	– 4·0
Hamilton	26,605,143	25,353,810	– 4·9
Home..	5,473,524	6,474,712	+18·2
Northern	11,978,442	11,316,079	– 5·8

Commenting on this showing, the 'Free Press' very pertinently says:

'It would appear that the Home Bank, judging by the above figures, and the fact of its being so closely associated with the interests represented by the Grain Growers' Grain Company, may be carrying heavy loans on the securing of grain. In respect of its total current loans, it occupies a striking position in comparison with other banks, which show but little variation.'

It will be observed that the only bank in the list quoted above, besides the Home Bank, the loans of which showed an increase on February 28th as compared with the grain season of September 30 last, is the Bank of Commerce—but as the Bank of Commerce is one of the strongest financial institutions in the world, it might well do that which a lesser institution could not properly do.

In the circumstances, it would seem to be desirable in their own interests that those farmers—more particularly the stockholders in the Grain Growers' Grain Company—whose grain is disposed of through that company, should ascertain at once the foundation for these very clearly defined reports that are in free circulation all over the city, that the Grain Growers' Grain Company is engaged in attempting to corner the market in oats, and that there in no other firm doing business in the grain exchange that is speculating more daringly than this company, which professes to fear and to shun 'the rut of the ordinary speculative trade in grain.'

Now, Sir, I believe that the importance of that article justifies its reading. We had before the House recently the question of the Farmers' Bank of Canada—a case in which a lot of financial buccaneers, playing on the name 'Farmers'" bamboozled the farmers up and down this country to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars, the money being put into an institution for speculative purposes where it was lost. Here we have, evidently, another instance of buccaneers trading on the name of the grain growers, endeavouring to get the farmers of the northwest engaged in this speculative work. As a matter of experience, even the best and shrewdest speculators on the Chicago board almost invariably tumble, and the day is not far distant when this Grain Growers' Grain Association of the Northwest, which is evidently seeking to corner the market and play the game of the shrewdest dealers, will come a cropper; and then good-bye to the association, and the people will see these gentlemen in their true light.

These gentlemen on the other side are great at crying: 'Reduce the duties!' I do not believe in reducing the duties. I stand here a supporter of the National Policy according to the principles laid down by Sir John Macdonald. Sir John Macdonald wanted reciprocity. He did not want free trade in natural products, but reciprocity—quite a different thing from the dose that we are getting now. He believed in protection for Canadian industries as against American industries. But the development of trusts in the United States, in Great Britain, in every civilized land, in recent years, owing to the great growth of trade, has shown that something further is necessary. If these men have complaints in regard to the prices of agricultural implements, or any other commodity, there is a solution for the difficulty without wrecking the homes of the working men of the Dominion. We have an agricultural implement industry, say, in Toronto. I well remember the time, not many years ago, when the Massey-Harris agents themselves came through the riding I have the honour to represent and told the people: Elect the Liberal candidate; return the Liberal government to power, and the price of your binders will go down to $80. They said they could compete with their rivals, and that prices would go down. I asked farmers recently what they paid for a binder, and the price is $130 or $140. That is under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite who have consistently permitted these trusts to get control of the people of the country. Now, we have established a Railway Commission which takes hold of any complaint against the railways or any demand of the railways, and the matter is adjudicated and settled nine times out of ten, to the satisfaction of both parties. There should be a trade commission in this country—not a tariff commission only, but a trade commission. We should protect our industries fairly; but if we find an industry trying to take undue advantage of the duties, let complaint be made before the trade commission, and inquiry made, and, after allowing for a fair profit, and allowing for the extra cost due to our northern climate, and our conditions, and if it then be shown that the manufacturer is charging too high prices, let him pay the public treasury a sum that will recompense the people for what he has taken from them

in exorbitant prices. In other words, let the trade commission manage these affairs, and you will find our country will prosper better than if you endanger our industries by lowering the duties.

There are many objections to reciprocity. The government has been asked: Why not let well enough alone? The country has grown, railways are extending, manufactures are getting firmly established, our farmers are receiving good prices, and becoming wealthy, our mines are in course of rapid development, and trade routes are constantly improving. I have here a letter from Mr. Flavelle, one of the largest produce dealers in the world. He points out, as he has pointed out to me before, that he imports eggs from the United States in great quantities, pays the freight into Canada, pays the duty, and then sells them at one cent a dozen less than he pays to the Canadian farmer. He brings eggs from Russia, and pays freight and duty, and then sells them at lower prices than he pays for Canadian eggs.

In other words, he shows that in case we have free trade the egg industry would be wiped out of existence in the Dominion of Canada, and to-day it stands second to any industry. So with all the other lines of agriculture. From 1879 to 1896, Canada prospered, although the Liberal party did their level best to destroy the protective policy introduced by the Conservative party. Since 1896 the country has undoubtedly progressed, and why? Prior to 1896 every move made by a man to establish an industry in Canada was met by the threats of the Liberal party that when they came into power they would wipe protection out of existence. But once the Liberal party got into power they dared not touch the principle of protection, and the man who invested his money in business had behind him, not only a Liberal party afraid to act, but the solid rank and file of the Conservative party telling him, 'Your capital is absolutely safe in this country, not one smokestack will be touched, not one dollar of your capital will be impaired. That inspired confidence in the hearts of Canada's business men, and that shows why Canada has prospered since 1896. The people have confidence. They knew the Tory party would not interfere, and they knew the Liberal party dared not interfere. Therefore, it is that the workingmen are receiving good wages, their homes are well built up.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's, Montreal). Before 1896 the workingmen only got a dollar a day, now they are getting two dollars.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not think the hon. gentleman knows what he is talking about. But suppose they were, I want to ask where he was prior to 1896? He was walking about the streets of Montreal, shouting that these industries, which were affording employment to his fellow countrymen, would be destroyed as soon as the Liberal party got into power. Up and down the streets of Montreal the hon. gentleman and his friends paraded, threatening that when they got into power they would not leave one stone standing upon another of the great factories. That is where the hon. gentleman was to be found. The Conservatives were to be found building up these industrial institutions, they are to be found to-day supporting them, and that is the secret of the confidence which exists in the country. Canada has prospered because the conditions are stable, the Northwest has grown and developed rapidly, and the men in this northern clime have no reason to complain. We do object, and I say it advisedly, the labouring men of this country do object to their sons and daughters coming into competition with the cheap negro labour of the southern states. Any one who has been in the southern states during the winter months has seen cattle roving in the fields. The people there have no need of expensive buildings to protect their cattle, no need of building warm houses, and buying ton after ton of coal to keep their families from freezing, no need to be at the expense of purchasing warm clothing such as we have to purchase in our colder climates. Down yonder 25 cents will clothe almost any labourer. Yesterday we saw in the newspapers that more than a hundred men were blown to pieces in a mine, and these men were criminals brought from the penitentiary whose labour is sold in competition with free labour. That is something that we do not want to compete with in this Canada of ours. We do not want our children to be brought into competition with that sort of thing, we could not compete with them if we tried. We must have protection. According to American authorities, this reciprocity agreement will divert the trade of this country to the United States. I cannot do better than to quote from the report of Mr. McCall when he introduced this reciprocity resolution before Congress:

It will divert the trade of Canada to the United States.

As I pointed out a little while ago we will get the chips and the brush of the pulpwood, and they will get the solid wood. It will destroy our home market, and bring our labouring men into competition with the negro and pauper labour of the United States. On page 5 of the report on Reciprocity with Canada, No. 418, you will find the following words of Mr. McCall in introducing the resolution:

It may be said that the prosperity of Canadian railways would correspondingly de-

cline. They would undoubtedly lose in the transportation of wheat, but they would gain in other directions. The effect of the proposed arrangement upon the growth of Canada would be magical, new interests would spring up, and her railroads would be called upon to serve a much larger population.

Might I ask, where new industries would spring up? Mr. Foss has told us that no more Yankee capital will come to Canada under reciprocity. Mr. J. J. Hill has told us that no more Yankee capital will come to Canada. The trade will be sent to Minneapolis under reciprocity. How will new industries spring up in Canada? Are we not doing pretty well as it is? As I have already pointed out, this agreement will bring us into competition, and establish free trade in all these commodities not only with the United States, but with all the British colonies and thirteen or fourteen other countries. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for Grey and others that the Argentine Republic could control the market for beef even in western Ontario, and our farmers would materially suffer by being brought into competition with the Argentine Republic. Water transport is cheaper than rail transport, and in a dozen ways we would be materially injured. Our wheat, as has been pointed out, would be seriously injured. I have all the figures here, but I will not go into the question of prices, as there are other members of the House who will take up that question, and they will show that the prices of wheat in Canada from year to year are ahead of the prices in any part of the United States, even in Minneapolis, except at odd periods of the year when the Minneapolis millers must have No. 1 wheat in order to mix with their cheaper grades. Figures will be quoted showing that prices in Canada are higher than the prices are in the United States, taking a number of years in succession. Even in the prices of grain, the farmer of the Canadian west has nothing to fear from competition with the American farmer under present conditions. But as soon as the grain trust of the United States gets control of Canadian mills, or rather as soon as Canadian mills join the grain trust—because you cannot blame the Canadian if he finds himself being crushed, and if, in order to save his capital and the capital of the shareholders, the earnings of a lifetime, he should join hands with this trust—and when that takes place the Canadian farmer will find his prices materially reduced. The wholesaler who makes a profit, and the Englishman who is talking free trade from one year's end to the other, will find themselves paying through the nostrils a great deal more than a shilling a quarter higher for the grain that they purchase in the form of Yankee flour.

Now, we are told that we will be able to make a greater profit out of the sale of our barley. I will give you a word or two on barley. I have here the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States. At page 139 of this report I find the evidence of Mr. Mauff, of Chicago, who says:

If the brewers would stop using substitutes for barley they would find they could use Pacific coast barley very nicely. That is the explanation of that. I have the technical authorities, if I had the opportunity to present them.

At page 140, Mr. Mauff says:

The gentleman asked why is Canadian barley raised in western Canada not as suitable for malt purposes as is Dakota barley? The most of the Canadian barley is fed. I will read a letter from a malster in Winnipeg, who left Chicago to go to Winnipeg:

'It will be years before they get alkali out of the soil in this country. Then we may expect better barley. I have started a campaign already to educate the farmer to allow his barley to get thoroughly ripe before cutting it; also to stack it and change the seed.'

And he asked me to engage them 20,000 bushels of barley similar to what is raised in the Mississippi valley to be taken to Canada.

Then at page 141:

They use about two bushels of barley, for which our brewers are substituting things like glucose and starch.

In the city of Washington there is a brewer who uses fifty per cent of substitutes for barley malt. Not only have they increased acreage and trebled the crop, but they are using as little of that crop as possible in the brewing of beer, substituting corn products and coarse ryes, which are cheaper. In Canada that is not allowed under the law. Any beer manufactured that way must be labelled 'imitation beer.'

So we find that the barley of the United States is not all used for malting purposes and we have a very good explanation as to the prices of it. On page 152 we find the following:

In 1890, the barley crop of the United States aggregated 59,000,000 bushels, with the average farmer price of 40 cents per bushel, and of this total crop about 66 per cent was used for malting purposes. The crop of 1910 aggregated 162,000,000 bushels of barley, with an average farmer price of about 48 cents per bushel, and of the total crop only 39 per cent was used for malting purposes.

Where does the rest go? The American farmer does as the Canadian farmer wisely does; he feeds it and gets nearly a dollar a bushel for it in the form of pork or beef. At page 4563 of the 'Congressional Record,' speaking of Canadian barley, Mr. E. J. Hill, of Connecticut, one of the representatives, says:

The hearing before the Ways and Means Committee developed the fact that because of its superior quality the barley of our own northwest had captured the markets of the

Pacific coast and actually driven out the domestic product there to compete on equal terms with Canadian barley abroad, and in addition to that the northwest had last year shipped barley malt into Canada in excess of the entire amount of Canadian exports of barley.

So that they can invade our country with barley from the western States and pay the duty. Further, on the same page:

The malsters also admitted that the barley of the Canadian Northwest was not now a competitor with our own because of the alkali in their soil, and that it could not for this reason compete for many years to come.

These statements illustrate that the cry that our farmers are going to make tremendously out of barley is not borne out by the facts of the case.

The production of hay is another important industry and I notice that our good friend the Prime Minister has been appealing to his beloved province of Quebec with reference to that article. I do not want to go into the question of prices, although I have them all here, because others will do that, but I wish to point out that the prices of hay in the United States vary with localities tremendously and that the prices in Canada, all in all, are higher than in the United States. At page 509 of the report on Agricultural Statistics of the United States of America for 1909, I find the following average prices:

	Average price per ton.
North Atlantic states..	$15 12
South Atlantic states..	13 87
North central states east of the Mississippi..	10 47
North central states west of the Mississippi..	6 81
South central states..	10 92
Western states..	10 51

Showing that the price varies in the different parts of the country where the hay is produced. On pages 2642-3 of the 'Congressional Record' I find the following which will show at a glance that we have not much to gain from free trade with the United States in hay. Before a House committee of investigation these gentlemen were giving evidence:

Mr. PUJO.—I am not exactly familiar with the extent of our lumber trade in the western markets, but I do say this, that we buy your Nebraskan hay, upon which you have a duty of $4 a ton. You are in favour of free lumber, are you?

Mr. HINSHAW.—Yes. We sell our hay at $4 a ton, nothwithstanding the duty.

Mr. PUJO.—I understand; but if we had no duty on hay, we might be able to get it at $2 a ton for the mules and horses that we have to use in logging operations in our state.

I wonder where the right hon. Prime Minister will find auditors in the province of Quebec to listen to him when he tells them that they are going to benefit by free trade in hay?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What State is that?

Mr. HUGHES. That is the State of Nebraska.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that we send any hay to Nebraska.

Mr. HUGHES. If the minister is not satisfied with Nebraska I will give him some other State. In the report of the Ways and Means Committee, page 223, the First Minister will find this. Mr. Grant, of Clinton, N.Y., was down in Washington showing how this arrangement was going to injure them in the States and Mr. Hill is getting these prices. He says:

The average price of all hay in Canada, according to the Canadian government reports, in 1909, was $11.14 on the farm, and in 1910 it was $9.66. So that it is higher in Canada than it is in Watertown, on your own statement.

There is the evidence that was offered before the Ways and Means Committee. It was proved by statistics there on the evidence of these gentlemen that the price of hay was higher in Canada than in the United States. I am giving the farmer's prices, not the price quoted in New York.

Now, let us come to the question of horses. We heard an hon. gentleman talking about horses in this House this afternoon. I come from a county that produces horses. There is one dealer who has a home both in the northwest and in the county that I have the honour to represent, and he has shipped nearly $300,000 worth of horses from Ontario into the northwest already this year. I saw a team sold in the street in Lindsay on Saturday morning for $600, one four year old and the other five year old. A gentleman by the name of Leddy sold a team for a Winnipeg dealer. Three hundred and twenty-five dollars for a single horse is not an extraordinary price to pay in our country. Mr. Silverwood and Mr. Weese, two of the most prominent dealers in our locality, tell me that in so far as the horse dealer is concerned he would profit by reciprocity because he could buy cheap Yankee horses, bring them into Canada and make more commission than he does by dealing in horses produced in our part of the country. That would be the result of free trade in horses with the United States. Mr. Silverwood came home from Chicago the other day and he told me that he saw hundreds of magnificent Clydesdales and heavy draught horses sold at anywhere from $75 to $125 lower than that which we would pay for them in the town of Lindsay, Ontario.

It may be necessary to tell it to some of the tenderfoot members of the House of Commons who have the bee of free trade with the United States in their bonnets, but it is not necessary to tell the farmers of Canada that they would lose by having reciprocity in horses. It takes $20 in the United States to raise a horse to maturity and it takes $100 to bring the same horse to maturity in the Dominion of Canada, taking locality with locality. If we have reciprocity with the United States, Canada will become the back field on the farm; our industries will be moved down to the New England states and we will have the privilege of reaping the raw material and shipping it there. In the United States towns the advocates of reciprocity argue that it will give people cheap food, but if it does how can it enhance the price to the Canadian farmer. On the other hand, in the farming districts of the United States they tell the farmers: Why the Canadians' prices are higher than ours and you will be able to ship your surplus products to their market. The advocates of reciprocity can take which horn of the dilemma they choose. Champ Clarke says:

The chief thing that this country needs in its business is a wider market, and I am in favour of this reciprocity Bill because it gives wider markets to American products.

This means of course on the authority of Champ Clarke that the wider market for the farmers of the United States will be found by sending their products to Canada to compete with the products of our farms. We were told to-day that some people in the United States are opposed to annexation, and I believe that statement to be true. The Minister of Finance made the statement, and he started to give the reason for it, but he did not give it all. There are hundreds of the best men in the United States who do not wish annexation because they prefer the two nations to be separate, and their line of reasoning is as follows: For instance during the Japanese war scare—and let me tell the members of this House that war between the United States and Japan was nearer than some people think—it was found that at strategic points on all the transcontinental railways in the United States Japanese were stationed as laundrymen, or railway men, or in some such capacity, and the moment war was declared the tunnels, bridges and passes would be rendered impassable so that the United States with her 90,000,000 people and enormous capital could not to save her soul put troops across the continent short of a year's time. Meanwhile Japan would move her army from the Hawaiian Islands and from Japan, occupy the western coast of America, and in spite of the two-penny half-penny 25,000 men the Americans could throw into the field, Japan could land 200,000 men, and the tablelands of the Rocky Mountains and not the Pacific ocean would henceforth mark the western boundary of the United States. This is no idle dream and the Americans know it. You cannot convince me that President Taft and the military authorities had not in view this very idea when they sent their army to the Mexican border in case Japan should interfere in Mexico, so that the American troops might move up the western slope and not have to cross the Rockies. Now, suppose Canada had been part of the United States, would England have been so interested in preventing a conflict? Not at all. If Canada and the United States were united England would practically have no interest in the Pacific ocean, and, therefore, with the desire to keep the Pacific not as a yellow sea but as a free ocean, Japan would have to face the hostility of Britain, of Canada, of Australia, and of New Zealand, in addition to that of the United States. Therefore, the United States is infinitely stronger separated from Canada than united to Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the reasoning of some of the best men in the United States who oppose this reciprocity deal—now let the First Minister say hear, hear—and they oppose it because they know that reciprocity means annexation, and they do not want it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES. The First Minister says hear, hear. Let him stand up now and withdraw this Bill.

Mr. NESBITT. Oh, no.

Mr. HUGHES. I give the hon. member for North Oxford warning that in six weeks from to-night he will not be half as chirpy as he is at present, because the Bill is going to be withdrawn and I will tell him why. I can read the First Minister, and I know the First Minister is at heart sick of it. I know that the Minister of Finance sees that he has been buncoed, and from the dear old Minister of Customs down through the whole outfit of them there is not a man who is not disgusted with the whole thing. We are not blind. We see the First Minister and the Minister of Finance and the other ministers wear their funeral smiles.

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend turn around and see the enthusiasm on his own side of the House?

Mr. HUGHES. Where could you see anything more cheery than the face of my hon. friend from Halton?

Mr. LANCASTER. No blue ruin over here.

Mr. HUGHES. In addition to the Americans who do not want annexation there

are Americans who are opposed to reciprocity and their fear is that if you remove protection from the farmer you must remove it from the manufacturer, and that is logical. Will the First Minister and the Minister of Finance deny that if by this reciprocity deal the farmers of Canada are deprived of protection they would not in turn demand that the manufacturer should be deprived of protection, and then will come that commercial union for which the Liberal party in this country have so long been hoping. There are Americans who are opposed to reciprocity because it unsettles trade conditions all along the border just as Mr. Flavelle in his letter, pointed out that after many years he has been able to build up a great trade which necessitated his bringing commodities into Lindsay last year on which $65,000 in freight rates alone were paid, and that this arrangement will perhaps cause the break-up of that trade and its disappearance for all time.

Do you blame these men in the United States, then, for opposing it? It is opposed by them because it leads to free trade, and the American people are not in favour of free trade yet. The Minister of Finance spoke of these gentlemen of the west demanding that it be not passed because it is going to introduce a new element, and interfere with the prices of land. Of course it will. He knows that the opening up of the Northwest affected the price of lands in Ontario, but it did not affect the price of wheat; and the farmers of the western states, whose lands are valued at from $80 to $100 an acre, very justly oppose this reciprocity deal, because they feel that if the great plains of the Northwest are opened up to free trade in wheat, the rush of immigrants there will naturally reduce the price of their lands just as the prices of lands in the eastern states and in Ontario was reduced by the opening up of the west. These are the reasons advanced for the opposition to this agreement in the United States. There are many in the United States who support it, and who are they? Those who favour annexation; those who want Canada's markets to sell in; those who are after Canada's resources. Mr. Beveridge, who was cheek by jowl with the First Minister and the Minister of Finance the other day, comes out frankly and says: We have squandered our United States resources, and now we want to get hold of those of Canada. Other reasons are that they want to divert attention from their own troubles, such as questions of capital and labour, the negro and other race questions, and the rivalries which are breaking up that country. Then, we find some people in Canada shouting, our farmers will get higher prices. That is what Mr. J. J. Hill tells the grain-growers of the Northwest, whereas he is telling the farmers of the United States: Don't be frightened, gentlemen; Canada gets as good or a better price for her wheat than Chicago does; Minneapolis has millions of bushels of low-grade wheat, and it wants to have one bushel of Canadian No. 1 hard to mix with every four or five bushels of United States cheap wheat to make good flour. Their aim is to control trade in Canadian wheat in Minneapolis, to destroy Canadian standards, and close Canadian mills, to control prices and markets, to close British mills and raise prices in Great Britain itself, and develop United States centres. Then Canada's wheat will lose its identity, the milling trust will control, and the mills of the United States, which now run half time, will then run full time. They will bring the prices down for the farmer and bring them up for the trust.

I am opposed to this agreement also for the following reasons: Instead of Canadian pulpwood being shipped to New England and manufactured into paper there, I want to see it manufactured into paper in Canada so that our fellow-countrymen in New Brunswick and our fellow-countrymen in Ontario and Quebec and Nova Scotia will be benefited instead of the people in the valleys of New England. We want our wheat to go out as flour, we want our cattle to be shipped in the form of beef to the markets of the world, our hogs as pork, our hay as horses and beef. At present we actually import Yankee beef into our lumber camps. Mr. Smyth, the member for East Algoma, told me that he imports large quantities of American beef, which undersells the Canadian beef. We want to protect our beef. We want to sell our cattle to England in the form of beef as much as possible rather than on the hoof. We want to sell our milk and cream in the form of butter and cheese. We want to sell our sheep as mutton, our wool as cloth, and our barley as beef and pork, and not as beer. We want to give the men and women of Canada a chance rather than the men and women of the United States. We have no fault to find with the United States for giving their people a chance; but we want to give the boys and girls of Canada an opportunity in their own country. We want our people to sell, not pulpwood at $3 or $4 a cord, but paper at $30 a ton. If the Americans want paper, let them make it free and buy it from us. This is the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party, and also the policy of thousands of men in the Liberal party. This is no party question. We have the best minds of the Liberal party in favour of this policy—the hon. member for Brandon, the hon. member for Brantford, the hon. member for Welland, who have already spoken, and scores of others who in their hearts know that this is the best

policy for Canada. Up and down the country there are thousands of Liberals who feel the same—like Sir Edmund Walker, Mr. Lash, Mr. George and many others. These men have the manhood to stand out and say: We are going to stand by Canada rather than by party, we refuse to wear the label when the bottle does not contain the essence, but we stand by the essence. I say all honour to the men who take that stand, and I am surprised that the right hon. the First Minister does not see his way clear to withdraw this resolution.

Now, Sir, I am coming to a rather important part of this matter. I am going to take up the question of wheat, and I am going to read a few extracts in relation to wheat that I think have not been presented to the public before. Mr. Steenerson, a member of the House of Representatives, at page 2517 of the 'Congressional Record,' speaking of wheat, says:

It is explained that wheat in Winnipeg carries with it the milling in transit privilege as far as Fort William, so that to compare Minneapolis prices with Winnipeg you need not add any freight to the Minneapolis price, which puts the wheat relatively in the same position as though it were in Duluth or Minneapolis. This would be for export purposes.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, at page 2533 of the 'Congressional Record,' says:

Distance from markets has much to do with the prices of grain. So this proposition is modified by proximity to markets and cost of transportation. While Canada is exporting wheat or other grains and the United States is also exporting wheat, there is no particular reason why Canadian wheat should come here, unless it be that a mixture of Canadian and American wheats may be desirable on the part of our milling exporters, and our millers may find it profitable to handle the Canadian surplus. But the price to the Canadian for this surplus wheat will be substantially the same whether sold in Europe or the United States.

Here is the kernel of the whole thing:

However, if the handling of Canadian wheat by United States railroads, merchants, and mills has a tendency to reduce the price, it will be reduced to Canadians; and if it should reduce the price of bread to the American consumer, wise statemanship may find it necessary to do that to avoid greater evils.

Mr. McCall, at page 2931, says:

The mills of Minneapolis will have their business greatly increased. The clearings of the financial transactions will take place here. Much of the purchase price will go into the ordinary channels of our trade, and the quickening influence will be felt throughout our entire country.

At page 2930, Mr. McCall further says:

When I scan the commerce of Canada and the United States; when I see, for instance, that of butter the United States sends to Canada more than twice as much, notwithstanding the existing tariffs, as Canada sends to the United States; when I see that we send over fifteen times as many eggs to Canada as Canada sends to the United States; that we send nearly as much wheat to Canada, notwithstanding our great mills, as Canada sends to the United States, I can see no threat to the agricultural interests of this country. . . . For a third of the year the price of wheat at Winnipeg is higher than the price of wheat on this side of the line.

Then further on he said:

Mr. Chairman, my statement about the price in Canada and this country is based upon the average for three years in Winnipeg and Minneapolis.

On page 3795 Mr. J. J. Hill speaks as follows:

Senator McCumber, of North Dakota, is also said to have stated that American wheat prices have been for many years from 13 to 17 cents higher on the American than on the Canadian side of the line. Both Senators are fighting reciprocity on the ground that it will injure the American farmer. They both show a fine disregard of facts, which the country is coming to expect from opponents of the treaty. Since their attack is inspired by public statements made by me, the facts should be stated.

I have taken the closing prices of May wheat as officially reported for each days of the months of November, 1910, January, 1911, and the first 16 days of February on which the exchanges were open in February of both 1910 and 1911. This covers the period to February 21st, 1911. I have averaged these figures to obtain the monthly averages for each of the three great markets—Chicago, Minneapolis, and Winnipeg. The results are not opinions, but facts. The following are the figures:

	Chicago.	Minneapolis.	Winnipeg.
Nov., 1910	96	105·4	95
Jan., 1911	99·6	106·5	98:6
Feb., 1910, 16 days ..	111·5	111·7	106·1
Feb., 1911, 16 days ..	93·7	100	95·6

It will thus be seen that Winnipeg prices are as high as, if not higher, than Chicago prices, taking them all in all. On some occasions the Minneapolis prices are high because the Minneapolis mills must have our better grades to mix with their cheaper grades. Speaking on this matter, Mr. Hill says:

All the opponents of annexation in Canada are shouting that it will reduce the price of Canadian wheat, while on our side they are shouting that it will depress the American price.

There is a plain admission of Mr. Hill that what is really meant by this proposed agreement is annexation. It is not the Canadians who are shouting annexation, but Mr. Hill and President Taft and one after another all these gentlemen in the United States who are supporting it:

Their claims destroy each other, therefore, according to the line of argument used by the gentleman cited, the proposal of reciprocity has caused wheat to fall 50 per cent more in Chicago than in Minneapolis. There is no end to the absurdities and contradictions that may be created by this method as long as this country is a large exporter of wheat.

Prices, as I have shown, vary just as much and more between local markets in this country where there is no tariff. For ten years the average price in California has been 12 cents a bushel higher than in Oregon, and in South California, 13 cents higher than in North Carolina.

The highest price for wheat for May delivery in Chicago varied last year from $1.11\frac{3}{4}$ in August to 98 cents in November; from $1.05\frac{1}{4}$ in October to 98 cents in November. The table given above exhibits far more singular fluctuations in respect to where the tariff cannot apply than in those where it does.

The basic price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool and varies with the world's supply and demand. It has been affected by a visible supply ranging from 20,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels and upward larger than a year ago, and by a world's yield which some estimate as high as 25,000,000 bushels larger. The local markets have additional variations from purely local causes. Minneapolis is reported as having nearly three times as much wheat in store as she had a year ago. Therefore, the Minneapolis price has declined. To ascribe such changes, whose causes are perfectly visible, to tariff or reciprocity is like charging the comet with an epidemic of infantile paralysis.

Mr. Hill says further:

That the tariff will not prevent the price of wheat from going down so long as we are exporting a surplus is evidenced by past experience. Under the Dingley law, for instance, we had the same duty on wheat that we have now, yet every one knows that prices ranged all the way from 60 cents to $1.25 per bushel during the 13 years that law was in force. Also, under the Wilson Bill the much-heralded free trade measure, there was a duty of 25 cents per bushel on wheat, yet the price went down to the rate of 40 and 50 cents per bushel.

Then follows a statement showing the amount of exports from and imports into the United States of these commodities, but I shall not take up the time of the House by reading it. Mr. Hill goes on to say:

A comparison of these figures will give some idea of the difference in the amounts of our exports and imports. The amount of wheat we import, for instance, is insignificant as compared with what we export. And that little amount comes from Canada, and after being made into flour becomes a part of our exports.

Mr. Hill goes on to say at page 3797:

Notwithstanding the fact that farm labour in the United States is the highest in the world, yet, because of the great fertility from soil, the energy and enterprise of our people, and the use of modern labour-saving machines, the American farmer can produce more cheaply and undersell the farmers of every nation on the globe.

And this is the country these gentlemen want our farmers to compete with. At page 4411 of the 'Congressional Record' I come to the experts, Messrs. Pepper and Davis, appointed by the United States government to inquire into this question. Their report is very interesting reading, and I shall take the liberty of placing a portion of it before the House. I might point out that I shall only give a very small portion of it, because it is most extensive, but no man can read it without being convinced that not only will the Canadian farmer be practically ruined by reciprocity, but there is a great deal more behind this deal than appears on the face of it.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the date of it?

Mr. HUGHES. It is a Senate document prepared upon the subject of Canadian reciprocity, No. 862 of the 61st Congress, Third Session:

The American farmer receives the benefit of this competition, and yet he fails to supply the full requirements of the mills for full-time operation. American mills have capacity and could convert into flour not only the entire annual wheat product of the United States, but in addition the entire wheat product of Canada. Make it possible for the surplus wheat of Canada to seek the exporting mills of the United States and they will convert it all into flour and sell it abroad, thus taking from the foreign miller the best part of his supply, and that which he now obtains at a relatively low price. The world's demand for wheat or flour will be none the less because of Canada's surplus finding disposition in the United States. The demand will still exist, but American mills will be enabled to meet the demand with the finished product——

Listen to this:

—transported by American railways, and marketed by American agencies.

Again, at page 4411, it says:

The price of wheat in the United States generally averages as to the northwestern crops, fully 10 cents per bushel, and sometimes so much as 15 cents per bushel higher than in the corresponding sections of Canada.

And here is the reason why our wheat is lower:

The bulk of the Canadian crop at present is marketed soon after harvest, and this will probably be the case for many years to come.

This will apply to fruit. The Yankee crop hits the market early and gets the high price; the Yankee wheat hits the market early, and the Canadian wheat tails in after the Yankee mills have begun work on the season's crop, and so it gets a low price.

It is marketed much later in the season than the crop in the United States. It goes directly to the market centres of Europe in large quantities at a time when it least is needed to meet the world's demand.

This is another reason why the price is low:

Thus ensues an enforced period of depression occasioned by the over-abundance. Lower prices thus brought about are reflected into every market throughout our own country, and this comes just at the time that our farmers are selling most freely of their products.

And now comes the most important admission I have seen yet in connection with this business:

The facilities offered by the American grain exchanges, our enormous elevator capacity, our abundance of capital, and——

That means the trust.

—if you will, our speculative sentiment,——

That is also included in the trust.

—will all become factors in controlling the flow of Canadian grain toward point of consumption.

Where is the Canadian farmer going to benefit? This document further says, at page 4412:

It may be remarked that Minneapolis wheat is now and often is at a premium over the current price in Chicago. That is true at times, for the reason that generally the demand for high-grade milling wheat at Minneapolis is much greater than at Chicago. Minneapolis is the greatest milling centre in the world. Minneapolis mills have a greater reputation throughout the world than mills of other sections. Their capacity being great, their cost of production is relatively low. With such facilities and reputation and low cost, they can afford to pay premiums for the better grades of wheat. There has recently been excessive competition among the mills of Minneapolis to attract wheat and hold it there. . . It requires 6 bushels of wheat to produce one barrel of high-grade patent floor. Even one bushel of high class wheat combined with 5 busheds of average wheat will materially improve the one barrel of high-grade flour when produced by such a combination. . . The farmer may not realize what must be apparent to the thoughtful student, that the ability of the American mills to absorb practically all the wheat that is grown in the United States and so combine it into a finished product that every kernel of it has immediate value, is the most important influence in existence for maintaining the high level upon which American wheat is sold.

Not how is it bought, but how is it sold.

Such an influence does not exist in the same degree in Canada as it does in the United States, and this is one of the reasons why the Canadian farmer has had to take less for his wheat than has the farmer of the United States. . . The admission of Canada's high-grade wheat without payment of duty will at once stimulate to greater activity every exporting mill in the United States to which the rates of freight will permit the delivery of Canadian wheat. . .

Every bushel of Canadian wheat thus used in the development of increased trade abroad will require its complement of 4 or 5 bushels of home-grown wheat that would not be required by the American mill if it were unable, as at present, to increase its foreign outlet for flour. . . . . The question presented is whether the Canadian surplus of grain will reach the ultimate markets where the world's price is fixed, on the low basis at which it is at present being marketed, or whether this surplus will be handled by American methods, through American elevators, over American railways and by American flour mills, all of which, with abundance of capital, established connections, and unparalleled facilities, provide channels and methods by which distribution may be made more in accordance with the world's needs, thus subjecting the Canadian surplus to influences that will add to its ultimate value when it finally goes into consumption.

In other words, the milling trust will pay the Canadian farmer what it chooses. Now, the Canadian farmer is independent, and he can raise the prices when he has the wheat to sell.

It is the part of wisdom that such a union of commercial forces may be provided by which the competition between the grain producers of Canada and the grain producers of the United States for the sale of their surplus products in the markets of the world may be minimized or entirely eliminated.

In other words, they want to remove the rivalry. They will have the market at their mercy, and you can see where prices will be.

Such union of commercial forces is made possible by the reciprocity agreements. The north American grain crop, once this agreement is approved, will move forward to the points of final distribution, not as now, a weight to bear down the market, but dealt out to meet the market's demands.

That is, just as the trust wants it to go.

It will no longer be 'dumped' in the season succeeding harvest, when the American home price is most seriously affected, but its distribution will be more and more in the shape of finished products.

That is, the American trust will hold it, and they will control the markets of the world and will make John Bull pay what price they please. Then, at page 4413, this document says:

In other words, the advantage we give the Canadian farmer will not hurt our farmer, for the price will remain the same, but by patronizing our elevators, our flour mills, our railroads, he will secure admission to the world's market at a less cost to himself, while we will secure the advantage of increased trade for our elevators, our mills, our railways and our commission men.

In this connection, the Minneapolis 'Tribune' says:

Though Minneapolis already has a large selling force in western Canada, and, though many firms will increase their forces only slightly, the smaller firms plan to branch out and go after the trade that would result in Minneapolis becoming a still greater wholesale market. To this end, the clerks, bookkeepers, office hands and even office boys today are in a better position to realize on day dreams than ever before, according to those in touch with the heads of Minneapolis business houses. No time is to be lost in having the reserve force all ready 'to shoot' into the new trade territory to win laurels for themselves and dollars for Minneapolis and her enterprises.

I want to see where Canada is coming in in all this business. Let me quote briefly the statement of Mr. Mauff, of Chicago, at page 147, of the Ways and Means Committee—a brief extract, but very interesting:

I would like to answer that question, and explain one of the features of that desire of the Minneapolis and Duluth millers to get that wheat from northwestern Canada. It is because of its very superior quality. It allows the use of inferior grades to make the blend that will come up to standard. With a little of that very superior wheat it is possible to use inferior wheat. That is the real reason.

—the reason why they want Canadian wheat.

Now, I have explained the effect of the beef trust; I have dealt with the milk question and I have spoken of eggs. In this same report of Pepper-Davis these matters are taken up in detail. As to agricultural implements, the Americans admit that agricultural implements can be made in the United States and sold in Canada cheaper than Canadians can manufacture them.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Can but they don't.

Mr. HUGHES. All stand at the same prices. Now, let me give the House a few words from the farewell address of Washington, which are well worthy of consideration. This has reference to the unity of the British Empire, on page 3279:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the evidence of your real independence, the support of your tranquility of home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken——

In view of this let me point out that for many long years the nations of Europe, and some people in the United States, have been building on this very line, the disintegration of the British Emipre. I now quote from the 'Congressional Record' page 3279:

Much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively, though often covertly and insidiously, directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

Let me point out that to these gentlemen, and ask them how they have observed the mandate in relation to the Dominion of Canada. Also on page 3280:

To the efficacy and permanency of your union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced.

I take the liberty of pointing this out to strengthen my argument that we must take no steps that will weaken the ties that bind the colonies to the mother land, but that, on the contrary, we should stand firmly for strengthening them. Now I come to the question of annexation. The question of annexation has not been raised by the people of Canada. I have seen speeches reported by some of those gentlemen who are elected to the House as independents, but who, like the turkey that dropped to the side where the most corn was to be found, complain that we are going about impugning somebody's loyalty. Well, I am not impugning any man's loyalty, I am merely pointing out the facts that exist. This question was not brought up by the Conservative party, but it was brought up by this government, by the agreement they made with the representatives of the United States. We find gentlemen occupying the highest position politically in the United States coming out flatfooted in favour of this agreement because it means the annexation of Canada. You cannot find half a dozen leading politicians in the United States who do not admit that it means annexation. What are we to do? Are we to sit here and say nothing? In the first place, it is an insult to the intelligence of a free people to find gentlemen standing in the legislature of another country talking of the annexation of Can-

ada. We have had experience of these people before. Only recently they sent a lot of buccaneers into Mexico to produce a rebellion, and President Taft sent 25,000 Yankee soldiers down to the border of that country, not for the purpose of restoring order in Mexico, but for the purpose of protecting disorder. There have been two or three rebellions in Central America created by Yankee filibusters. It would be easy to show that there has been much less disorder in Mexico than there has been in the United States. Now, taking up the question of annexation, we find this Mr. McCall, one of the ablest men in Congress, speaking thus in favour of reciprocity:

Add to the tremendous influences that are pulling the two countries together the entangling web that is woven by reciprocal trade, and the inevitable day will be more quickly reached when the two countries shall be politically one.

Mr. Good, of Iowa, on page 2731 of the 'Congressional Record,' says:

It is unquestionably true that the first step in the direction of a closer bond between this country and Canada must come through trade and commercial concessions.

Mr. Martin, of South Dakota, on page 2570 says:

I am not unfriendly to genuine reciprocity with Canada. I have often said I would like to see Canada annexed to the United States . . . . I am willing to take up our tariff wall altogether and place it down on the northern boundary of Canada.

In the report of tariff hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, December 4, 1908, when the Payne-Aldrich Bill was pending in Congress, we find this conversation taking place:

Mr. Champ Clarke—Nearly all those who are raising wheat in the Northwestern British possessions are Americans who have gone over there, are they not?

Mr. Henry—A great many of them are; yes, sir.

Mr. Clarke—Nearly the whole outfit?

Mr. Henry—Yes, sir.

Mr. Clark—Fixing to bring that country into the United States, are they not?

Mr. Henry—I cannot speak for them.

Mr. Chairman—I do not think you ought to give it away, if they are.

Mr. Clarke—That is exactly what they will do; exactly what they did with Texas.

Now on page 2518 Mr. Jones is speaking:

That is what they ought to do; the same as any foreigner; If he wants to come in, let him throw out the Stars and Stripes and let them float over that country, and then he can come in, and we are perfectly willing to let him.

Then on page 2519, the Carthage Board of Trade says:

If Canada were proposing to unite with and become a part of the United States, sharing in the expenses of our government and taking on our standards of life, then questions of patriotism might arise and an appeal to patriotism might have some force.

Then on page 2930 Mr. McCall, speaking of the Louisiana purchase says:

Why, if it were proposed to add to this country to-day another Louisiana purchase, if it were proposed to add two or three agricultural States, who would there be to deny that such a circumstance would augment materially the prosperity and wealth of the two countries? And yet, to the extent to which this Bill goes that is just what we are doing. One has but to look at the map to have the case conclusively shown. The common frontier between the two countries is 3,700 miles long.

On page 3275 Mr. Sherwood says:

I was elevated and highly entertained by the closing remarks of the able and experienced gentleman from Missouri, (Champ Clark) in predicting that this proposed compact, if enacted, will not only promote our trade with our near-by Canadian neighbours, but tend to unite the people of the States and the people of the provinces into a union, so that at no far-away day the Flag of many Stars may supplant the Union Jack from the Gulf of Mexico to the North Pole.

He should have said from the sandy plains of Popocatepetyl to the north pole.

This was said amid great applause. This prescient spirit of an all-pervading patriotism arouses serious thoughts, and touching the absorption or annexation of Canada.

Mr. Swasey, of Maine, page 3445, said:

I live under the American flag and am more interested in the welfare and prosperity of the American people than the people of any other nation. I am in favour of annexation, but I am not in favour of giving to Canada the full benefits of the American markets for her farm products and her paper manufactures free of any duty, in competition with the products of American farmers and American paper manufacturers. I said I am in favour of annexation, sharing with the Canadians all the rights of American citizens, provided they shall share with us some of the burdens and responsibilities that attach to American citizenship.

Mr. McCall, page 2484, says:

The Bill takes a long step toward establishing for the continent of North America a policy of unrestricted trade and commerce, recognizing natural conditions that have been too long ignored.

The attempt to set aside the plain decrees of nature by artificial tariff barriers has injured both countries, but on account of her configuration Canada has suffered far more than this country.

And the benefit to us would be enormous. If we could sweep away all tariffs between the two countries, it would have the effect upon our trade of another Louisiana purchase.

Mr. Champ Clark says:

Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.

Speaking of the Panama canal, he proceeds:

We are not spending that vast sum because we are altruists, but as a business matter. I am for it, because I hope to see the day when the American flag will float over every square foot of the British North American possessions clear to the north pole. They are people of our blood. They speak our language. Their institutions are much like ours. They are trained in the difficult art of self-government. My judgment is that if the treaty of 1854 had never been abrogated the chances of a consolidation of these two countries would have been much greater than they are now.

Mr. MARTIN.—Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and making free trade with Canada on all products?

Mr. CLARK.—By taking Canada in to become part of the United States; Yes.

Mr. Eb. J. Hill, at page 4562, says:

Under reciprocity trade between Hawaii and this country flourished to the great advantage of both until by the logic of events the islands became a part of this nation.

Under reciprocity our trade with Cuba has more than doubled. Under free trade with Porto Rico, which met with a storm of denunciation when first proposed, but which Wm. McKinley declared to be 'our plain mines, and copper industry, the woollen increased nearly fifteenfold.

Under reciprocal relations with the Philippine islands, a territory containing a larger population than the Dominion of Canada, our mutual trade has grown in less than a single year 70 per cent.

So that, from whatever aspect yau take it, it all comes down to the same result in the end. Mr. J. J. Hill is in favour of what he calls heading off the British preference, Mr. McGuire comes out flat-footed in favour of reciprocity, Mr. Gains, of West Virginia, introduced a Bill for commercial union, and Mr. Bennett, a representative from New York, brings in a resolution to annex Canada. Mr. Bachelder, the governor of New Hampshire, in giving evidence and speaking of farm machinery and the price of farm products, said:

It probably would to some extent; but if you remove the tariff on farm products, remove it on everything, and let the Stars and Stripes float over Canada, the same as over the United States.

From whatever source you take it, boards of trade, state legislatures, town councils all over the United States, have been passing resolutions in favour of the annexation of Canada to the United States.

Let us see to what we would be annexing ourselves. Mr. Sherwood, at page 3275 of the 'Congressional Record,' speaking of the condition of the United States, says:

Why have we been losing the most thrifty and most valuable citizens of the western states, who, from choice, have left the protection of our flag and renounced citizenship in a republic to become citizens in the Canadian provinces under the protection of a British flag? Why have these valuable citizens left their homes and firesides in a mild climate to settle in the frozen north? Here comes the startling thought: Why should any United States farmer care to repudiate the flag of his country for the flag of Great Britain? or why are the Canadians opposed to annexation to the United States? Is it because we have parted with the simple republic of the fathers and are now tending rapidly to a military oligarchy, with the military spirit dominant and a present military establishment more costly than the empire of Great Britain? Is it because of the corruption of American politics? Is it because of the present unrest of our industrial classes? Is it because there is an economic and financial system in the United States controlled by not more than 5 per cent of our people, who either own or control all the railroads, steamship lines, iron mines, steel mills, oil refineries, tank lines, copper mines, and copper industry, the woollen industry, and the cotton industry? Is it because the average Canadian, looking across the border line, sees in this country no fair opportunity or a poor man's chance, outside the controlling influence of monopoly?

That is the condition of affairs to which these hon. gentlemen would annex us. These are the conditions to which they want to make us subject by this free trade compact. At page 3755 Senator McCumber, also speaking of the condition of the United States, says:

Here is a table, Mr. President, I will ask to insert which will explain this proposition:

AMOUNTS PAID DURING THE YEAR 1909 FOR:

Wines, liquors, &c.	$1,750,000,000
Meats	1,500,000,000
Tobacco	800,000,000
Lumber	685,000,000
Cotton goods	650,000,000
Woollens and worsted goods	460,000,000
Boots and shoes	435,000,000
Flour	435,000,000
Potatoes	205,000,000

They spend practically ten times as much for liquors as they do for bread. That is the country to which they want to annex us. He continues:

Let me analyse it. I want the senators who claim that these labourers benefit and that the farmer is getting too much, to listen to this. In the year 1909 the American people paid for wines and liquors and beers $1,750,000,000, and they paid for flour $435,000,000, or more than four times as much for liquors as for their bread; and yet some of the consumers complain of us. The brewer wants cheaper barley and wants the farmer to produce it for him for less compensation. I find also that the labourers and the rest of the American people spent $205,000,000 for potatoes in 1909 and they spent $800,000,000 for tobacco, or nearly $4 for tobacco to $1 for potatoes.

This is the class of people to which these hon. gentlemen want to annex us. Mr. McCumber further on says:

Mr. President, the dome of this Capitol looks benignly down upon the great Centre Market of the city. The same rising sun that gilds its towers finds the wives and daughters of farmers who have driven miles through the darkness with their vegetables, their eggs, or butter, that they may be ready with their wares to greet the early shoppers; and there they stand in their frayed and faded ginghams, in sun or in shower, disposing of the fruits of their labours. Here is a little girl 14 or 15 years of age, wearing away her young life, while your daughters are embellishing theirs with the priceless gift of education. Here is a little boy remaining home during the hot sultry days, knowing no recreation, producing the vegetables, and fruits for mother and sister to sell, while yours are running their autos, their sail-boats, or their yachts.

Here are the farmers in the near vicinity of the city of Washington, knowing no vacation, summer or winter, while half the population of this city is off touring Europe or fishing in the summer and growing fat on lean congressmen during the winter, and begrudging this farmer's wife the little sum of 5 cents for three bunches of celery.

Mr. President, I am awakened every morning at half past 4, winter and summer, by the clatter of the slow and tired horse of the farmer that has travelled 6 miles to bring in the milk and have it ready to deliver for breakfast. And when I think of the work—the good wife getting up at 2 or 4 o'clock in the morning, the son going out to milk the cows to have the fresh milk ready for such early delivery—and when I think of the hardships of that life the greatest regret that is in my heart is that I do not have to pay three times as much for milk as I do. I could stand it and so could the rest of the world stand it if they would cut off a few of the luxuries of life in which they are indulging, because the price paid the farmer is only a very small measure of the cost of living.

A short time ago I visited Washington, and I took pains to inspect the condition of the farmers in the vicinity of that city, supposed to be the richest in the world, and within sight of the dome of the capitol there were American farmers occupying a most degrading position. I protest in the name of the respectability of the farmers of the Dominion that they should be dragged down as the American farmers are under the grinding heels of the monopolies and trusts in the United States. Champ Clarke is a remarkable man; he is one of the three possible presidential candidates of the Democrats, Wilson of New Jersey, and Harmoan, of Ohio, being the other two. Champ Clarke, as a possible presidential candidate has taken to advertising himself in the newspapers of the country, and while most people have read the 13th chapter of Corinthians in days gone by, Champ Clarke has discovered it lately, and he impresses a newspaper reporter very materially with it. Champ Clarke says:

All the evidences seem to me to lead to the conclusion that the world in general and especially our part of it is getting better. People have quit fighting prize fights to a great extent.

Why, you can hardly take up a newspaper but you find a long report of a prize fight in the United States.

Duelling has been practically abolished; homicides have grown fewer.

The returns show that in the United States there are 111 homicides to each 1,000,000 population, whereas there are only four to 1,000,000 of the population in Great Britain.

Lotteries are largely a thing of the past.

You can hardly go into a church organization, much less a saloon in the United States that you won't find lotteries.

There are fewer wars than there used to be.

There are 25,000 Yankee soldiers on the borders of Mexico, a lot of Yankee free booters down there murdering their neighbours; in the Central American states there are wars going on; altogether there are five or six different wars on the American continent at the present time.

The doctrine of peace and goodwill seems to be gaining converts everywhere.

Among the professionals.

In proportion to the wealth of the American people ten times as much is given in charity as was given 100 years ago.

Then Champ Clarke comes to the most interesting of his statements which I want to place on 'Hansard.' He says:

Our urban population is growing out of all proportion to our rural population. Nobody ever heard of an agricultural community being crowded. It is an impossibility in nature.

Some two or three years ago Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson stated that if the Mississippi valley were cultivated for all it were worth, one acre, on the average, would support one human being. Missouri is richer than the average of the Mississippi valley, but let us take Wilson's estimate and figure on it.

The county of Pike, Missouri, in which I live, is situated on the Mississippi river and is one of the largest and most beautiful counties in the United states. It comprises 700 square miles of land, or 448,000 acres, and, according to Secretary Wilson's report, ought to support 488,000 people, but, being richer than the average county of Missouri, and Missouri being richer than the average of the Mississippi valley, this country ought really to support some 700,000 people. As a matter of fact, it has a population of about 25,000, and it is among the most densely populated rural sections of Missouri.

This simple statement as to one county shows the vast possibilities of the growth of the Mississippi valley states in days to come, yet newcomers stop in the cities. This vast horde of immigration which is coming here ought to be distributed, not only for their own good, but for the good of the country.

I can show by other authority also that the United States have ample ground for maintaining many times their present population. Now, Mr. Speaker, to what land are we going to be annexed. We are going to be annexed to about the only country in the world, where during the present age we find them resorting to savagery and burning people at the stake. We are going to be annexed to a country of filibusterers—there was the Texan filibustering raid which brought about the annexation of Texas, there was the Fenian filibustering into Canada from the United States; there was the Mexican filibustering war; the Cuban filibustering expedition, the Porto Rican filibustering expedition, and the Panama canal affair where Roosevelt boasted: I annexed the canal zone, and let Congress debate it. Here was a President of the United States boasting that he used his autocratic power to annex another country's territory, and he left it to his Congress to debate it afterwards. That is not the kind of country to which we wish to be annexed. Then another aspect of the arrangement is to inquire if the United States have been friendly to Canada. When they found Britain at war with the world in 1812 they declared war on Canada, and the state of Massachusetts felt impelled to declare: We will not send a single man, because the war is unjust and unholy. In that war the Americans placed 43 soldiers in the field to one British and Canadian, and yet on almost every occasion in 25 set battles the British and Canadian troops were the victors. Then, the cause of the war was not the tyranny of Britain, for Britain was fighting for liberty throughout Europe against the tryanny of the oppressor, and the United States did not hesitate to join against Britain's struggle for liberty. In 1837-38 they encouraged the unjust rebellion in Upper and Lower Canada; in 1841-42 they massed troops on the New Brunswick border, and threatened trouble; then, as in the Trent affair, they backed down, but in 1866, and 1870, we had the Fenian raid in which many Canadians were shot down. When Cleveland became President a Yankee fish poacher was caught in the maritime provinces and captured, and without inquiring into the merits of the case Cleveland called on the governors of the different states to know how many troops they could mass on the Canadian border to take Canada by force, and set this ship free. Then we had the Venezuelan affair, and we have every evidence that the people of the United States have not been grateful for the kindnesses that Britain and Canada have extended to them. 100,000 Canadians fought in the civil war to free the slaves, and during the Cuban war even the plans of the Cuban harbours were furnished them by Great Britain. In the Philippine war had it not been for Sir Edwin Chichester, the Yankee fleet would have been sunk by the Germans and Spaniards in Manilla bay. And, though on every occasion Canada and Britain have been friendly to the United States, on only one occasion, and then for their own benefit, have they been friendly to us. I want no annexation to the land in which there has been forgotten the ancient watchword: Love of right, and disdain of wrong. Washington gave out the order to his officers on duty that none but true men should be put on guard, but the Yankees of to-day have forgotten that. In olden times another watchword of the United States was for fair play for all, but to-day they are openly practising savagery, and this freebooting work that I have spoken of. There are many rich people in the United States, but there are many poor people also; in no country are the extremes of wealth and poverty so marked, and the rich people have not at all times done credit to the reputation of the nation. As was pointed out by a speaker in the House of Representatives the other day, they need more of the spirit of the fathers of the nation. Manhood seems to be on the wane in that country at the present time, and it is not a country to which we should feel inclined to be annexed. Speaking of bribery in the United States elections, the American papers have shown recently that in one election every solitary man in the district was bribed, except one who landed on the morning of the election, otherwise it was possible he would have been bribed too. Preachers and others sold themselves. Senator Lorimer has recently been tried for bribery in the Senate of the United States. His case was discussed widely during the past year, and finally he was whitewashed. The Chicago 'Tribune,' speaking of this case on March 12, 1911, said:

> The purchase of representation has but one alternative, and that is revolution.

The same paper on the same day, quoting an able speaker on this subject, said:

> We have another example of that quasi-legal lawlessness which is one of the many present day symptoms of anarchy throughout the land. Nothing that a half crazy anarchist could say in revolt against law, on a city street corner, could do one tithe the mischief which the Senate has done in the acquittal of Lorimer.

The United States, like other lands, must learn the foundation for peace and good government is not wealth or trusts, but manhood, womanhood, the masses educated, individuality, honour and self-control on the part of the masses of the people. In the United States there are many millions of good and true men, of

splendid manly mould, such as laid the foundations of that grand nation in 1776; such as brought it through the stormy periods of its history, and led it out of the civil war. But these men are not all in politics. Before we can say that any movement is going to be lasting, the rank and file of the nation, as well as a few of its leaders, must be imbued with the same spirit.

Now, I have spoken at greater length than I intended. I suggested to the First Minister the desirability of withdrawing these resolutions. He must realize, as his followers behind him realize, that the heart of the nation and the best interests of the nation, are not in this movement to which he has committed himself. There is to-day too much sordid grasping for the almighty dollar. Magna Charta, a simple treaty wrenched from the King of England, has done more for the upbuilding of humanity the world over than all the trade treaties that were ever negotiated. The Bill of Rights of William and Mary has done more for the upbuilding of humanity than all the trade treaties. The old song, Annie Laurie, and the poetry of England have done more for the nation than all the trade treaties. Washington warned the United States against them and experience has shown that they do not serve the best interests of the people. The best interests of a nation consist first in looking after the home interests, and then in looking after the interests of all the nations of the earth. I regard this present measure as one of those influences which tend to disintegrate the empire, to wean one part or another from the homeland. This movement has, to my mind, that end in view, and I would most respectfully urge, as far as my voice can influence him, that the right hon. the First Minister will withdraw this resolution from the records of the House. He has a splendid opportunity to do so. The American Congress has failed to pass the measure in the session just closed. Thus far in the present session it has shown no disposition to ratify it, why should we, a self-governing country, pass this measure until they enact it? We have responsible government here. If this measure passes this parliament, it becomes part of the law of the nation. Although the Democrats control the House of Representatives, they do not control the Senate, and there is no guarantee that the measure will pass either House. Here the government must pass it or go down. There no government goes in or out if it fails to pass. Therefore I maintain that it is the duty of this government to withdraw this measure until the American Congress, at all events, passes it. Then, if the government does not get its eyes open in the meantime, it can reintroduce it and fight it to a finish.

Mr. T. A. LOW (South Renfrew). Mr. Chairman, as a manufacturer, and one who believes in the principle of protection, I desire to make a few remarks on the question now before the House and the people. If I were under the impression that the agreement which has been entered into was in the slightest degree going to affect the manufacturers of this country or impede its industrial progress, I would be one of the first to oppose it most strenuously. But when I look at the tariff arrangement as we have it, I find that the manufacturers are protected simply because they desire to be protected. If to-morrow a deputation of manufacturers came to the government and asked that manufactured articles be placed on the free list, I venture to say that the government would accede to their request. Is there any good reason why the farmers of this country, representing 60 per cent of our population, are not entitled to the same consideration as the manufacturers? They have asked to have their natural products placed on the free list, and as that does not interfere with the manufacturing interests, why should their request not be considered? If by means of this arrangement they succeed in getting a few cents more for their products, so much the better for me as a manufacturer. I and all the other manufacturers of this country will be able to sell to the farmers more manufactured articles. The hon. member for North Toronto has time and again said in his place in this House that the government have no mandate from the people—that the issue in 1891 ended reciprocity with the United States, so far as the Liberal-Conservative party was concerned and so far as the people of this country were concerned. But I find that in the year 1892 the hon. gentleman and some other members of the Liberal-Conservative government, made a bee-line for the city of Washington; and perhaps never in the history of this country was there a more humiliating spectacle than that which occurred on that occasion, when the hon. member for North Toronto and his friends were prepared, not only to enter into an arrangement similar to what this government has entered into, but to sacrifice the National Policy on the Washington altar—to make a much more extensive arrangement. These hon. gentlemen opposite, who shout of their loyalty from the housetops. The hon. member from North Toronto, speaking in this House in the session following his return from Washington, and reporting what had passed between Mr. Blaine and the delegates from Canada, stating that Mr. Blaine had said that a reciprocity

treaty would have no compensating advantages to the United States of America unless they were given preferential treatment in our markets, especially against Great Britain. Was my hon. friend as loyal then as he is to-day? Did he then rise in his seat and say: No, we shall not descriminate against Britain. No, he remained to see if it could not be worked out and here is what he reported:

Well, when that point was reached, we discussed the difficulties to be met by Canada in subscribing to a treaty of that kind, and they were fully and frankly laid before Mr. Blain. They were in brief these: First the $8,000,000 or so which we collected upon the products of the United States which came into Canada.

That was one of the greatest considerations—the loss of revenue. There was no objection on the ground that we were going to discriminate against Great Britain:

And secondly, the decrease, whatever it might be, which would result in the imports from the outside world owing to the competition and entrance of United States goods free of duty into our market.

Contrast that with the arrangement entered into by our ministers who were at Washington a few months ago—no treaty, no sacrifice of Canadian industries, no interference with the preferential tariff, no breaking of the tie that binds us to the mother country; and best of all, we are free to amend our tariff whenever we see fit.

If the hon. members in the year 1892 had come back to this country with an arrangement of this kind every Conservative would have exclaimed: What a magnificent agreement! But that has always been the policy of this country, and I am not aware than any hon. gentleman in this House has yet repudiated it. In the National Policy was inserted a clause providing that as soon as the United States were prepared to enter into an arrangement of this kind, the Canadian government were willing to do so. I find that the hon. member again in his speech in 1891 said:

Time and again Canada has made advances in a fair and honourable spirit for the resumption of the old or the negotiation of new relations upon some fair and equitable basis.

What more fair and equitable basis could one desire than the arrangement which has just been negotiated by the ministers of this government. If such an arrangement were a good thing in 1891, is there any reason why it should not be a good thing to-day?

The hon. gentleman who just preceded me (Mr. Hughes) talked a good deal about annexation, and no doubt there has been an annexation sentiment among some people in the United States for many years.

The leader of the opposition, a few weeks ago, referring to the United States, said:

They were a great and powerful and a rapidly growing nation, and it was said in 1854, and repeated in 1866 and afterwards, that the manifest destiny of this country was not only commercial but political union with the United States, and there were undoubtedly those in the United States who thought that.

That was the feeling of some people in the United States in 1854, that feeling also existed in 1866, and I suppose that as long as time lasts some people there will continue to entertain it. But I would ask my hon. friend if the sentiment in Canada to-day is any more in favour of annexation or if any one thinks that Canada is more likely to be annexed to the United States to-day than in 1854 and 1866?

Much has been said upon the loyalty question. In fact the greater portion of the speech of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Hughes) was on that line. But one has only to look back over the past 12 or 15 years to see what a hollow pretense that loyalty cry is. Look at the stand of the different parties in the different matters that have come before this House, and no unprejudiced observer will be long in coming to the conclusion that while the Conservative party shouts louder than the Liberal party, yet the Liberal party is always more ready to do something substantial. For instance, when the British preference was before this House, Sir Charles Tupper, then leader of the opposition said:

We should not give England any preference without receiving something in return.

Yet to-day these men shout loyalty just as they did in 1897. Let me read a few utterances made in the days when the British preference was under discussion in this House. Sir Charles Tupper was of the opinion that we should give nothing to Britain without receiving something in return. The Liberal party, however, believed that we should do something for Britain as she had been our good friend and had looked after our interests, and should not ask for anything in return. Sir Charles Tupper, speaking of the British preference, said:

We will now give you a substantial advantage of 25 per cent reduction on the general tariff of our country and give that if you will give us a small preference.

The Liberal party to-day, therefore, are more loyal than the party who are waving the flag, and in this connection I would again refer to the remarks of my hon. friend from E. Grey (Mr. Sproule). Speaking in 1897, he said:

We are charged here with a certain duty. That duty is to look after the interest of the

people of Canada. We are told that Britain is pleased with this concession. Why should she not? She gets from us a concession she never got before. She is reaching after the ideal of the Cobden club. Few governments have done for her what we have done. I do not wonder she is pleased, but we have no right to give away the rights of Canada without getting something in return. We as Canadians are willing to do our duty, but should not be called on to do more than our duty.

This is the loyal gentleman who will speak no doubt on this question if he has not already spoken on it. Again he said during that same session:

It will mean the throwing out of employment of hundreds of Canadian labourers and sending our money to feed labourers in England.

This is what this loyal gentleman had to say about the British preference. What a loyal gentleman is my hon. friend from East Grey when it cost him nothing. But should it affect his pocket, then his loyalty vanishes, like that of many hon. gentlemen opposite. If our loyalty is dependent on the amount of goods we sell to or buy from the mother country, where would we be to-day? One need only compare the figures of trade in the two countries in the past few years. Here are our sales to Great Britain and the United States respectively:

Canada sold to—

	U.S.	Britain,
1891—	$ 40,194,000	$ 49,280,000
1901—	59,962,000	105,328,000
1910—	110,614,000	149,630,000

Canada bought from—

	U.S.	Britain,
1891—	$ 57,994,000	$ 42,048,000
1901—	109,208,000	42,996,000
1910—	233,071,000	95,660,000

Total trade (including bullion)—

	U.S.	Britain,
1891—	$100,784,000	$ 91,357,000
1901—	185,591,000	148,493,000
1911—	352,221,000	245,313,000

That is, about fifty per cent more with the United States than with Great Britain. Will anybody argue that, because we have purchased more from the United States we are less loyal than in former years? If a free interchange of natural products means annexation in 1911, what did it mean in 1879, and for nearly twenty years thereafter when the Conservative party were willing to accept it? In the National Policy tariff Act of 1879, there was a clause dealing with all natural products, offering the United States reciprocity in natural products, including a great many more articles than are included in the list to-day. For instance flour, and all manufactures of wheat were included in the list. If it was loyal for that great statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1879, to insert that clause in his tariff Act, will somebody tell me why it is disloyal for the Liberal party to do the same thing to-day, or why they should be charged with being annexationists and traitors?

In the city of Montreal there has been quite an agitation worked up against the agreement. One of the newspapers taking the greatest part in this campaign is the Montreal 'Star.' In its issue of February 4, last, was a full page advertisement, which, among other things, said:

We will utterly shatter the costly steel framework of this nation and debase the Dominion to a string of subject provinces serving the convenience of the nearest American centres.

Now, if the capitalists of the old world thought that the business of the transcontinental railways were likely to be affected, we should immediately feel the effects upon the stock in the open market. But I find, on turning over the pages of this same issue of the Montreal 'Star,' that Canadian Pacific railway stock is going up by leaps and bounds, and that all other industrials are strong. Further, Sir Donald Mann, vice-president of the great system of the Canadian Northern, in an interview states that he does not think the trade east and west will be seriously affected. Again, I find by current reports that the Canadian Pacific railway are contemplating the spending of many millions of dollars this year. If the proposal now before this committee involved serious injury to the Canadian Pacific railway, is it likely that they would go on with this great expenditure? It does not seem to impede their development. I personally think that it will not injure the business of the Canadian Pacific railway, or any other transcontinental railway. I believe that the great increase in the farm products of the Northwest will be sufficient to keep them all going, notwithstanding that there may be a few million bushels shipped southward across the line.

The Montreal 'Star' further says:

Financiers of every European capital are watching our behaviour in the face of this sudden crisis. Are we going to keep faith with the men who invested their money in Canadian enterprises on the understanding that the development of Canada along national lines was a permanent feature of our policy; or, are we about to destroy the value of millions of these investments by a wanton act of betrayal, and close every market in the world against us for years to come? We have been borrowing money for decades on the pledge that we would keep Canada commercially and politically independent; and to repudiate that pledge is equivalent to repudiating our debts.

Opinion in Great Britain, which was nervous to begin with, has fallen into dismay.

I see nothing to indicate that the investors in Europe are likely to withdraw

their capital; I see nothing to indicate that the great industrial development which has been going on is likely to be stopped. On the contrary, larger and larger sums of European capital are being invested in Canada. The 'Star' goes on:

Thus every British subject looks to Sir Wilfrid to save the empire. Every money-market in Europe, every Canadian enterprise that needs capital, every public body which must borrow, all look to Sir Wilfrid to save the credit of Canada. Every railway man looks to him to save the souls of our railways.

There is an old saying that railways have no souls. I do not think their souls, if they have them, would be injured by this arrangement, nor will their business be injured by it. I think that when the 'Star' awakens from its trance, it will find that things are going on just the same as before. It says:

Down come our tall chimneys! Useless are our railways for the east and west haul! Abandoned are our ports! Empty are our canals!

Mr. Chairman, we have heard all this before. We heard it in 1896, before the election; we heard it in 1897, when the British preference was introduced; and from the same sources. But the tall chimneys are still standing, and the business of the transcontinental railways is greater than ever before, and likely to increase. The 'Star' also says:

Next, it implies the opening of our natural resources to the American exploiter. Our forests will soon fall before the American lumberman and paper-maker, as have their own. Our mines will be bled into the pockets of New York stock gamblers. We will be stripped as bare as their own forest lands.

If the removal of $1.25 a thousand of the American duty on lumber is going to destroy our forests and give our natural resources into the hands of Americans, I would like to understand how this result is to come about. The only result that I can see of the removal of this duty is that it will enhance the value of properties held by the Canadian people. Canadian forests, Canadian mines, and other properties will be enhanced in value.

To-day Sir Wilfrid has the ball at his feet. He is the one man to save the situation. The Canadian people never watched him so eagerly, so anxiously, as they are doing at this moment. Thousands of his best friends hope that he will see the true bearing of the tremendous issue which lies in his hands.

Thank goodness, Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been able to look a little further ahead than the editorial writer of the Montreal 'Star.' Thanks to the people of Canada, he still has their confidence, and I believe that when the ballots are counted after the next election some of the hon. gentlemen who are opposing this agreement most strenuously will no longer be found in their seats. Then it goes on:

He has lost powerful minister after powerful minister, and yet his prestige has remained unshaken. 'Masters of the Administration' have come and gone; and yet the real master is more powerful to-day than he has ever been in the past. The meaning of this is that he can at this moment take his own course on this reciprocity agreement without reference to what any colleague may say or any 'cave' of private members threaten.

If Sir Wilfrid Laurier is to-day strong in the affections of the people of Canada, it is because he has always had the courage of his convictions. I believe that in dealing with this matter he has endeavoured to do as he has always done in dealing with great issues. A great agitation has been worked up in the city of Montreal, and there is no question that there is something at the back of that agitation, something that requires money. An evidence of that is the fact that the Conservative organ in the city of Montreal refers to certain advertising matter as being paid for. The Ottawa 'Citizen,' in referring to that, says:

The Montreal 'Star,' in an appeal that cannot be construed as anything but hysterical, is calling upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier to 'save Canada.'

Now, those are significant remarks, coming from a paper friendly to the opposition, and I think they must make some hon. gentlemen opposite sit up and think when they contemplate the probable results of the next campaign. Much has been said about a resolution signed a few weeks ago by a number of Liberals in the city of Toronto. I think, perhaps, those gentlemen are sincere, but unfortunately for themselves they have been to a certain extent hoodwinked. I read over the reasons they assigned for asking that this agreement should be rejected, and in not one of those reasons do I find any statement that any manufacturing industry in this country is likely to be affected. The British flag is waved, the loyalty cry seems to be uppermost in their thoughts. Now, I would like to be able to ask these gentlemen three questions. First, how many of those men trade largely with the United States? Second, if the United States offered a favourable market for the products of the various firms they represent, would they sell to that market? Third, in buying and selling to the United States do they feel that there is any danger in their affection for the mother country being alienated? To the first I venture to say that every man would answer: We buy from and sell to our American neighbours as much as possible.

To the second they would answer: If the United States offered us a favourable market we would certainly trade with them. To the third, they would reply: Do you mean to insult us by insinuating that our affection for the mother country is measured by dollars and cents? Yet they seem to think that the farmers might be injured if they were permitted to sell their products more freely across the border. A number of resolutions have been adopted by boards of trade. Now, if we are afraid of the Americans swallowing us up, why do we welcome American capital and American ownership of everything that they choose to buy? Why do we have American directors in our banks, on our railway boards, and on many of our large corporations? Why do we employ American managers, clerks and operators? If there is danger to our Canadian nationalism is it not to be found in the entrance into Canada of men, money and enterprise, more than in our farmers selling them a few dollars worth more of their products. Mr. Flavelle, speaking on the resolutions adopted by the Toronto Board of Trade a few weeks ago, said:

> We wanted, Mr. Flavelle said, the opportunity to trade where we might; we must have friendly relations with our neighbours to the south, because we have so many things in common.

Well, if that is the case, if it is the wish of Mr. Flavelle, who is opposing this arrangement, to have the privilege of selling on the other side of the line, why does he raise any objection to this arrangement? And Mr. F. W. Hay, of Listowel, puts his case very clearly:

> If these gentlemen will tell you that we are still trading with the United States to a greater extent than with the mother country, they would be telling you the fact: for the $300,000,000 worth of business, transacted between this country and the United States, is much larger than the trade with Great Britain. It would be poor argument to say that getting more would endanger the nationhood of Canada.

Mr. Hay very properly sizes up the situation. Then we have another class of people in this country who say: Let well enough alone. There are some shrewd business men on the other side of the House, and I would like to ask them: If they adopted that policy in their business of letting well enough alone, how long would they remain in the race? How long would they be able to continue their business? I believe every man in this country who has any ambition, endeavours to expand his business, and do as much trading as possible, and why should different methods be adopted by this government? We are a rapidly-growing country, our output will be much larger in a few years; is it not wise, is it not prudent for the government to look forward to markets that will be of some use to the people of this country with its ever-increasing output?

We have heard about the industries of this country being ruined. It is the same old story, it has the same old ring as it had in 1897. I have noted the singular absence from the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite of the actual name of any industry that will be ruined by this arrangement. The only members who have made any attempt in this direction are the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). The hon. member for Brandon, speaking in the House a few days ago, said that the flour milling business of this country would be ruined, that the agreement would have a most disastrous effect upon that industry. The only thing I can say to my hon. friend is that I am slightly interested in a flour mill and from my knowledge of the flour milling business, if there is one industry in this country that should be able to compete with the world it is in that very industry. We have the best wheat, we have cheap railway facilities and we have cheap power. These things go to make it possible for us to compete with the world. Notwithstanding the disastrous effect which my hon. friend from Brandon says it is going to have upon the flour milling trade of this country, in the early part of the year we contemplate increasing our flour milling business. We have a mill with a capacity of 250 barrels a day and we propose this summer, notwithstanding the effect that this tariff will have upon it, increasing the capacity to 500 barrels. This is the best answer I can give to my hon. friend from Brandon.

We have only to go back to the remarks of some hon. gentlemen opposite in recent years to find that the cry to-day is just the same as it was when the British preference was introduced and when they prophesied that the great industries of this country would be stopped and that many things would happen. I would like to read to the House a few paragraphs from the speeches of some hon. gentlemen on that occasion. During the thirteen years of prosperity with which we have been blessed the country may perhaps have forgotten what these hon. gentlemen did say, but I want to recall these utterances so that the people will be able to compare them with the remarks that are being made by hon. gentlemen to-day. Sir Charles Tupper, speaking in this House in 1897 said:

> The result is that this tariff goes into operation, and the hon. gentleman knows that the industries of this country are already paralysed in consequence. While hon. mem-

bers gloat, vindictively gloat, over the destruction of Canadian industries, I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail, of those industries in the Montreal 'Gazette' where one manufacturer after another declared that their industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada.

These were the remarks of that hon. gentleman in 1897 and hon. gentlemen opposite are saying the same thing to-day. Again, Sir Charles Tupper said:

I feel that far from rejoicing at it from a party standpoint, I deplore from the bottom of my heart the ruin that is going to be inflicted upon the best interests of Canada upon its great industries. Still, I unhesitatingly say that from a party point of view the hon. gentlemen are doing our work.

They did not do it very satisfactorily for the then leader of the opposition:

They are showing the people of this country that no reliance can be placed upon the most solemn declarations that they make, either in the House or out of it; they are showing the people of this country that, having obtained power, which was all they wished for, they are now prepared to abuse that power at the cost of the sacrifice of the industries of Canada.

Notwithstanding the fact that the then leader of the opposition prophesied in that way, the government is still in power, things are still going on, business is increasing rapidly and the trade of this country has doubled and trebled. Now, I shall quote the remarks of some other hon. gentlemen. Mr. Bell, then member for Pictou, in speaking upon this question, said:

With the preferential clause in full operation, I think it is not open to doubt nearly all the industries built up in Canada by the National Policy will be destroyed. And if this be the result, a state of affairs will arise in this country that will not be one of progress. . . If the government, by such a tariff, destroy the industries built up under the old tariff, what are they going to give us in exchange for them? Nothing. There can be no question that this country will go backward. . . . Such a state of affairs is not pleasant to contemplate, and I would hope that the sober second thought of the government, by the time we meet again, will have induced them to reverse their policy and to go back to the main schedule and drop out of use this preferential clause.

These were the prophesies of another hon. member. I am sorry that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is not in his seat because I would like to read to him a few of his remarks upon that occasion. He said:

The government go so far as it is possible for them to go and grant this 25 per cent reduction, the industries of this country cannot be maintained in the face of that competition. Is it a light thing to disturb all the growing industries of the country, is it a light thing to disturb the young life and energy and capital and enterprise which have been at work for the last fifteen or twenty years building up these Canadian interests? . . . Is it right, is it fair, is it statesmanlike, to allow this young and growing industrial life and development to be hampered and shackled, if not totally destroyed, by the invoking of competition on the basis of a reduction of duties to the extent of 25 per cent? To diminish these revenues, so far as the imports go, by 25 per cent of the whole, which totally disarranges the financial basis, turns a surplus into a deficit or adds to a possible deficit many thousands of dollars, may be many millions of dollars.

Have we had many millions of deficits during the last fourteen years? We certainly have not. Again he says:

I say that once this is passed you will import a contingency, a doubt, and an uncertainty into the business which will make it impossible for prudent men to invest large capital in staple businesses, and will consequently derange for the worse the business and trade of this country.

I do not think that any gentleman opposite will venture to say that the business of Canada has been in the slightest degree deranged by that arrangement. After fourteen years experience hon. gentlemen opposite are willing to accept it and endorse it, and I believe when the present arrangement has been in effect for less than fourteen years hon. gentlemen opposite will be ready to laud it just as they are to-day lauding the fiscal arrangement which this government inaugurated in 1897 and which they then condemned. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) speaking on the same occasion, said:

I candidly believe that in time, and as the operation of that tariff becomes better known you will hear a very wide spread complaint against it.

Up to the present moment there has not been any very widespread complaint. Speaking during the same session, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) said:

I dont believe the government expect the tariff to go into force and I hope it will not by reason of the disadvantages that will accrue to Canada for they will be great indeed.

Notwithstanding all these prophecies of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Liberal tariff has not had the bad effect on business they expected it would, and I suppose to some extent they are disappointed in that. The Manufacturers' Association of Toronto should be able to voice the feeling of the

manufacturers of this country, and they have put themselves on record thus:

As manufacturers we have hesitated to express opinions on an agreement which in its present scope does not directly affect very many manufacturing industries.

If it does not affect many manufacturing industries, why is objection raised to it by hon. gentlemen opposite who claim to represent the manufacturers? The Kingston 'Standard,' a Conservative organ, speaking of the arrangement, says:

However the new tariff arrangements between Canada and the United States may be regarded by the special interests whose tariffs have been readjusted, whether the view be a friendly or unfriendly one, it seems to the 'Standard' that the opinion of the average layman will be that the readjustment will prove of decided benefit and advantage to Canada, and must work this country infinite good. One thing is certain, and that is that there has been no general sacrifice of Canadian interests, such as in some quarters had apparently been decided. Canada appears to have gotten a little the best of the deal, as a comparison of the reduction in the two tariffs will bear out—the greater reduction being made by the United States—and, indeed, as President Taft in his special message to Congress practically admits when he explains that 'if the Americans are to have friendly commercial relations with Canadians, an active aggressive and intelligent people, it will be necessary to meet Canada in a spirit of real concession.' Upon the whole, the new arrangement seems to be one that should prove beneficial and satisfactory to both sides—one that will help to perpetuate friendly relations between the two countries to the sacrifice of the real interests of neither.

That is quite an admission from a Conservative organ like the Kingston 'Standard.' Again it says:

As for annexation, we must not be deluded by that bugaboo.

I commend this to hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly to the hon. gentleman for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Hughes):

As for annexation, we must not be deluded by that bugaboo. Let us face the facts clearly. Supposing this agreement (which the alarmists say will bring about annexation because it will assure closer relations) should never go through. And let us suppose then—which is not improbable—that the States should decide that in any event it wants our wheat, our barley, our oats, our butter, &c., &c., and accordingly proceeds to take off the duties from these things while we stand pat. What follows, then, unless the very thing that now the 'Star' waxes hysterical about—a movement of our natural products to the south? There would be no stopping them—neither sentiment nor loyalty nor fear; for trade is trade and follows natural channels. Which is to say, in short, that if annexation is inevitable if we trade freely with the States, then the States holds us even now in the hollow of its hands, because there is nothing in the world to prevent the Americans taking off their duties on our raw products and foodstuffs at any time and enlarging our trade with them immeasurably.

The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, believing the time was opportune and realizing that the Americans might take down their tariff wall against us, endeavoured to get and succeeded in getting some advantage without practically giving anything in return, and so if anything has been gained by this agreement it is undoubtedly for the benefit of Canada. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto told us that this trade arrangement would injuriously affect the labouring classes in this country, but I take it that the trades and labour union of the city of Toronto is a better judge of this than is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and this is how that body views it:

That such a reciprocal arrangement, sanctioned by the governments of both countries, and yet not cast-iron in its effects upon Canada's policy, should meet with general approval, inasmuch as it is calculated to improve conditions of trade in Canada without offering any risk whatsoever of loss to our country.

Wherefore, it is resolved by this organization that its approval of the proposed reciprocity arrangement be placed on record and that the same be made known to the government and to the public of Canada.

The labour organizations in Montreal, in Toronto, and all over the country are approving of this arrangement and their approval is the best answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), in that respect. A few weeks ago in the city of Toronto very much was made of a public interview with that great captain of finance, Sir Edmund Walker. It seems to me, however, that his remarks were greatly minimized when he was compelled to state publicly that he spoke for himself personally, and not for the large financial institution of which he is the president. I am told, that it is not an uncommon thing for the bank which Sir Edmund Walker represents, in doing business in the United States, to loan large sums of money in the city of New York; but I suppose that it is all right, that there is no danger of his loyalty so long as he is permitted to do the trading and negotiating with the people across the border. I suppose it is all right for him to invest in the United States the savings of the farmers of this country, and I suppose it would be all right for him to sell their products if they would place them in his hands; but for them to sell their own products would, Sir Edmund thinks, endanger their loyalty. Mr. Larkin, of Toronto, puts the matter very clearly when he says:

Sir Edmund Walker has had a large experience in business in the republic to the south of us. Has he found that in his case it has created an annexationistic sentiment? Possibly it has, but his well-known imperialistic views enable him to overcome the feeling and thus he has been able to continue trading in the market which he finds most profitable.

Sir Edmund feels, however, that it would not be right to expose the farmer to temptation.

That is, he feels that while it is wise and profitable for him with his millions to trade in the United States, it would have a bad effect on the loyalty of the farmer if he were enabled to get five dollars more for a horse or five cents a bushel more for wheat a little south of where he now sells it.

Again, one of the Toronto papers, in referring to Sir Edmund's remarks, said:

Sir Edmund Walker is a firm believer in free trade in money. He is president of a bank that has important branches in the United States and that uses Canadian money to operate United States industries and carry on commercial transactions of great magnitude. Is he not afraid that free access to the American money market and the diversion there of some of Canada's surplus funds will hamper the developments of Canada's resources in her own way and by her own people? Or is it only surplus farm products the export of which will weaken the ties that bind Canada to the empire.

These are some of the comments on Sir Edmund Walker's remarks, and I think they size them up very correctly.

An attempt has been made to make political capital out of the remarks of the ex-president of the Canadian Pacific railway, Sir Wm. Van Horne. It is some satisfaction to know that those remarks have been to a certain extent repudiated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as the vice-president of that company says that no person has a right to speak for the company except the president, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy. Sir William Van Horne is another gentleman who thinks that it is all right for him to invest his money wherever he desires; but, like Sir Edmund Walker, he thinks that the farmer would be in danger if he were permitted to sell a few more dollars' worth of his products to the people across the border. A few weeks ago I listened to my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Harris), who, I believe honestly, opposed this arrangement. But I noticed that he spent the greater part of his speech in trying to show that the farmers were injured by this arrangement. He did not make any serious attempt to show that the manufacturers were affected by it. He gave four reasons for opposing it. The first was that the government had no mandate. I am sure that the Prime Minister has very clearly comfuted that argument. As has often been said, it was the policy of the Conservative party during their term in office, and I am sure that it has been the feeling of the people of this country, that whenever it would be possible for the government of Canada to enter into an arrangement of this kind with the United States, they were quite ready to endorse it, and they will, I believe, endorse this arrangement at the first opportunity. The hon. member for Brantford gave as his second reason, that parliament should have been consulted. Well, Sir, if he were in his seat to-night, I would be tempted to ask him, as a business man and a director of many companies, if the government did not negotiate this arrangement in exactly the same way that any business corporation would carry out any large transaction? First, the directors would meet and discuss the question, just as the cabinet met and discussed this question. The directors would delegate two or three directors to negotiate with the concern they were dealing with. If it was possible to make some progress, these delegates would come back and report to their directors. The arrangement would be ratified by the directors, just as this arrangement was ratified by the cabinet. It would then be placed before the shareholders and be ratified by them, just as parliament is asked to ratify this arrangement to-day. There has been no departure from good business principles in the carrying out of this agreement. The third reason given by the hon. member for Brantford was that there should be no alteration in the tariff without a thorough investigation. For 40 years an arrangement such as this has been the wish of our people, so that it is nothing new and, therefore, I do not see how it can be described as a radical change in our policy It is a consummation such as has been looked forward to for many years. We are now told, however, that it hurts the pride of Canadians. Could anything be more childish? Will you tell me that because the government are extending every possible avenue of business, that is going to injure our pride? No business man would look upon it in that light but would regard such a suggestion as eminently absurd.

The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) said he could not see that any good was going to come to our farmers by this arrangement, but even if it did it would be carried out at too great a cost. I would ask at too high a cost to what interests in this country? Not to the manufacturer, because the Montreal 'Star,' which is the mouthpiece of the Manufacturers' Association, admits that they are not injured in the slightest degree. What people are there to whom this arrangement will cost too much? The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) also said that he would be in favour of free trade within the British Em-

pire. Well, I have heard hon. gentlemen on this side declare their faith in free trade, but I must say that I do not believe free trade at all advisable in this country. It is utterly impossible for our Canadian manufacturers to compete in the open markets of the world so long as conditions remain as they are in the United States. In England the wages paid are only about 50 or 60 per cent of what we pay in Canada. At present we are bringing out some men from England to work in our industry. These men in England are receiving from $8 to $10 per week, but out here they will be paid $18 per week. If, however, we had to compete in the markets of the world, the first thing we would do would be to lower our schedule of wages. What would that mean? It would mean that these men who are now getting $18 a week out here would have to take $8 a week as they do in England. That, however, is not practicable in this country and will not be so long as we have 4,000 miles of line stretching along the United States, and so long as the Americans are paying the wages they do to-day. The only way in which we can keep our men is by paying them an equal wage to what they would get across the line. Just as soon as we would suggest the reducing of their wages, they would put on their hats and walk across the border where they could earn more money. I do not believe, however, that the government has any intention of establishing free trade. At least I hope not.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), in debating this question, said:

> This agreement presented to us in this unexpected manner, which has not been discussed by us, and our electors, comes to us with startling suddenness after 40 years of complete isolation from our great neighbours.

I cannot quite understand how my hon. friend arrives at the conclusion that we are completely isolated. We buy to-day almost from the United States as much as from all the other countries put together. Surely that is not isolation. But like many others, my hon. friend believes that to increase our trade is likely to interfere with our Canadian nationalism. Again he said:

> We have created considerable industries, and upon the principles which lie at the basis of that fiscal policy those industries have grown until large and practically vested interests have been created.

But there is nothing in this agreement which is going, in the slightest way, to interfere with the continued growth of those industries. A few years ago, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), made a tour through the Northwest, and I am told that at some of the meetings he attended there were large banners drawn across the platform bearing the words 'reciprocity with the United States.' I would like to ask my hon. friend if in speaking from those platforms, he repudiated or denounced those banners. To-day he is denouncing this reciprocal arrangement. In like manner he formerly denounced the British preference which now he pronounces quite satisfactory. And no doubt in a few years he will be ready to laud the arrangement we are now entering into. It is beyond question that protection has for years been the watch word of the Conservative party, but that party never shut out reciprocity in natural products until to-day, and reciprocity would be quite acceptable to them if it could be secured without bringing fresh prestige to the Liberal party. Any benefit to Canada they could approve except benefit which implies advantages to the Liberal party. That benefit they view in another light. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said:

> One would have thought that the present was an especially inopportune time to take up tariff negotiations with the United States.

In that I differ with the hon. gentleman. The most opportune time to do business with a foreign country is when that country is most anxious to do business with us, and for that reason the time chosen was most opportune. He further states, in referring to the growth and development of large interests:

> Will you tell me we have not a right to be absolutely satisfied with the material progress, splendid, world wide in its reputation which has come to the people of Canada.

We are perfectly satisfied with the great development brought about during the last fifteen years; but is there anybody in this country who will say that because there has been a development we are now to sit still. Development has taken place, but only because the government has always been ready, and anxious to do something which would help the prosperity of this country. And for that reason, I say, we should not be satisfied with conditions as they are to-day. He further said:

> If, in the future, the trade of this country is to flow north and south, instead of east and west, what is the meaning of all these sacrifices that have been made, of all this treasure that we have poured out? What is the meaning of the Transcontinental railway, as it is being built to-day? What is the meaning of the Georgian Bay canal, as we propose it to-day? What is the meaning of the proposed enlargement of the Welland canal? Have these any real national meaning to the people of Canada if the lines of our trade and commerce are to be diverted, so that in the future they will run north and south, instead of east and west as they have been doing?

I do not believe there will be the slightest loss of business. I believe that the

transcontinental roads will have as much to carry in the future as they have had in the past. I believe that in place of 100,000,000 bushels, we shall have, in a few years, 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 bushels, and that the railways will be taxed to their utmost capacity by the trade. The Georgian Bay canal, I hope, will be built by that time, but besides all, we may have a few bushels of wheat to sell to our American neighbours. He says also:

In 1910 Great Britain took, of our animals and their products, $42,000,000 out of $54,000,000 which we exported, equal to 77 per cent. Of our agricultural products, she took $71,000,000 out of $91,000,000, equal to nearly 80 per cent.

And I believe that England will still continue to take a large portion of our output. And as long as England is able to pay the same price as the United States, I believe England will get what we have to sell. If a business man has had a customer for years, and that customer is able to pay the same prices as a new customer who offers, is that business man likely to turn aside from the old customer? As long as England can pay as high a price as the United States can pay, it will get the goods of this country. And I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite expect to have things on any other basis. Again he says:

Well, we did ask for reciprocity, and we asked for it on many an occasion. It is perfectly true that Sir John Macdonald, in making his argument for the National Policy in 1878, before conditions had changed as they have in the past 30 years.

Well, Sir, the whole thing seems to be that it was quite acceptable, it was quite all right for the Conservative party to negotiate an arrangement of this kind, but it is a great risk for the government of this day to do it. I cannot, for the life of me, see why that distinction should be made. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, speaking of our trade and commerce, said: 'What we have we'll hold.' That is a very good motto. But the Minister Finance (Mr. Fielding) believes in going a little further, for he said: 'The trade we have we will hold, and we will look for more.' And that, I believe, is a good policy for this country. The leader of the opposition quoted the remarks of Mr. Beveridge, of the United States—and I must say these remarks do not in any degree discredit the arrangement entered into by the Minister of Finance:

We should admit Canadian wood pulp and Canadian paper free in return for Canada's admitting our agricultural implements, our engines, pumps and other machinery free. We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada freely admitting other American manufacturing products to Canadian markets.

I am sure that Mr. Beveridge would like to have seen that kind of an arrangement entered into with Canada, but, thank goodness, we had two gentlemen looking after our interests at Washington who were quite capable of doing it. And, as a result of that, few manufactured articles will be permitted to enter this country on a free basis. The leader of the opposition said:

We should have a fiscal policy that aims at the development of our own country, at the employment of our own labour, at the increase of our own population, at the utilization of our resources.

That has been the aim of this government since they came into power, and no better evidence of that could be given than the rapid development of our country industrially, and the great increase of our trade. The hon. gentleman further states:

My idea of a tariff is one which would give the industries of this country a fair chance.

I believe the tariff of the day gives the industries of this country a fair chance to operate. Perhaps a few slight changes might be beneficial, but it is impossible to have a perfect tariff. The hon. gentleman says further:

We have begun a great work in this country. Two great races whose mother tongues are spoken in this parliament came into the inheritance of this great country under the providence of God.

No person who has ever lived in Canada has done more to unite the two races into one happy people than the present leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). His ambition has been to unite all diverse elements, and in many ways he has shown his master hand in this work of bringing harmony between the east and the west. There is no person but will admit that in the provinces in the west there is a strong feeling for free trade, while the people of the east are for protection. To bring together these two elements, to come to some arrangement satisfactory to both east and west, is something, I believe, which is accomplished by the Prime Minister in this case. He is giving something to the people of the west without injuring the producers of the east. It is a great accomplishment, and I am sure it will stand as a masterwork of the Prime Minister long after he has passed from the scene.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has gone out of his way to refer to the gentlemen who negotiated the agreement and some of the other members of the cabinet as being not very extraordinary and not very well informed men. It is true

perhaps that the hon. gentlemen he has referred to have not had the same experience in financial matters as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but we on this side of the House thank God for that. During this debate the hon. gentleman stated:

In 1891 the Liberal-Conservative party made its last endeavour for reciprocity with the United States of America, and after the negotiations were ended and we returned home to Canada, the Liberal-Conservative party declared itself as done with reciprocity from the United States of America.

It has been shown on many occasions during this debate that these gentlemen made several trips after that. Again, speaking during this debate, he said:

There was quick sale, easy sale, no glut in the markets, no lying in our bins and cellars, no rotting in our fields.

If I am any judge of what is likely to follow it is there will be quicker sale and more markets.

Further on he said:

Death is repulsive in every form, none the less so in its political forms.

I am sure the hon. member for North Toronto realizes that perhaps more than any one else, and when the people of this country have an opportunity to pronounce on this issue, my hon. friend will fall into a political trance from which he will not awaken until some years after this agreement has been in successful operation. Further on he says:

It is that the United States of America covets the rich natural resources of the Dominion of Canada.

I fail to see how the people of the United States, if this agreement comes into force, will have any more claims upon our natural products, upon our forests and our mineral wealth, than they have to-day. I believe it will increase their wealth, but they will have no more claim upon our resources than they had in former years. In drawing a comparison, the hon. member for North Toronto said:

Let a man with $8,000 go into business with a man with $100,000, and who manages that business?

Well, I do not believe that is the case here, there has been no partnership entered into. I think the hon. member for North Toronto would have made a more accurate comparison if he had said that two men were entering into business, one with a capital of $8,000, and the other with a capital of $100,000, one on Bank street and the other on Sparks street, but each man would have full control of his own business. So in this arrangement, the people of Canada have still control of their tariff and the Americans have control of theirs, and they do not control our tariff any more than they did in former years. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

But it does not follow that, because you are friendly with your neighbour and are doing each other good turns, you should give him half or three quarters of your house and install him in it. Neither does it follow that because we want to be on good terms with the United States we are to hand them over our rich possessions.

Well, I fail to see where the Canadian people have given the United States three-quarters of their house, or any of their possessions. They are still in exactly the same position as they were before this arrangement was made, except that they are in a better position to do business with the people to the south of us. He placed before the House a long list of articles on which he claimed the British preference had been reduced. But I noticed that nearly all the articles in that list which have been affected by this arrangement, have been only slightly affected, and that Great Britain has still a decided advantage. On all the larger imports there is still a substantial preference. We have heard some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who, in discussing the reference in the speech from the Throne to this matter, placed themselves on record rather prematurely. The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) referred to it, and was quite satisfied. He said:

Why, of course, we would hold up both hands for that. But does anybody suppose for a moment that our American friends, the shrewdest, keenest business men in the world, came to Canada merely to discuss measurements by which the products of Canada would be admitted into the United States on satisfactory terms to Canada? . . . . Everybody will hold up both hands for any arrangement to enable us to send our goods on satisfactory terms to the United States, but whether or not we shall agree to let their goods in here is another story.

The manufactured articles the hon. member referred to have not been admitted free into this country. It will be interesting to note, when the time comes to vote, if that hon. gentleman will still stand by the remarks he made so early in the session. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) also had this to say:

Personally, I would favour reciprocity if I thought we could get a fair deal.

Those are strong words. If he thinks the deal has been fair, and I am sure that any honest thinking man will admit that it is a good arrangement, I wonder how the member for East Huron will vote when the time comes. I cannot understand how he can go back on those words. Let me say in conclusion, that I hope the day is not far distant when men in this country will

cease to drag the good old British flag in the political gutter. I hope that some of the hon. members on the other side of the House will have the courage of their convictions, and if they vote as they believe, the majority in favour of this resolution will be a large one.

On motion of Mr. Sexsmith the committee rose, and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.07 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 12, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

VERDICT OF A MONTREAL JURY.

*Mr. HUGHES :

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to, or has any member thereof observed, the report of the action of the jury in the case recently tried in Montreal, where a man charged with assaulting another and stealing from him certain Masonic property, was by the jury declared not guilty, in response to an alleged fanatical appeal to creed passions on the part of the prisoner's solicitor, although the prisoner admitted his guilt and the judge strongly charged against him?

2. Has the Minister of Justice or his department received any report on the case from the presiding judge?

3. Does the government purpose taking steps in this case to have justice vindicated and to have the jurymen prosecuted for violation of their oath of office?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. Not otherwise than by the question and by references in the newspapers.

2. No.

3. The matter is not within the authority of the Dominion government, as by the British North America Act everything relating to the administration of justice in the provinces is assigned to the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures and authorities.

MARRIAGE LAWS.

*Mr. HUGHES :

1. Is the government or any member thereof aware that the Hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church and the courts of Quebec province are said to decline to recognize as valid a marriage between a Roman Catholic man and a Roman Catholic woman if solemnized by other than an ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic Church?

2. Is the government or any member thereof aware that as alleged, ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church declare invalid marriages solemnized between a Roman Catholic and one of another faith throughout the Dominion of Canada, unless the ceremony be performed by an ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic Church?

3. Under the British North America Act, section , does not marriage come under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada?

4. Is it the intention of the government to enact legislation which throughout Canada will make a marriage legal in any and every province if performed between persons of the same creed or faith, or of different creeds or faith, in any province by any official or officials recognized for such purpose in any other province; in short, to enact a Dominion of Canada marriage law which will accept for every part of Canada, and make lawful in every province a marriage consummated under the law or form of any province?

5. Is it the intention of the government to make it a criminal offence, and to prescribe punishment, for any person, ecclesiastic or other, who intrudes or promulgates or publishes, or declares any rule or dogma of any ecclesiastical organization casting doubt upon or declaring invalid or in any sense reflecting on the legality of a marriage performed by any official recognized as entitled to perform a marriage ceremony, or setting up any such ecclesiastical dogma or rule as overriding the law of Canada?

6. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to declare valid a marriage solemnized in Quebec or in any province of Canada between two persons of the Roman Catholic faith, providing the officiating clergyman be a Protestant, and for the removal of doubt to make the law retroactive?

7. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to permit any ecclesiastical dogma or rule to override the laws of the people of Canada?

8. Is it the intention of the government of Canada to restore to legitimacy every woman who supposed her marriage legally consummated and also the children born of such marriage?

9. Will the government enact legislation compelling alimony to the woman where the man has left her under the ecclesiastical dogma of any church?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1 and 2. Neither the government nor any department of the government has any knowledge in relation to the matters referred to in these questions other than such as may be gathered from newspaper articles or references to the subject.

3. Under the British North America Act the subject of marriage and divorce is one in regard to which parliament may legislate, but everything relating to the solemnization of marriage in the provinces is within the exclusive powers of the provincial legislatures.

As to the remaining questions, other than

question No. 7. Legislation of the character indicated in the questions would appear to refer wholly to the persons by whom, or the form of the ceremony by which, marriages in any province could be validly solemnized, and in that view such legislation would seem not competent for the parliament of Canada to enact.

Legislation such as is indicated in questions 8 and 9 would seem also to relate to property and civil rights in the province, and on that ground as well to be matter for the exclusive consideration of the provincial authorities.

7. The government is not acquainted with any law of the people of Canada which has been overriden by any ecclesiastical dogma.

COAL CONSUMPTION ON CRUISERS.

*Mr. MONK:

1. What amount of coal per day is required for the cruiser 'Niobe' when cruising?
2. What amount of coal per day is required for said cruiser when in port?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. About 108 tons.
2. About 9½ tons.

SPEED, &c., OF THE 'NIOBE' AND 'RAINBOW.'

*Mr. MONK:

1. What were the results of the official trials of the 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' as regards speed attained, indicated horse-power developed, and coal consumed, specifying the different results at low power, cruising power and full power?
2. What provision of coal are the 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' capable of receiving, respectively?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1.

'Niobe'	Low Power.	Cruising Power.	Full Power.
Speed..	10 knots.	12 knots.	20.5 knots.
Horse-power ..	1,800	3,300	16,500
Coal expended per hour.. ..	2.8 tons.	4.5 tons.	17.75 tons.
'Rainbow.'			
Speed..	*	11.6 knots.	18.2 knots.
Horse-power* ..	*	1,400	7,085
Coal expended per hour.. ..	*	1.9 tons	*

* Not on record.

2. 'Niobe,' 2,005 tons.
'Rainbow,' 570 tons.

COST OF GUN PRACTICE, &c., ON CRUISERS.

*Mr. MONK:

1. Is the estimated approximate cost per day, 'Niobe,' $1,726, 'Rainbow,' $809, 'Hansard,' page 5748, March 20, 1911, calculated for their full complement or for their present nucleus crew?
2. What is the estimated cost in detail for full complement and reserve?
3. What is the cost of gun practice?
4. What is the cost of each round of ammunition fired from six-inch guns?
5. What is the cost of each round fired from four-inch guns and from the Light Artillery?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1 and 2. Figures given include pay of training crew and recruits; expenses for board, clothing, fuel, gun-fire, repairs, &c.

3. Total estimated annual cost $32,000.

4 and 5. Approximate cost of one round: 6-in. $90 to $21; 4:7 $23 to $11; 12 pdr. 12 cwt. $8 to $5; 12 pdr. 8 cwt. $7 to $4; 6 pdr. $4 to $3; 3 pdr. $3. Depending in each case on the type of projectile used.

POSTMASTER A. C. MIQUELON.

Mr. AMES:

1. Is Mr. A. C. Miquelon, at present postmaster at Chemin Gouin, in receipt of a pension as retired assistant postmaster at Sherbrooke? If so, what is the amount of his pension?
2. Is it in accordance with the rules of the department that a postmaster should draw a salary and a pension at the same time?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Yes; he is in receipt of a superannuation allowance of $528 per annum.
2. The Superannuation Act does not prohibit persons who have from any reason been superannuated from undertaking the duties of a rural postmaster.

WADDINGTON POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. BRODER (Dundas). Has the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) yet received a report from his officials as to the effect of the proposed power development at Waddington, New York, on the navigation of the St. Lawrence river?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some weeks ago when the Long Sault Power Development was under discussion I asked my chief engineer to get me some information with respect to that, and also with respect to the development at Waddington, on the point as to whether it would effect our canals on either side. I will have the report made ready and bring it down as soon as possible.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCITY AND THE TARIFF.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a question in regard to any further fiscal changes during the present session.

More or less has been said about the British preference since the day on which the Minister of Finance introduced the reciprocity proposals. The effect of these proposals so far as the British preference is concerned has been summed up by a non-official British authority in the following terms:

1. The entire removal of the preference on British goods of which Canada imported nearly $3,500,000 worth in 1909-10.

2. Reduction of the margin of British preference on other British goods, of which Canada imported more than $2,000,000 worth in 1909-10.

3. The extension to favoured nation countries of the reduced Canadian rates on United States products.

4. The preference which Canadian products will enjoy over those of the United Kingdom in the United States market. Imports of this class from the United Kingdom amounted in 1908-9 to nearly $15,000,000.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, foreshadowed some impending tariff changes when he spoke in this House on the 26th of January last. He said this:

I think that if this arrangement be confirmed, it would probably lead to some readjustment of our tariff here and there, in order that we may maintain, as we fully intend to do, the principle of the British preference and that the concessions under the tariff now existing may be maintained under the condition of affairs when this arrangement is made.

After some questions from my hon. friend from North Toronto and myself, the Minister of Finance said further on:

If this arrangement be confirmed, it would probably necessitate some readjustment of the rates in our tariff laws generally with a view to the maintenance of the preference at whatever rate we may see fit to make.

I intend to place these statements before the House without any comment, and I am doing so purely for the purpose of inviting the attention of the government thereto, in order that they may give an answer to the question which I propose to put to them at the conclusion of my observations. On the 8th day of February last, the Minister of Finance sent to the High Commissioner for Canada, Lord Strathcona, a telegram, the concluding paragraph of which was as follows:

It appears to be assumed in some quarters that the tariff rates agreed upon discriminate in favour of the United States against Great Britain. There is no foundation for this. In every case, Great Britain will still have the same rate or a lower one. Canada's right to deal with the British preference as she pleases remains untouched by the agreement. The adoption of the agreement will probably lead to some further revision of the Canadian tariff, in which the Canadian parliament will be entirely free to fix the British preference tariff at any rates that may be deemed proper. You are free to use this any way you think best.

On the second day of March the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, (Mr. Carvell), spoke in this House upon the reciprocity proposals. He is a gentleman who occupies a very prominent position among the supporters of the government, and hon. gentlemen will attach some importance to his observations, and his declaration of policy, when they recall the fact that for some time it was an entirely open question as to whether he should fill the position of Minister of Public Works in place of the hon. gentleman who now occupies that position. This is what he said:

I can assure the government that there is no way in which they can more ingratiate themselves with the people of Canada or do more good to the people of Canada than to bring down before this parliament adjourns a measure increasing the British preference to at least 40 per cent.

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was inspired when he made that observation, or whether he made it purely of his own motion; but inasmuch as it was followed up by a resolution in the legislature of New Brunswick, I think the coincidence merits some attention and makes it desirable that we should have a clear statement of the intention of the government in that regard. In the legislature of New Brunswick the leader of the opposition, the Hon. Mr. Robinson, who occupied the position of Prime Minister of New Brunswick before the defeat of his government about three years ago, moved an amendment on going into Committee of Supply on the 4th of April instant, in these terms:

Resolved that this House desires to take early opportunity of expressing its opinion that the ratification of reciprocity agreement now before parliament would greatly promote the prosperity of the people of this province, and,

Further resolved that it is desirable that there should be an increase in British preference to fifty per cent of the general tariff.

There has always been a close working agreement between the Liberal party of the province of New Brunswick in provincial affairs and this government, and it can hardly be believed that that resolution was moved in the legislature of New Brunswick for any other purpose than to test public opinion and as foreshadowing some further fiscal changes during the present session. On the other hand, there are some observations pointing to a contrary conclusion. I think it is only fair and just to our hon. friends on the other side of the House that I should bring these matters to the attention of the House at the same time, in order that we may endeavour to get some

idea of what the intention of the government may be. My hon. friend from North Oxford, on the 3rd day of March last, as reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of March 4, said this:

He could not see that manufacturers would be touched very much, as few articles manufactured in Canada were affected. He was sure the Bain and Woodstock Wagon Companies would compete in the world's markets even with 2½ per cent reduction in the tariff. He thought the manufacturers opposed reciprocity because of what might follow, the 'thin end of the wedge,' but he had been assured by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding that nothing of the sort would follow. They had gone as far in the farmers' interests as they would.

It would be foolish for us to think of tinkering with the tariff or putting it on an unstable basis. Therefore, the present government, in his view, would not tinker any more with it unless to make some minor adjustments.

The Prime Minister, when that utterance was called to his attention, in this House on the 17th day of March, said this with regard thereto:

The statement made by the honourable member for North Oxford was quite consistent with our policy, it was nothing new, and he had perfect authority, not only he but every member of the Liberal side, to make that statement.

Then, our attention has been called to a telegram from the Prime Minister under date of about the 20th of March, addressed to Mr. T. C. Robinette, of Toronto. It was published in the 'Globe' under date of the 21st of March, and reads as follows:

We have not hurt the manufacturers, and we will not do so. We have benefited the farmer and the consumer. When the time comes we will sweep the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Then in conclusion I desire to recall certain resolutions which have been alluded to more than once in this House—resolutions that have been passed by various branches of the Grain Growers' Association in the prairie provinces. These resolutions are all very much in the same form. A typical one is in the following words:

1. That the reciprocity agreement before the House of Commons be ratified during the present session.
2. That agricultural implements be placed on the free list during the present session.
3. That the British preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff at the present session.

It is to the last clause, clause No. 3, that I would more particularly direct attention. In view of all these utterances, which more or less directly touch the question of increasing the British preference, it was with some surprise that a great many members of this House noticed the entire absence of any reference to the British preference in the Budget speech of my hon. friend the Finance Minister. There was absolutely not a single word on that subject in that speech, and no indication as to what the policy of the government is likely to be. On the 26th of January, and in the subsequent telegram addressed to Lord Strathcona by the Finance Minister, there was a distinct intimation that tariff changes would be necessary, and that those changes would be made in order to maintain and preserve the British preference. Therefore, I think that I am not asking any more than is reasonable, or any more than the House is entitled to know when I venture to ask whether it is the intention of the government to increase the British preference during this present session, and if so to what extent; and also whether or not it is the intention of the government, in view of the reciprocity proposals now pending before parliament, to introduce any further tariff changes of any character whatever during this session, and more particularly with respect to the British preference.

Mr. NESBITT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly, two if you like.

Mr. NESBITT. Are you in favour of increasing the British preference?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I shall tell my hon. friend this, that when we come to occupy the treasury benches we shall give a very much clearer statement on that point than we are likely to have this afternoon from his friends who are sitting there now.

Mr. FIELDING. The intimation from my hon. friend that he is not obliged to make any statement of his policy on the class of questions to which he refers until he reaches the seat of government will be a very interesting one for the people of this country, who have sometimes had it in their minds that gentlemen who discuss these public matters should not be content simply to criticise but should have a policy of their own, and not hesitate to state it. If they criticise the policy of the government while carefully avoiding having any of their own, if an hon. gentleman occupying one seat on that side says I am in favour of such a policy, and another occupying the neighbouring seat says I am opposed to that, and in favour of one exactly the reverse, the general public will probably come to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen oppposite are not very united in these matters.

However, I have no objection to answer the question put by my hon. friend. In the course of the discussion on the recipro-

city agreement now submitted to this House, it was indicated by various speakers and writers that the government had taken a step which would prevent them ever dealing with the question of British preference in any way they might desire. It was in particular indicated, perhaps more in England than in Canada that the tariff reform movement in England—as to the merits of which I desire to offer no opinion—was likely at no distant date to lead the British government and people to offer a preference to Canada, but that this arrangement would prevent the Canadian government and people from accepting such an offer. In consequence of such comments I have on several occasions emphasized the fact that there is nothing in this agreement which will prevent the people of Canada at any time making any changes whatever that they may desire in their tariff policy, and that if at any time they desire to give the British people a larger preference than now, there is absolutely nothing in this reciprocity agreement to prevent the Canadian government and parliament from doing so. That touches one point of my hon. friend's question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not ask any question about that.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, my hon. friend quoted from the telegram I sent to Lord Strathcona in which I emphasized that particular thing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I dare say, but I did not ask any question about that at the conclusion of my remarks. I simply asked whether or not it is the intention of the government to introduce the tariff changes foreshadowed by my friend in his speech, and in that telegram.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree that tariff changes were foreshadowed in my speech. What I said in my telegram was that Canada had maintained her absolute freedom and right to make changes in her tariff at any time she desired. But I want to answer my hon. friend's question clearly and distinctly. My telegram to Lord Strathcona said that upon the adoption of the reciprocity proposal it might be necessary to make some further changes. I can repeat these words to-day. It may be necessary, on the completion of the reciprocity agreement, to make some changes in order to be in harmony with the British preference; but let me say at once that if such changes be made, they will be on small matters, they will not be important, and they will not include an increase in the British preference to 50 per cent.

We are well aware that the farmers of the west, in their resolutions, have not only asked for a reciprocity agreement, but have also asked for other things. They have asked for free agricultural implements, but we have told them frankly that we cannot comply with their request. They have asked us to increase the British preference to 50 per cent. We tell them that at the present we do not think that should be done. I may say frankly that we do not think that should be done. I may say frankly that we do not think the manufacturing industries of Canada could be successfully carried on if that reduction in their protection were made. We say to the people all over Canada who would like a larger measure of tariff reduction on agricultural implements and other things, that we are not able to meet that wish, that by this reciprocity agreement we are meeting to a large extent their demands, and we are going to ask that we be not pressed to grant free agricultural implements, and an increase in the British preference to 50 per cent, because to grant these would have a disturbing influence on the trade of Canada, whereas the reciprocity agreement will not create any disturbing influence, but on the contrary will have a good effect, and be accepted by the country generally as something which will work for the general advantage of Canada.

GOVERNMENT BUOYS.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) if there is any truth in this statement published in the Montreal 'Star':

Why Government Buoys?

One of the government channel buoys is not, one would suppose, a thing which would commend itself to the people who 'covet' commodities in the government stores or on the government wharfs. A buoy is too large to be of value as a drawing-room ornament and too clumsy to be of use as a hitching post. To break it up and sell it for scrap requires more effort than those who help themselves from the official supplies are usually willing to make, and there is no money in anchoring it in the river and using it for target practice.

Nevertheless government buoys have been disappearing from the wharf at Sorel, where the Department of Marine and Fisheries was supposed to have them stored safely for use in the St. Lawrence when navigation opens, where they discharge an important function. As is the invariable and commendable custom of this department, there have been secret inquires and investigations into the occurrence. This tends to allay public excitement, it affords subordinate officials a chance to show their zeal, and it rarely incommodes any one seriously; the Marine and Fisheries staff is becoming quite expert in them. On the present occasion, we are tempted to urge the department to let the public have a share in the fun. A man who would steal a government buoy must have either his acquisitiveness or his humor developed to an extraordinary extent, even the officials who did not discover him doing it ought to be worth attention in a department noted for strange occurrences.

I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) if some buoys have disappeared from the wharf at Sorel, and if so, how many? If this property has disappeared, has an investigation been made into the matter, or, if not, is it the intention to have an investigation to ascertain who the guilty parties are?

Mr. BRODEUR. During an investigation that is now being carried on in Sorel, it was reported to the officers who are conducting the investigation that some buoys had been removed from the wharf—old buoys which were not to be used, because a wood buoy, after a couple of years, is absolutely of no use. We ordered the officers immediately to investigate the situation. I have not received any further report on the subject.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. OWEN. I see it stated in the daily newspapers that census commissioners have been appointed to the number of 220, and that it is going to cost this country $1,000,000 to take the census this year. That is a vast amount of money, and I trust the census will be taken as accurately as possible. I have noticed the statement in the daily press, and credited to a very prominent gentleman now residing in the western part of Ontario, who, ten years ago when the last census was taken, was a resident of Ottawa and in very close touch with the province of Quebec, that the census returns of the province of Quebec in the last census were stuffed. And I have never seen that statement contradicted. I do not say that the statement is true. If it is not true, it is a slur on the good name of the province of Quebec, and if it is true, it is very unfair to the other provinces whose representation is fixed according to the population of the province of Quebec. Therefore, I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) What are the qualifications necessary for a census commissioner? Or, are any qualifications considered at all? What qualifications are considered necessary for a census enumerator and a census sub-enumerator? I would like to know whether these officers are appointed on account of their past services to the party or whether their ability to fulfil the duties of enumerators and sub-enumerators is taken into consideration?

Mr. FISHER. In answering, let me begin with the last question and then deal with the point which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Owen) first brought up. The census commissioners are chosen from among men who are well informed in regard to the electoral district for which they are severally appointed and which form the census divisions.

Mr. OWEN. On whose recommendation, may I ask?

Mr. FISHER. On recommendations that I discover as best I can, either personal knowledge or the recommendation of people in whose judgement I have confidence. The census commissioner must be a man of education and of standing in the community and familiar with the locality for which he is commissioned. The duties of the census commissioner are to supervise the taking of the census in the division. He has to receive the instructions from the department and to give those instructions to the enumerators; to see that the enumerators do their duty, to revise the schedules of the enumerators, and to make the returns to the department. These gentlemen are now all appointed. Their appointment is by order in council. The enumerators are appointed by ministerial order and are chosen, as much as possible, from the localities in which they are to make their enumeration.

Mr. OWEN. How are they chosen?

Mr. FISHER. They are chosen by the minister and appointed by the minister. They must be men of sufficient education to understand the instructions and to carry them out, to fill up the schedules correctly and promptly. Their duty is to go from house to house and to make an enumeration, that is to give the names, ages, occupations, &c., of the individuals in the districts for which they are appointed enumerators. Roughly speaking one enumerator is appointed for an area about the size of a polling division—sometimes a little more, sometimes a little less; but, in a general way, there will be an enumerator for each polling subdivision. Now, a word in regard to—

Mr. FOSTER. Just before the minister leaves that point,—in what month will the enumeration of population take place?

Mr. FISHER. On the 1st of June.

Mr. FOSTER. That takes how long?

Mr. FISHER. The instructions are that it must be done within three weeks, and we hope it will be practically done in that time.

Mr. FOSTER. And the tabulations will be——?

Mr. FISHER——will be commenced as soon as the schedules come in.

Mr. FOSTER. And finished, when?

Mr. FISHER. We hope to have them finished before the end of October. The enumerators, I hope, will get through their work in less than three weeks. Their schedules will have to be revised by the commissioners of the census districts, when

they will be forwarded to Ottawa. As soon as they arrive, they will be taken in hand by the compilation clerks in the office, and the compilation will commence,—we do not wait for all the schedules to come in before the compilation begins. The work of compilation will proceed as rapidly as possible, the first being simply that of numbers,—everything else will be left in abeyance until that has been accomplished.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that, years ago, that used to be accomplished by the 1st of September.

Mr. FISHER. But the census was taken on the 1st of April. Unfortunately April is a very bad month, the roads are bad, and it is difficult to get about. Therefore we have decided to change the date to the month of June, when the days are longer, and the roads are better. It is a time coming between the farmers' spring work and the haying and harvesting.

Mr. OWEN. Are any Conservatives appointed enumerators?

Mr. FISHER. I think, probably, if competent ones are to be found there might be some appointed. The hon. gentleman made a reference to the alleged stuffing of the lists in the province of Quebec in 1901. That was most effectually disposed of eight or nine years ago. I do not think the hon. gentleman was in the House then, and probably never studied the question. The statement was then made that the lists of the province of Quebec had been stuffed. A careful investigation was made at the time, and there was found to be no foundation at all for the statement. It was based on the fact of some comparisons made between the census of 1891 and the census of 1901, but the whole matter was gone over at the time. I do not care now to revive the controversy, but I have under my hand documents with reference to that controversy which I could quote if necessary. The statement has now disappeared from the arena of political warfare, and its revival now has no more justification than it had at the time.

Mr. OWEN. I will merely say to the minister that the statement I referred to was made by a very prominent man now in the western part of the Dominion, and I have not seen it contradicted. The same statement appeared six weeks ago in the Montreal 'Star.'

Mr. FISHER. I have not seen it, and I would not consider it worth while contradicting it; particularly if I had seen it in the Montreal 'Star,' I would not take the trouble to contradict it.

Mr. LAKE. Did I understand the minister to say that the census was to be taken and completed in three weeks from the 1st to the 21st of June, or is it to be taken at a certain fixed date?

Mr. FISHER. On the 1st of June.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How can that be done if it extends over three weeks?

Mr. FISHER. Because the question will be asked each householder who were in the House on the 1st of June.

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking from memory, I think at the time of the former census questions were put to heads of families with regard to their children who were absent. The question is put: Do you expect them to return? Fathers and mothers of a family always expect their children to return, and consequently the answer invariably is, Yes. It may be that some of the children are married and settled down, and in those cases will never return, but they still reside in Canada, and are still counted as members of the household. I think that was one of the causes of the incorrect census in some parts of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. The instructions to enumerators are very particular indeed, only to put down children, for instance, who are away on temporary absence. Married children who are away are not counted, and will not be counted. The instructions to enumerators are clear in that respect, and I have reason to believe that they will be able to carry them out as well now as they did in 1901.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that was one of the questions, and that was the answer expected to the question, which was put directly: Do you expect him to return?

Mr. FISHER. The question is not put so bald as that. The reasons of the absence, the conditions and circumstances of the absence, are inquired into.

Mr. ARTHURS. Does the pay of the enumerator depend upon the number of names added by him to the list?

Mr. FISHER. The enumerators are paid by the name, that has always been the case. But at the same time they are sworn to do their duty, and to see that the people are properly enumerated.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister put a copy of the questions that are to be asked on the table?

Mr. FISHER. They are published in the 'Canada Gazette,' but I will see that copies are laid on the table.

NORTH YORK AND RECIPROCITY.

Mr. MACDONELL. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he has observed a statement in the Toronto

'News,' of the 8th of April, and if so, I wish to ask him a question with regard to it. It is headed 'Mr. Armstrong's challenge.' Mr. Armstrong is a citizen of North York, and he has issued this challenge to the Minister of Finance through the public press.

Mr. Fielding, at Montreal, said that the Liberal party always trusted the people. I want to tell him he has never had a better chance in his life to display his sincerity and 'trust the people.' The estimable gentleman who represents this riding has signified his intention of retiring at the close of the present term. Here is an excellent chance to test the feeling of the farmers of North York on the question of reciprocity. I dare Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding to open the riding of North York at once. Let them put their strongest man in the field, be it Mr. Robinette or a cabinet minister. I, as the candidate of the Liberal-Conservatives, am willing to trust the farmers and the general electors of North York and have no fear of what the result will be.

That is the declaration made by Mr. Armstrong, a young farmer of King township, and former reeve, at Sutton and Aurora, on the 8th of April. Possibly the minister has not seen the item.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Is that the same Mr. Armstrong who was defeated at the last general election?

Mr. MACDONELL. It is the same gentleman; but conditions have changed. I would like to point out to the Minister of Finance that an election in this constituency would afford an excellent opportunity of testing public feeling upon the question of reciprocity. The hon. the Minister of Justice sits for that riding; it is an historical Liberal riding in political affairs. His predecessor is the present Sir William Mulock, formerly Postmaster General of Canada. Now, inasmuch as the Minister of Justice has declared his public intention, according to the press, of retiring from public life, and inasmuch as Mr. Robinette has been nominated by the Liberal party of North York to contest the riding at the next election, and is now in the field as a candidate, and inasmuch as Mr. Armstrong, the Conservative standard bearer, has also been nominated, I would commend the conditions to the Minister of Finance, with a view of having a test made in the farming community of North York on this particular question.

North York is ideally a rural riding; there are one or two villages in it, but I should say that 95 per cent of the electorate of that riding are yeomen. The hon. gentleman has not taken an opportunity of testing public opinion in a general way. No doubt he will say that it is the intention of the government to make a public test throughout the whole of Canada. A resolution to that effect was moved in this House by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) was voted down by hon. gentlemen opposite, so it would appear that there is no immediate possibility of the people of the country having an opportunity of going on record on this question. North York stands practically vacant today; all conditions favour the government in that riding and it ought to be a reasonable opportunity and one that would be taken advantage of by the government. Hon. gentlemen opposite are now saying that this arrangement will also benefit the cities. It might be said that an opportunity should be afforded to test a city riding. I have no doubt that if the government desire to open any city riding they will be accommodated by hon. gentlemen on this side who represent most of the cities in this country. If the hon. gentleman is looking for a test and wants an opportunity the riding of South Toronto will be open as soon as the government state their intention of appealing to the people in South Toronto. Then they would have a variety, a city riding and a rural riding. Be that as it may I commend at least the present condition in North York to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) as an opportunity which he should not let go to make a public test on this question.

Mr. FIELDING. In regard to South Toronto if my hon. friend desires a vacancy there that is a matter entirely within his own control, we need not offer him any opinion on that.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). If I should take the opportunity will the government undertake to issue a writ and test it immediately?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not mind saying that it might be a case of the Dutch capturing Holland; we have heard of such things before. With regard to North York, I am bound to say if my hon. friend is anxious that we should get rid of the esteemed gentleman who represents that constituency we do not share that desire; we view with the utmost regret his decision not to be a candidate for the House of Commons again, and we value his services so highly that we want to keep him as long as we can.

As to the item in the Toronto 'News' to which the hon. gentleman called my attention I had not read it before, but I was interested in hearing it read. The most interesting article that I have read in a Toronto Conservative paper lately was an article which appeared within the last week in the 'Mail.' Considering that we have been told again and again that our Conservative friends wanted a dissolution and to go into the fight at once, I noted with some

interest that the 'Mail' warns its people to be very careful, because this man Laurier is likely to spring an election on them very quickly.

Sir ALLEN ALYESWORTH. I am sorry that I have a very inadequate idea of what my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has been saying, but I understand that he has been discussing to some extent the condition of public feeling in the constituency of North York, and I think, without any undue self-sufficiency, I am entitled to say that there is no man in this House, not even my hon. friend himself, who has a better idea of the state of public feeling upon this question of reciprocity, or upon any other question, in the constituency of North York than I have myself. It is quite true that during the elections in 1908 in that constituency I stated not only at the nomination meeting and upon the hustings, but upon other public platforms in the constituency that unless my hearing improved I should not again ask them for their votes. I thought that to say that was no more than just to the people who had honoured me by sending me as their representative to this parliament, and I made no secret of the intention which I then entertained and which I cannot say I have as yet altogether departed from. But while that is so, if there were any circumstances that would lead me to change my mind it is the fact that this arrangement now before the House has been arrived at and is now before the country for consideration. I approve that arrangement with both hands. It suits me, at any rate, in every respect, as to some extent identified with the farming interests of this country and as representing a constituency mainly of farmers. It suits the people of North York without reference to politics. I may tell my hon. friend that I have in my possession letters that I am glad to have. letters which tell me of more than one case of not merely individual voters, but of families containing dozens of voters who have never given a Grit vote in their lives but who are going to break their record on the first opportunity.

With reference to the challenge, as I understand it is termed, which the gentleman who was my opponent at the elections three years ago has thought it well to make public, there is just one consideration that I cannot help having occur to my mind. It falls to my lot, in the ordinary course of daily work, to see something of the sentiments which animate convicts in our penitentiaries, and nothing is more universal than the expression by the convict of a desire for a new trial; only a new trial! A new trial possesses many advantages from the point of view of the convict. It gets rid at a stroke of the last verdict; it puts him right back into the position he was in before there had been any hearing at all, and he cannot be any worse off than he is. Accordingly the convict all but universally pleads for just one more trial, and I cannot help applying that to the situation of hon. gentlemen opposite, if I may be allowed to do so. I will do it simply in the view that the party which is represented by hon. gentlemen opposite stands convict before the people of this country as not entitled to their confidence.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would not have risen except for the last argument, if you can grace it as such, that the Minister of Justice used. The convict in that case is the Minister of Justice himself who contested the constituency of Durham, but was overwhelmingly defeated; they wanted none of him. His government got into power again, and they granted him the grace of a new trial in North York, but if the hon. gentleman had not had a new trial he would not have been here at all.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. J. A. SEXSMITH (East Peterborough). Mr. Chairman, ever since the question of reciprocity has come before this House I have been deeply interested in it, because we have been told by the government and their supporters that it is going to increase the prosperity of the farmer. As a farmer myself and as the representative of a riding composed largely of farmers, it would of course be a great pleasure to me to support any measure really calculated to advance the cause of agriculture, because when the farmer is prosperous the nation is prosperous, and when the farmer is unsuccessful the whole nation suffers. Reciprocity is a question that requires deep consideration, and it is a question as to which the government should be armed with facts and figures in respect thereto, so that there may be no guesswork about it at all. I have listened to hon. gentlemen on the other side telling us that the condition of the Canadian farmer is going to be improved by this arrangement, but not one of them has produced a scintilla of evidence to prove these vague assertions. It is really after all a question of the market conditions in Canada as compared with those in the United States. If the United States markets are better for farm products than they are in Canada then the Canadian farmer would be benefited, as he would be raised to that higher plane which would be occupied by the farmers of the United States under a prevailing condition of higher prices. But,

if the farmers of Canada are enjoying equally as good markets as those enjoyed by the United States farmers, then the the farmers of Canada have nothing to gain, and, if the Canadian farmers are enjoying better markets than are enjoyed by the farmers of the United States then we are sure to lose and must be dragged down to their level. I listened to the speech of the Minister of Agriculture with a good deal of attention and have read it carefully, but I have failed to find one particle of proof from that man in that speech to show that the condition of the Canadian farmer is going to be improved. I am confident that if the Canadian farmers read the speeches of the Minister of Agriculture and his supporters, and if they take that reciprocity agreement and study it they will come to the conclusion that it is a delusion, and when the time comes for them to pronounce upon it by their votes, they will declare that they will have none of it. I say without fear of contradiction that the government went blindfolded into this arrangement. They had it in their power to get all the necessary evidence; they could have made thorough inquiry into the conditions of the markets of the United States and the markets of Canada, and they could have compared the two and told the members of this House and the farmers of Canada just what they were going to get by this arrangement. But apparently the government neglected to secure any information and rushed blindfolded into this thing without knowing where it would lead to. The government, not having the information at their command, or having refused to give it if they have it, I have been compelled to go to considerable trouble to hunt up statistics which would enable me to arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to how we stand in trade relations with the United States. Time and again have these gentlemen opposite told us of the benefits the farmers will derive by getting our dairy products into the United States markets, and the Minister of Agriculture told us the other night that we would sell the United States people what they wanted and send the rest to Great Britain. Well, I have gone into the figures of the exchange of these dairy products between the United States and Canand and vice versa for the last five years; I have taken the imports and exports of butter, cheese, eggs, &c., and if the House will bear with me I shall place them on record. This is the result:

CANADA EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES.

—	1906.	1907. (9 mos.)	1908.	1909.	1910.	Total.
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Butter	36,167	35,078	43,045	54,894	201,968	371,152
Cheese	16,389	6,918	27,247	28,936	63,309	142,799
Total						513,951
Eggs	11,924	9,047	9,846	14.952	13,896	59,665

CANADA IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES.

—	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.	Total.
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Butter	54,426	87,999	77,994	156,443	18,075	394,937
Cheese	45,904	84,084	116,851	55,030	48,739	350,608
Total						745,545
Eggs	92,172	142,868	216,278	238,842	179,408	869,568

Total Dairy imports	$ 745,545
Total Dairy exports	513,951
Difference in favour of imports	$ 231,594
Total value of Eggs imported	$ 869,568
Total value of Eggs exported	59,665
Difference in favour of imports	$ 809,903

I do not anticipate any great advantage from getting our dairy products into the United States market, but I do think that on the contrary the United States farmers will reap considerable benefit from being able to compete with us in our home market. The market which the Minister of Agriculture speaks so highly of and as to which he said, speaking on the 13th December last year:

To-day in Canada the production of dairy products, that is milk and its products, is at the least $100,000,000 a year and that is at least $20,000,000 greater than was the product of the cows in 1903. The dairy commissioner goes on to say:—

'Our home market is growing at the rate of $2,000,000 a year, and it is already by far the most important one that we have, in point of volume, as it takes fully four times as much as there is surplus for export.'

You will see, therefore, how very important it is in these calculations and discussions not to discard the home market and not for a moment to base our estimates or our contentions upon the export trade.

We have a home market that consumes $4 worth of our dairy products to every dollar's worth that we export. That is the market which the hon. minister on December 13, 1910, spoke so favourably of, the market we should guard so religiously, and that is the market that the government now proposes to throw open to the competition of the whole world. I contend that there is no market for Canadian cheese in the United States to-day, and the conditions are such that we were practically unable last year to supply the market of Canada for butter. Of eggs we bought from the United States in five years nearly $1,000,000 worth more than we sold to them. Yet we are told that there is a great market for our farmers in the United States, and that if they get in to that market they are going to reap a wonderful reward. On December 13, the Minister of Agriculture, in his speech on cold storage, referred to our poultry product in these words:

There is no question whatever that to-day there is a far greater production of eggs and poultry meat than there was ten years ago, and yet the prices of those things are much higher. Why? Because home consumption has increased more rapidly than home production, and the result is, that the home market for eggs and poultry meat is better than the export market; consequently, we have practically no export of eggs or poultry to Great Britain, and very little to the United States.

At that time the hon. minister was very proud of the home market. He said we should guard it because it is the best market for our farmers, and in that I agree with him. But, Sir, when this reciprocity arrangement was brought down, he immediately turned his face away from the farmer to the interests of his party, and tried to deceive our farmers into thinking that they will be benefited by this arrangement, which the government, with the assistance of the servile following behind them, are trying to put through. Now, it is one of the most serious things that could happen to the farmers of Canada to have their home market invaded by all the cheap producing countries in the world. Even if the favoured nation clause did not affect us, I contend that our farmers are in a better position to-day than the farmers of the United States, and we have no reason to open up our market and allow them to come in and compete with us. In answer to a question of Mr. Taylor, of Leeds, on March 9, the following statement was made:

Statement showing the quantity and value of butter and eggs imported for consumption into Canada, by countries, during the month of February, 1911:

	Lbs.	Value.
Butter—		
Great Britain	2,800	$ 689
Australia	15,008	3,000
New Zealand	181,826	41,813
United States	6,838	1,707
Total	206,472	$ 47,209
Eggs—		
Hong Kong	4,250	$ 193
Chinese Empire	11,138	1,673
United States	719,315	131,341
Total	734,703	$133,207

New Zealand is one of the countries that will come in under the favoured nation clause. It is a cheap producing country, and its summer season occurs at the time of our winter season, when the farmers of this country are producing at the highest cost and expect to have a little higher price for their products. If our market is thrown open and New Zealand and all the other cheap producing countries of the world are allowed to pour their products into it, and if New Zealand should send the same average for the 12 months of the year, she would invade the market of Canada in butter alone to the extent of over half a million dollars. I just want to say that if this agreement goes into force the farmers of Canada will get a blow such as they have never received before. Our home market for dairy products consumes over 80 per cent of our total dairy products, but if it is thrown open, the whole world will have the privilege of competing with our farmers on even ground. When all these goods come in under duty, what may we expect when we have free trade? The United States are not by any means an importing country. They are producing all they want and to spare. Last year they exported a great amount of dairy products to the various markets of the world. Now,

I wish to deal for a little while with our imports and exports of meats. The government has refused to supply us the market prices as it should have done, so that I have taken our own trade and commerce reports and our own official records in order to make comparisons. Here is a list of the exports of Canada to the United States from 1906 to 1910:

Bacon and hams—

1906	$59,551
1907	19,190
1908	5,211
1909	208,945
1910	8,569
Total	$3,864,298

We imported from the United States bacon and hams as follows:

1906	$ 782,330
1907	656,225
1908	851,807
1909	744,694
1910	829,242
Total	$3,864,298

Yet this is the market in which our farmers are told they will be able to sell to better advantage than in the home market. The price of hogs, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us, is greater in the United States than in Canada; but if that be the case how is it we have been buying such a very large amount from them in excess of what we sell to them.

Then, take our exports of beef to the United States. We exported as follows:

1906	$ 6,141
1907	11,484
1908	12,708
1909	14,227
1910	12,635
Total	$57,195

Of all other meats we exported to the United States as follows:

1906	$ 67,974
1907	53,613
1908	48,871
1909	60,164
1910	61,508
Total	$292,130

And the total of all our exports amounted to $650,791.

Compare that with our imports. We imported from the United States beef salted in barrels as follows:

1906	$159,848
1907	131,718
1908	137,525
1909	122,668
1910	122,444
Total	$674,203

Of canned meats, poultry and game we imported from the United States as follows:

1906	$ 82,805
1907	28,062
1908	27,596
1909	30,412
1910	45,460
Total	$214,335

Let me now give the figures of the other meat products imported from the United States. I have already given the imports of bacon and hams:

——	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.	Total.
Extracts of meats and fluid beef, not meats and soups	64,081	33,297	45,503	40,699	52,436	236,016
Meats dried or smoked, etc	155,288	136,574	144,674	69,328	87,302	593,166
Pork, barrelled in brine	816,416	634,752	713,726	889,892	924,547	3,979,333
Poultry and game	38,481	40,363	52,175	45,525	57,390	233,934
All other meats	82,037	76,784	100,588	117,572	161,274	538,255
Lard	652,526	584,275	1,073,440	1,228,293	1,358,513	4,897,047
Lard compound	18,818	17,427	54,167	52,538	53,867	196,817

The total value of meats and meat products, including bacon and hams, imported from the United States during these years amounted to $15,427,404, whereas our exports of these goods to that country only amoutned to $650,791. There is no use comparing our imports with our exports for one year; there is no use comparing the market of one little village on this side with that of one little village on the other side. We have to make a comparison during a number of years, and deal with it from a national standpoint. There is no doubt that in some places it might work to the advantage of the individual farmers, but, on the whole, it will be a detriment to the farming community of Canada. The total value of meat and meat products imported from the United States during these five years was $15,427,404. In the same period we succeeded in selling them meat and meat products to the amount of $650,791. Is there any hon. member of this House who, in the face of these figures, would say that the market for hogs and meat products is better in the United States than in Canada? Is it

reasonable to think that they would leave higher prices and a better market and sell their product here at lower prices?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). And pay a duty?

Mr. SEXSMITH. And pay a duty. The figures show that the farmers of the United States sold us in five years $14,776,613 more than we sold them. In the face of this fact, it is absurd to tell the farmers of Canada that we are going to get a better market for hogs and hog products, beef cattle and beef, than we have in Canada. This proposed change would simply mean that we should be subject to the beef trust of Chicago. Our local packing establishments, instead of being able to control the market of Canada and to ship to Great Britain, where we have had the best market in the world—a market that sets the price for the bacon of the United States as well as that of Canada, and where we have been able to compete and have established a standard for our bacon that far surpasses that of the bacon of the United States—will come under the domination of the American trust. Let me read a few words from the speech of the Minister of Agriculture of February 28 last on this subject of reciprocity. And, if there is any member of this House who, more than another should lay the plain facts before the people, it is the Minister of Agriculture, for the farmers look to him and expect him to give them guidance and not to deceive them. Speaking of the beef trust of Chicago, the Minister of Agriculture on that occasion said:

I said a moment ago that the packing houses would not disappear. I think my hon. friend had in mind particularly the packing houses in Winnipeg. I have heard it said that the packing houses in Winnipeg would disappear, because Chicago would swamp them when the whole west is thrown open and made subservient to the Chicago market. What is the condition of affairs to-day in the United States? Does the Chicago packing business swamp the packing houses in Kansas City, in Omaha or in South St. Paul? We know, if the hon. gentleman does not know, that these cities are doing a large packing-house business. I have here some figures to show what that business is in comparison with the packing-houses of Winnipeg.

The minister goes on to show the difference between the packing houses of Kansas City and Omaha, and the packing house of Winnipeg:

In Kansas City last year the local killings of cattle were 1,284,000; of sheep, 1,186,000; of hogs, 1,900,000. The local packing and abattoir establishments of Kansas City showed, of cattle 773,000; of sheep, 1,256,000; of hogs, 1,656,000. In South St. Paul, the local killings were 169,000 cattle, 207,000 sheep, and 823,000 hogs.

Compare Winnipeg:

Cattle—80,000; half of those in St. Paul; one-tenth about of those in Omaha; one-fifteenth of those in Kansas City.

Sheep—30,000; one-seventh of those in St. Paul; one-fortieth of those in Omaha; one-thirty-fifth of those in Kansas City.

Hogs—91,000; one-ninth of those in St. Paul; one-twentieth of those in Omaha; one-twentieth of those in Kansas City.

That is, the minister, in discussing the question of the great Chicago beef trust, tried to make this House and the people believe that there was no danger of that trust coming into Canada or injuring the packing industry in Winnipeg. The reason he gives is that the packing houses in the western cities flourished in spite of the beef trust. But see what he was compelled to admit, a moment or two afterwards, when he was questioned by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong):

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I merely want to ask the minister if it is not a fact that these large meat packing firms in Kansas City, Omaha and St. Paul are a part of the meat trust. I have visited these cities frequently and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend says that he knows they are I will not dispute it. I do not know that they are, and I, therefore, will not say whether they are or not. But that does not make any difference.

I would ask the Minister of Agriculture: Is that a fair speech to send out to the farmers of this country? Does that give our farmers an intelligent view of things as they really are?—to make it appear that there was no danger to our bacon and our beef industry from the beef trust of Chicago? I have no hesitation in saying that, if this arrangement goes into effect, the whole meat business of Canada, inside of two years, will be under the great combine, the meat trust of Chicago, and that trust will pay the farmers of Canada just what it pleases. I pointed out to the Minister of Agriculture a year ago, and, I think, in the year previous to that, that the farmers seemed to think they were labouring under certain grievances by reason of the packing industry in this country, that these people had pressed the market down in certain seasons of the year. The minister said that he would have the matter investigated. And this is the result of his investigation—he finds difficulties that might be overcome by proper legislation, but, in order to avoid this, he says: Take down the bars, and we will have free trade.

Now, a word or two on the question of the throwing open of our markets to the foreign countries that are allowed to enter under this arrangement. The Minister of Agriculture, on the 13th of December last, told the House that the Canadian farmer was not in a position to compete with the Australian farmer in raising sheep and cattle. He told us that the conditions in Australia were entirely different. This is what the minister said:

As I am not acquainted with the details of the business, I would not undertake to say

whether my hon. friend is right or wrong. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that the number of sheep has decreased in Canada, but when he compares that with the increase in Australia, Argentine, South Africa and other countries, he is drawing a comparison with countries in which the climate and other conditions are entirely different.

These are the words of the minister himself:

Australia, both as regards sheep and cattle, is a ranching country. The cattle there run wild over enormous areas and are not taken care of at all. Sheep are in the same position. They have illimitable expanses for pasturing, which we have not, and they have a climate more suitable for that kind of wild life than ours. Therefore, a comparison between Canada and Australia in this regard is not a fair one.

Now the Minister of Agriculture admitted on December 13, 1910, that the conditions in Australia were so different from those in Canada that the Canadian farmer could not compete with the Australian farmer in raising beef or sheep. But to oblige our American cousin he now says we will allow the farmers of Canada to come into competition with Australia; we will allow Australian beef to come into this country; there is no longer any danger in allowing Australian beef and mutton to come into Canada. Now I say he is entirely wrong. I wish to quote an article that appeared in one of the Toronto daily papers on April 11, 1911: It is headed 'Will ship meat from Australia.'

Mr. Arthur Kidmar, chairman of the Perishable Foods Committee of the Chamber of Commerce at Sydney, New South Wales, is at the King Edward. He is breaking his return journey for a day in Toronto, and leaves for home via Chicago this afternoon. Mr. Kidmar is largely interested in the meat, butter and egg packing industry in Sydney, and has been spending the past year in a tour of inspection through Great Britain, France, Germany and other parts of Europe, studying particularly the abattoir systems and methods of exportation in the continental centres of the packing industry. He has also been arranging, in behalf of the Sydney chamber, for the exportation of food products from Australia to Great Britain and America. Shipments will be made immediately to Toronto and Montreal, and shortly also to New York.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). And they pay a duty of three cents a pound.

Mr. SEXSMITH. This man says that shipments will be made immediately under present conditions, paying a duty, either to Toronto or to Montreal. Now we propose by this arrangement to take off the duty, and let them send into Canada as much meat as they like, and that from a country that the Minister of Agriculture said a few weeks ago, was one that we could not compete with on even terms. Now, speaking of the United States market, and what we are to gain, I want to quote some figures of their exports in the articles I have been mentioning:

Eggs, United States exported in 1909, 5,207,151 dozen, valued at..	$ 1,199,522
Butter, United States exported in 1909, 5,981,265 pounds, valued at..	1,268,210
Cheese, United States exported in 1909, 6,822,842 pounds valued at..	857,091
Condensed milk, United States exported in 1909..	1,375,104
Lard, United States exported in 1909..	52,712,569
Pork, pickled, United States exported in 1909..	4,599,431
Ham and shoulders, cured, United States exported in 1909..	23,525,307
Bacon, United States exported in 1909..	25,920,490
Beef, fresh, United States exported in 1909..	12,698,594
Beef, salted and pickled, United States exported in 1909..	3,438,048
Total meat and dairy products in 1909..	$166,521,949

And we are to come into competition with a country with a home market ten times greater than that of the Canadian people, a home market that exports ten times more than Canada does. I want to say a word to show what conditions really are in our home market. In the province of Ontario I find that the total number of swine slaughtered during the year 1909 was 1,986,432, valued at $21,407,549. Our total exports of hogs and hog products for the same year, for all Canada, amounted to only $6,915,577. Thus we see that Ontario alone has produced three times more hogs and hog products than the total exports of all Canada in the year 1909. Is it therefore reasonable to say that the home market is not the best market the Canadian farmer has? In 1909 the province of Ontario produced $184,747,900 worth of live stock, and there were sold or slaughtered in that province alone in the same year $64,464,923 worth. So in the province of Ontario alone as a home market we have disposed of over $64,000,000 worth of beef and other cattle, whereas, our total exports of cattle from all Canada, during the same year, only amounted to $12,254,287. And yet we are told by the Minister of Agriculture that our home market is not as valuable as it was a few months ago, and we must discard it, and allow all the countries of the world to come in and enjoy it. I do not see the Minister of Customs in his seat, but I wish to refer to what he said a few evenings ago, in discussing dairy products. He did not care to discuss them in bulk, but for some reason or other, I suppose for political reasons, he reduced pounds of butter to ounces, and reduced dozens of eggs to units, and then told us that we only import two or three eggs and

two or three ounces of butter per capita into the Dominion. Let me give you a few figures prepared in the same way. Take the meat products. We bought from the United States annually the last few years $2.10 worth for every man, woman and child in Canada, while we only sold to them seven-tenths of one per cent per capita. Now, I will speak about potatoes, and let me first read from 'Hansard' what the Minister of Agriculture says about potatoes on the 28th March, 1911:

In twelve years of high duties, the United States accepted from Canada $11,000,000 worth of potatoes more than they sent into Canada, Surely if we can get those potatoes into the states without duty, it will be to the advantage of our potato raisers.

I put a question on the Order Paper and received the following answer from the Minister of Customs:

1. The quantity and value of potatoes (Canadian produce) exported from Canada to the United States during the fiscal years from 1901 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

	Bushels.	Value.
1901	231,101	$ 68,151
1902	808,041	327,046
1903	138,855	56,969
1904	1,451,070	742,537
1905	34,870	18,301
1906	473,239	128,363
1907 (9 months)	8,941	4,250
1908	34,392	15,459
1909	574,454	251,907
1910	678,632	345,903

2. The quantity and value of potatoes imported into Canada from the United States during the fiscal years from 1901 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

	Bushels.	Value.
1901	136,666	$ 88,649
1902	81,771	87,970
1903	407,425	228,609
1904	77,028	78,025
1905	518,875	232,044
1906	227,155	126,163
1907 (9 months)	94,521	71,065
1908	249,907	195,650
1909	127,110	129,725
1910	217,170	181,751

I notice the total exports of potatoes during ten years from Canada to the United States were $1,958,886 while our imports from the United States were $1,419,651, a difference of $539,235 in favour of the United States. This is the great market of which we hear so much. Potatoes and hay are the only farm products that we have been able to export to the United States in greater quantity than we have received from them, but this is the market they are going to give us. It is on statements of that kind that we are asked to settle this great question. I have not gone into the figures since confederation, but I think I am safe in saying that the United States have not admitted a million dollars' worth of our potatoes more than sent to United States since confederation, let alone the $11,000,000 worth in 12 years of which the minister spoke.

I shall quote our exports and imports of vegetables. During five years we imported from the United States $3,368,083 worth of vegetables. We sold to them $2,021,054, a difference in favour of the United States of $1,347,029. And yet our market gardeners are told: 'Oh, you are all right, you are perfectly safe, you get the United States market, you can ship your potatoes and vegetables there. But they have been invading our markets and are selling millions and millions of dollars more to us than we have been able to sell to them.

I have laboured hard in the effort to come to some reasonable conclusion in connection with our wheat trade. I have consulted the statistics of the United States, and their market prices and compared them with Canadian statistics for the last fifteen or twenty years. I do not know that it would be wise to take up time by reading prices for twenty years, so I shall read them for the last ten or fifteen years, and give the averages.

WHEAT.

—	No. 2 White—Price per bush., Toronto, 1st December each year. Quotations Toronto 'Globe.'	Market Value—Stat. Abstract, Annual Rep. Dept. Agriculture, 1st December each year.	No. 1 Northern—Price per bush., Winnipeg, 1st December, each year. Various sources.
	Ontario.	United States.	Winnipeg.
1890	93	83·8	75
1891	90	83·9	91
1892	64-66	62·4	73
1893	57	53·8	65
1894	57	49·1	58
1895	65-65½	50·9	55
1896	85	72·6	81¾
1897	83	80·8	92
1898	68	58·2	69
1899	65	58·4	65¼
1900	64-64½	61·9	76
1901	72	62·4	71
1902	68½	63·0	71½
1903	77½-78	69·5	79
1904	100-101	92·4	91½
1905	79-80	74·8	75½
1906	71	66·7	72½
1907	95-96	87·4	102
1908	93-94	92·8	99¼
1909	100-105	99·8	96
Av. for last 20 years	77-75	71·23	78·95
" 10 "	82-60	77·00	85·40

I notice according to these statistics, and they are the only reliable statistics we can get, that the price of wheat to the

farmers of the United States for the last ten years has been lower than the price to the farmers of Canada even in Winnipeg. We have been told that the wheat production of the United States is falling off, and that in a short time they will require some millions of bushels from the Canadian farmer to supply their own market. The Minister of Agriculture speaking on the reciprocity question said:

> This makes a total acreage in our Northwest of 213,000,000 acres within the wheat producing area. I do not mean to say that all this land will produce wheat, or will ever be under wheat, but I do not think it would be out of the way for me to say that, in the course of 15 or 20 years, one-quarter of that land, say 50,000,000 acres, will be producing wheat. When that time comes, the Canadian Northwest will produce 1,000,000,000 bushels of wheat. I venture to say that the farmers will need not only the home country and the American market, but also the European market in which to sell that wheat. When that time comes, there is no doubt, there will be in the United States from 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 people, and they will need at least 250,000,000 to 300,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Nothing could be further from the mark than the conjecture of the minister in this respect. I have gone over and taken the production of the United States wheat crop for several years, and the figures taken from the statistical abstract show the following results:

United States production of wheat in each year, from 1891 to 1901.

	Bushels.
1891	611,789,000
1892	515,949,000
1893	396,132,000
1894	400,267,000
1895	467,103,000
1896	427,684,000
1897	530,149,000
1898	675,149,000
1899	547,304,000
1900	522,230,000
Total for 10 years	5,153,756,000
Average for 1 year	515,375,000

United States production of wheat in each year, from 1901 to 1910.

	Bushels.
1901	748,460,000
1902	670,063,000
1903	637,822,000
1904	552,400,000
1905	692,979,000
1906	735,261,000
1907	634,087,000
1908	664,602,000
1909	737,189,000
1910	691,769,000
Total for 10 years	6,764,632,000
Average for 1 year	676,463,200
Last 10 years product	515,375,600
An average of more per year than for previous decade.	161,087,600

They have increased their production during the last ten years over the previous ten years on an average by 161,000,000 bushels of wheat per year. That is to say that in the last period of ten years they produced each year 161,000,000 bushels more than they did during the ten years previously. The Minister of Agriculture told us that in a few years the people of the United States would be consuming all the wheat they could produce, and would require from 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 bushels of wheat per year from us for home consumption. Nothing could be further from the mark. Their increase in the production of wheat in the last ten years over the previous ten years is annually greater than the total production of all Canada. Figuring that on the average per capita consumption of the United States for the last 20 years, or for the last 30 years if you like at 5.38 bushels per capita we find that their increased production in the last ten years was capable of feeding 30,000,000 people, while their increased population was only 16,000,000 people. Instead of the population gaining on the production the production has actually increased twice as rapidly as the population. The United States is now producing enough wheat for 140,000,000 population, and it is safe to say that in the next 20 years they will be producing for a population of 200,000,000. Where then is the market for our Canadian wheat. Why do the Americans want our wheat. Last year they had 48,000,000 acres under wheat, and the American farmer is an aggressive farmer, and under a proper system of farming if they bring up their production per acre to the standard of Canada they will be producing in the next few years nearly one billion bushels of wheat annually. Why then do they want our wheat?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). They want it to mix with their wheat for export flour.

Mr. SEXSMITH. That is it. I do not think I can explain that better than by reading this from an American publication, the 'Northern Miller,' published on February 8, 1911:

> WHEAT AND FLOUR.
>
> When it is considered that owing to the high quality and superior strength of the wheat grown in the newly opened Canadian Northwest, one bushel mixed with three bushels of the less virile wheat grown in the United States, and ground into flour, is sufficient to raise the whole to high value, it is apparent that the free importation of this wheat would not only fail to depress the price of American wheat, but would actually give it added value, because it would enable the American miller to use the Canadian product as a leaven to raise the value of his mixture; thus every bushel of Canadian wheat exported as flour by the American miller would carry with it a much greater amount of wheat grown in the United States.

The miller who is able to grind this enormous crop will be the miller of the future, and where he is, there will be the great mills of the world.

With free Canadian wheat secured, the prospect is a grand one, with this enormous and steadily increasing crop free to pursue its natural geographical and commercial channel flowing into the mills and elevators of the States, a splendid tide of activity and prosperity would follow in its wake. Assured of their future supply of raw material, the mills of America would go forward on their developing course continuing the march of progress which has brought them to the front. New mills would be built, and capacities enlarged. New markets abroad would be sought and conquered.

The returns from this renewed and extended activity would be felt in increased commercial prosperity. New railways would be extended into the wheat-growing territory; American railroads carrying the flour from the mills would secure additional freights; American banks would obtain increased deposits, and greatly enlarged exchange accounts; American mill operators would be in demand, and pay-rolls would be increased; mill machinery, bags, barrels, and other mill supplies would be required in large quantities; more money would be in circulation and the benefit would be felt in every artery of industrial life touched by the milling.

There would be an increase in grain firms, in elevators, and in every branch of the grain handling and flour making interests.

This would be felt in the added value of real estate, and in the solid and substantial development of every undertaking and enterprise that makes a community prosperous. Farmers would find a market for their products, and in the end, should this crop be assimilated here rather than abroad, they will secure an average higher price for their wheat, because of the ability of the progressive and successful miller to pay more for his raw material.

Canada will lose in—
Transportation,
Manufacturing,
In wages paid expert labour,
In wages paid all workmen,
In goods supplied,
In machinery, bags and barrels.

But the greatest loss would be in the by-products which Canadian farmers so much need.

Now, I wish to read from President Taft's speech before the Corn Exchange in Columbus, Ohio, on February 10. He was speaking from the farmer's standpoint, and he went on to show that they had nothing to fear from reciprocity with Canada, but that they had considerable to gain from getting into the Canadian market, because of the majority of commodities raised on the farm. The Canadian people had been buying more from the United States than the United States had been buying from Canada. The president then goes on to say:

Canada is our neighbour on the north for three thousand miles. Her population is English, Scotch and French. Her soil is like ours. Her traditions are the same as ours. Her language is ours. Her climate is temperate like ours, except that her growing seasons are shorter and she cannot raise corn in any great quantity. She has a free popular government with a wage-earning class as intelligent and as well paid as ours. It is difficult to see in what respect her farmers have any advantage over our own except a virgin soil in the far northwest.

'How is the farming to be hurt?' he asked. He then took up the effect it would have on corn and wheat prices, on the value of farm lands in the United States and on the milling industry in the United States. He declared that 'in respect to corn the American farmer is king and will remain so, reciprocity or no reciprocity.' As to wheat, he said the domestic price is governed by the world price and that 'the sending of any part of Canada's surplus through our country instead of through Canada to be milled or to be exported without milling will not perceptibly or materially affect the price of wheat for our farmers.'

The value of farm lands, he said, is affected by the proximity to market more than by any other element and he maintained that the American farmer would still have the advantage in this respect. He also predicted a great increase in American milling as a result of the agreement.

'It is a mere truism,' said the president, 'to say that the farmers of a country constitute the greatest wealth producing class of the country and that it is of the greatest importance to conserve their welfare. When we have had good crops, the wheels of all industries have moved and wealth has been stored. Any one, therefore, who would initiate a policy to injure the farmer has much to answer for at the bar of public opinion.

'The greatest reason for adopting this agreement is the fact that it is going to unite two countries with kindred people and lying together across a wide continent, in a commercial and social union to the great advantage of both. Such a result does not need to be justified by a nice balancing of pecuniary profit to each. Its undoubted general benefit will vindicate those who are responsible for it. I say this in order that by answering the arguments directed to the detailed effect of the agreement upon different classes of persons, I may not be thought to abandon the broad ground upon which the opportunity to confirm this agreement ought to be seized.'

Taking up first the effect of the agreement on corn, he said: 'The total production of corn in the United States in 1910 was 3,125,713,000 bushels, of which we exported 33,072,209, and used the rest in domestic consumption, chiefly in raising cattle and hogs, of which in live cattle and packing-house products we exported in value $135,985,212.

Now, I would like to know how the farmers of Canada are going to gain by getting into the markets of the United States for their beef and pork products, a country that is competing with Canada in the markets of Liverpool, that sets the price for the farmers of the United States as well as for the farmers of Canada, and a country which, according to the president himself, exported

last year $135,985,212 worth of beef and pork. The president went on to say:

The Canadian product of corn was 18,726,000 bushels, or six-tenths of one per cent of the total production of the United States. We exported 6,000,000 bushels to Canada. Certainly in respect of corn the American farmer is king and will remain so, reciprocity or no reciprocity. Indeed, the change will greatly help him by increasing his supply of young and thin cattle, now very scarce, for feeding with his corn and making good beef.

They propose to go to our Northwest and buy up our thin cattle and take them over to fatten on their own farms, and, as the hon. member for Brandon said, that country will become the backdoor of Chicago. But the president went on:

But it is said that the farm land of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin and other states, is much more valuable than the land in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Assiniboia and Alberta, the four great northwestern provinces of Canada, and that to give Canadian farmers free entry of products raised on cheaper lands will be certain to lower farm lands in value in this country. Nothing could be further from the fact. Canadian lands are farther removed from the Minneapolis and Chicago markets than the lands of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa or Illinois, and proximity to market is a most important element in the value of farm land. Then the natural change in farming in this country is from the raising of grain for export to the raising of grain for farm consumption and development of the secondary products in the forms of cattle and hogs. The live cattle are bought and fattened. The hogs are raised and fed. It is farming of this kind that explains the high value of farm lands in Illinois and Iowa.

The president goes on to argue that where the finished article is produced the high priced land is, and we propose by this arrangement practically to compel the farmers of Ontario and of the western provinces to sell their thin cattle to the United States to be fattened on their farms. The president continued:

The difference in the value of the acre between Manitoba and Minnesota is but little more than eight dollars, while the difference between Minnesota and Wisconsin is $60, between Wisconsin and Illinois is $52, between Wisconsin and Iowa is $40, between Michigan and Indiana is $31. These figures show incontestably that the fear of a reduction in farm land values of this country by letting in Canada's products is wholly unfounded.

The price of wheat less transportation and other charges for warehouse and delivery is fixed by what all the wheat exporting countries including the United States and Canada, can get for their surplus in Liverpool.

Hence, the sending of any part of Canada's surplus through our country instead of through Canada to be milled or to be exported without milling, will not perceptibly or materially affect the price of wheat for our farmers.

Open up the market of Minneapolis and Chicago, give the transportation and warehousing facilities of our northwest and the Canadian farmer will get for his wheat practically what the American farmer gets, less the higher freight charges due to greater distance from market. In other words, the advantage we give the Canadian farmer will not hurt our farmer, for the price will remain the same.

Where do you find that the Canadian would get a higher price for his wheat under this agreement? President Taft says it will make no difference; or in other words that the agreement will not hurt the American farmer. He goes on to say:

But by patronizing our elevators, our flour mills, our railroads, he will secure admission to the world's market at a less cost to himself, while we will secure the advantage of increased trade for our elevators, our mills, our railroads, and our commission men.

The United States secured for the farmers the free listing of such important agricultural products as cotton seed oil, all kinds of fruits and vegetables, timothy and clover seed, eggs, and numerous other products in which the movement to Canada from the United States is much greater than from Canada to the United States. The remission of $1,300,000 in duties on rough lumber imported into the United States by free listing it, along with pickets and palings, and the heavy reductions on dressed lumber, laths and shingles, are all in the interest of the farmer.

Let the agreement be adopted and go into operation and in six months the farmers on the border who now have fears will rejoice in this great step towards closer business and social relations with our neighbours. The whole country—farmer, manufacturer, railroad company, middlemen, warehouseman—all will be the gainer.

That is the argument of President Taft, and I submit that what he predicts is exactly what will take place if we allow this treaty to go through.

Just a word in conclusion about our horse market. We are told that the Canadian horse market will not be injured, but so good an authority as my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) pointed out to the satisfaction of every hon. member of this House, that the market for horses in the United States is not as good as that in Canada. He showed that the average price received by the farmers in the United States for horses last year was $118, while the Canadian farmers received $133. I have here a table showing the quotations in Toronto and Chicago on March 24, 1911:

HORSES.

	Toronto.	Chicago.
Heavy draught—		
Ch. 1,650 lbs. and over..	$260—$350	$225—$325
Fair, 1,650 lbs..	200— 250	200— 225
Ch. 1,500 lbs. and over..	250— 300	175— 225
Fair, 1,500 lbs..	160— 200	150— 200
Agricultural, good.. ..	160— 225	165— 200
Agricultural, fair..	100— 150	100— 180
Express horses...	175— 250	160— 250
Drivers..	150— 260	175— 300
Saddlers..	150— 275	160— 350

With the exception of drivers and saddle horses, the prices at Chicago are lower than those in Toronto. The heavy horses which our farmers have been producing are lower in Chicago than in Toronto, and the market for Canadian horses to-day is our great Northwest. That will be our market for years to come. But by this arrangement we are allowing the American farmers, who are closer to our western country than are the farmers of Ontario and Quebec, to sell their horses there on equal terms with our own. Even the province of Manitoba, which has horses to sell, will have to meet that American competition.

I have here a letter written by one of the greatest horse men in the western states regarding the effect which this reciprocity pact is likely to have. This letter is written by Mr. R. F. Williams, of St. Paul, representing one of the largest horse dealing firms in the United States, Barrett and Zimmerman. He writes as follows:

To the farmers: In compliance with your request, we are glad to state our view of the proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada, from the standpoint of horse raisers, breeders and dealers.

Minnesota and adjoining states are rapidly forging to the front as horse raising states. The high price horses during recent years has caused every farmer in our northwest to buy brood mares and plan to raise a few market horses, thinking the great demand, caused by the settling up of new lands in the west would continue. The lands available to homestead entry are about settled up.

He is speaking of the United States, of the western states where some years ago homesteads were being opened up and there was a demand for horses. Now, however, he says, all that country is practically taken up, and there are no new settlers coming in as in the Canadian Northwest, and consequently the market for horses has decreased:

Again the lands available to homestead entry are about settled up, and the demand for horses with which to open up new lands is on the decrease. Moreover, the automobile is taking the place of horses in our large cities. With a rapidly decreasing horse demand at home——

I would like some hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to this, who tell us that reciprocity will not affect our horse market:

With a rapidly decreasing horse demand at home and a great increase in the number of colts foaled annually, the American horse raiser will soon have a large surplus of horses; and if we do not have a market for them, horses will take a decided drop in value in the very near future. It is evident that the only logical market the American horse raiser can hope for is western Canada.

Now, I would like the farmers of Ontario who are engaged in the breeding of heavy horses to notice this:

No country in the world needs so many horses as western Canada. With the duty off, thousands of carloads of American horses will be shipped across the line in the next few years, and practically double our local markets and give an outlet for all the surplus horses our farmers raise, at stable and profitable values.

I would like to know how the horse-raisers of the Dominion of Canada are going to come out on this phase of the reciprocity pact. We have a great market in Canada for horses. The Americans engaged in the horse trade admit this themselves—that it is the only growing market on the continent of America. We have hundreds of thousands of immigrants pouring into the west, and they cannot bring their horses with them. The farmers of Ontario and Quebec can raise these horses and supply them just as well as the farmers of Minnesota and adjoining states. And I believe that the farmers of this country are entitled to their home market without being intruded on by the Americans. Just to show what our interprovincial trade has been in horses, I looked up the Ontario statistics, and I find that in 1909 Ontario sold horses to the value of $9,825,476, while we only exported $783,194 worth. Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture where these horses were sold? These horses were sold in the Dominion of Canada. That is, the farmers of Ontario disposed of them to the people of our own country, and a majority of these horses, I am convinced, went into the western market which we have now lost, or in danger of losing.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If this Bill goes through.

Mr. SEXSMITH. If this Bill goes through, but I have great hopes that it will never go through.

In conclusion, I would say I am opposed to this pact as a Canadian farmer. After going into the facts, and studying the markets from an unbiassed standpoint, I feel it my duty to oppose it and to oppose it to the utmost of my ability. I oppose it also because I am a Canadian citizen, and because I can see nothing else in it but the breaking up of our federation. I oppose it as a British subject, because, to my mind, it will lead to separation from the British Empire. We are told: You preach loyalty. Well, I have heard a great deal of loyalty preached on the other side of the House. They say that there is no danger—as they put it, if I trade with a Jew that does not make me a Jew. Perhaps that is logical, but it reminds me of the old Biblical story of Abraham and Lot. These hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we can run our trade channels north and south instead of east

and west, that we can deal with these Americans, but we will not become annexed. I remember how we are told that Abraham said to Lot, let there be no strife between me and thee or between thy herdmen and my herdmen. He said: You go east and I will go to the west. Abraham knew well what kind of a man Lot was—anxious to grab all the dollars he could. Lot, with covetous eye, looked toward Sodom. The low lying well watered land, and he pitched his tent toward Sodom. He had heard of the people of Sodom of course. He said: I will go down and deal with these people; there is no danger that because I deal with them I shall ever become their fellow-citizen. And he went down and they began to deal with him. After a while he said: Why, these are very fine people and directly they were wining and dining together. And a short time afterwards what took place? Why, Lot's family was intermarried with these people of Sodom and they became one people, and Lot lived in Sodom. But Abraham remained out in the high altitude and in the open and became the head of a great nation.

Mr. THOMAS MACNUTT (Saltcoats). Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is the wish of the House to adjourn for the Easter holidays at six o'clock, and at this hour it is hardly worth while for me to begin any statement. I do not intend to take up a great deal of the time of the committee, but I do not wish to give a silent vote. I think it would be better that I should move that the committee, rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 19, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY CONTRACT.

*Mr. MARTIN (Regina):

1. When does the contract expire that was made between the government and the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company, whereby the government agreed to advance to the said company the sum of $80,000 per annum for a period of 20 years in return for certain services to be rendered by the said company?

2. What was the nature of the security taken by the government for the repayment of the money so advanced?

3. Was there an assignment or power of attorney given by the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company of its right of selection of lands retained by the government in connection with the said contract or agreement? If so, to whom and on what date?

4. If such assignment has been made, has there been any subsequent assignment? If so, to whom and on what date?

5. What was the total land grant earned by the said railway company?

6. What portion of the said land grant was held by the government as security for the advance of $80,000 per annum referred to in question 1?

7. Is the government aware that in respect of the lands so held as security, there have been repeated alleged refusals to pay taxes to school districts and local improvement districts?

8. When the contract referred to in question 1 expires, what steps will the government take to issue the patents for the lands affected, and thereby render such lands liable to taxation?

9. Are any patents for the land affected being issued? If so, under what authority and on what conditions?

Mr. FIELDING. Pending the settlement of a dispute which has arisen, between the government and the company which now controls the interests of the Qu'Appelle company in the lands held by the government as security under the contract referred to in these questions, as to the meaning of such contract, the government would prefer not to make any statement in regard to these inquiries. It is hoped that a determination of rights under the contract will be had either by adjustment or other means without undue delay.

KINGS COUNTY, P.E.I., FISHING BOUNTY.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What are the names and addresses of the persons to whom fishing bounty was paid during the year ending March 31, 1910, in Kings county, P. E. I., and what was the amount paid to each?

2. Who are the fishery officers receiving payment from the federal government in said county, and what sum was paid to each during said year?

Mr. BRODEUR. 1. List containing 619 names handed to the hon. member making the inquiry.

2. James A. McCormack, $100.

PEEL COUNTY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BLAIN:

How many post offices in Peel county receive less than a daily mail, what are the names and how often are their mails received, respectively?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. (a) Three. (b) Cedar Mills, tri-weekly; Mount Wolfe, tri-weekly; Kilmanagh, tri-weekly.

AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY CONTRACT.

*Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

1. When was the contract between the government and the American Bank Note Company for the printing of Dominion notes, postage stamps, &c., entered into?
2. How long has the contract still to run?
3. Is there any provision in said contract requiring the government to accept the designs of the American Bank Note Company for new postage stamps, in the event of the British postal authorities not submitting satisfactory designs?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. 11th April, 1906.
2. Until the 1st October, 1912.
3. There is no provision in the contract with regard to the preparation or acceptance of designs.

ST. PETER'S—REPAIRING WHARF.

Mr. FRASER:

1. Is it the intention of the government to rebuild the wharf at St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., this season?
2. If so, what amount of money will be expended, and will tenders be called for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.
2. (a) $5,000; (b) Will be done by contract or by day labour as recommended by the chief engineer.

BRUDENELL WHARF.

Mr. FRASER:

1. Does the government intend to build the wharf at Brudenell, P.E.I., during this year?
2. If so, is it the intention to build the wharf at the old site?
3. Will tenders be called for this work?
4. Has the government received letters and petitions asking to have the wharf built at the old site?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. Matter under consideration.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR.

SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Mr. Oliver) moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the carrying out of a certain agreement of sale made on the 31st day of March, one thousand nine hundred and eleven, between the government of the Dominion of Canada and the government of the province of British Columbia, whereby the Songhees Indian reserve in the city of Victoria, in the province of British Columbia, shall be conveyed or transferred to the government of British Columbia for certain considerations set forth in the said agreement.

He said: The band of Indians known as the Songhees have their reserve within the limits of the city of Victoria, bordering on the harbour. The question of this reserve is one of long standing in the city of Victoria, and I will not surprise the House when I say that the Indians have not improved the land, and the condition in which they have kept it has become a very serious matter to the city. Efforts have been made from time to time during many years to induce the Indians to release their hold on the land, and take land elsewhere, but these efforts did not materialize. The provincial government and the Dominion government then came into conference, and the provincial government have been able to effect with the Indians a settlement whereby, in return for the payment of a large sum of money, the Indians have been induced to release their hold on that reserve and accept a reserve elsewhere, in the vicinity of Esquimalt. An agreement to that effect has been reached between the Dominion government and the provincial government, and the object of this Bill is simply to give effect to that agreement.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say, for the information of the committee, that the Bill consists of one clause, which is as follows:

The agreement for the sale of the Songhees Indian reserve contained in the schedule to this Act is hereby confirmed and, notwithstanding anything contained in the Indian Act, the whole of the amount payable to each head of an Indian family under the terms of the said agreement may be paid in the manner therein provided.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount of money to be paid, and by whom is it to be paid?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The money is to be paid by the provincial government.

The agreement provided that that government shall deposit in the Canadian Bank of Commerce, in the city of Victoria, the sum of $10,000 to the credit and in the name of each head of a family of the Songhees band of Indians. There are some 43 or 44 of these heads of families. These Indians, I may say, are somewhat advanced, though not so keen for business as the white people, and I understand that they are quite able to look after their own interests. But this settlement is in excess of the powers vested in the government by the Indian Act, and that is the reason why we have to obtain this authority from parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of fact, is the amount paid over to each family, or is it put in the form of a trust fund?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. It is paid to each family.

Mr. FOSTER. So that it becomes their very own?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it paid by the provincial government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. The provincial government becomes the owner of the reserve, therefore pays the money for it.

Mr. HUGHES. This has nothing to do with the Act passed the other day?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at all.

Mr. HUGHES. In case of Indian land in Ontario being expropriated under that Act, it would, I presume, go to the provincial government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. While we have introduced that legislation, it did not cover this case, so we had to introduce a special Act covering the agreement with the Songhees. Not only in the province of British Columbia, but in the other provinces, where a reserve is in the vicinity of a growing town, as is the case in several places, it becomes a source of nuisance and an impediment to progress. But of course we must keep faith with the Indians; that is the first requisite. By this law we are giving power to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to submit to the decision of the court whether or not the Department of Indian Affairs might be authorized to take possession of such a reserve, dispose of it to white people and settle the Indians elsewhere and determine what should be a fair compensation and what should be done for the preservation of the rights of the Indians and keeping faith with them.

Mr. HUGHES. Take Fort William and Sarnia, where there are Indian Reserves adjoining these towns, in case these reserves were taken, under this proposed law, the proceeds of the Indian Lands would revert to the Dominion government for the Indians.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. For the Dominion government to handle on behalf of the Indians?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the new reserve provided from provincial or Dominion lands?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Provincial lands.

Mr. FOSTER. The question is not at all a new one but an old and very vexed question, and I shall be very glad indeed if a solution can be arrived at equitable and agreeable at all.

Mr. SPROULE. There is this feature. If the Indians are the wards of the government and the government must take care of their money, why should not the government take care of the proceeds of this transaction which revert to the Indians so as to prevent their squandering it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The answer is this. At present the Indians have a reserve and nothing else. That reserve is not a subject of commerce. They can not sell it. All they can do is have the enjoyment of it. At present, under the agreement we have made, they receive a price for their present reserve, and they are given another to replace it. They will have the same rights in the new reserve which they have to-day in the reserve they are selling, so that they will be in exactly the same position. To-day they have a reserve at Victoria, but when they part with that, they will be given one at Esquimalt, so that they would be in the same position as they are in to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. If the reserve they are leaving be worth ten times as much as the reserve on which they are to be located, the nine-tenths will be for the benefit of the Indians. It would be doubtful wisdom to give that money to the Indians and allow them to squander it while they are still the wards of the government. Why should not the government handle that money the same as they do the Indian fund?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The reasoning of my hon. friend would be right if the reserve were in commerce, but they cannot sell their land in the vicinity of Victoria.

They can only have the enjoyment of it. Whether it be worth $1,000,000 or $10,000,000, it is all the same. They have nothing but the possession and the enjoyment, and they are to be given another reserve so that they will have just as much as they have to-day. It does not matter whether the reserve they have now can sell for a larger or smaller amount, the only thing we can do is to see that they have the same thing as they now enjoy. It will simply be in Esquimalt and not in Victoria.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the Indian family consists of 10 or 15 people and they get $10,000 a family, and that is paid over by the provincial government. What will become of the minors, who are entitled to a share of this money, if the parents are allowed to squander it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Suppose the reserve were not sold at all, and the Indians kept it, the family would be just in the same position.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is all right to sell, but it seems to me that the proceeds of the sale ought to be held in trust by the government, and paid out by way of annuity or in some other way so as to prevent the Indians from squandering it foolishly as they may do if it be all paid to them, in which case the children would get no benefit.

Mr. BARNARD. For the information of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), I may say that under the Indian Act the general policy of the department is to allow one-half of the amount paid in cash on the sale of a reserve to be paid directly to the Indians. In this case, as I understand the situation, the Dominion government has agreed that the new Indian reserve should be accepted as practically one-half the value of the purchase price. For that reason, the deal is an equitable one. This is a matter of vital importance to the city of Victoria, and I would be very sorry, indeed, to see any obstacle put in the way of this settlement. The people out there have been trying for the past 30 years to get rid of this reserve and have the Indians transferred elsewhere. With regard to the administration of the fund, that is one of the grievances of the Indians. There is a small fund of some $10,000 or $15,000 which is being administered by the Dominioin government for the benefit of the Indians, and it has always been a source of irritation to the Indians that they could not lay their hands on that money. There has been considerable difficulty in getting a settlement of this matter at all, as it required very delicate negotiation, and the Indians have been dealt with very generously, as the value of the new reserve is very great, indeed. My own opinion was that this government was, if anything, a little too careful in looking after the interests of the Indians.

Mr. HUGHES. How far removed from Victoria is the new reserve?

Mr. BARNARD. About four miles.

Mr. HUGHES. They might sell that again.

Mr. BARNARD. Possibly.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 179) respecting the Songhees Indian Reserve.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SMALL-POX EPIDEMIC.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the orders of the day are called, might I be permitted to draw the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to a very dangerous condition of affairs existing with regard to the parliament buildings here, and also in the city of Ottawa. It is generally known that one of the members of the Press Gallery was taken down with small-pox some three days ago. Is it true that the room which he occupied in this building remained unfumigated until to-day? And when was this reporter taken away? I would also like to ask whether the government has any information to the effect that the family in the house in which this young man boarded has been stricken with small-pox, two or more members of the family as well as the reporter having taken the disease? And is it the intention of the government to take charge of the sanitary condition of the parliament buildings, and even of the city itself, if necessary, on account of the city officials being totally inefficient in the management of epidemics of typhoid, small-pox and other diseases that have arisen?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A memorandum has been placed in my hands by the Clerk of the House which will answer the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes):

It appears that Mr. Blue, one of the official stenographers of the House, was sent to Porter's island, on Sunday last, 16th instant, he having a mild attack of small-pox. The last time that Mr. Blue was present in the precincts of the House of Commons, was on the previous Monday, the 10th inst., when he left, not feeling well. The stenographic office occupied by Mr. Blue with others, and the sessional clerks' office adjoining, have been fumi-

gated under orders of the Health Department. The other two stenographers, Messrs. Dickson and Matthews have been vaccinated. These are in excellent health. The lady typewriters of the stenographers' office left Ottawa on Wednesday last for the Easter vacation, and have not yet returned.

As to the question of the government looking after the sanitary conditions of the House, I suppose that is a question for my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). If one member of parliament should be taken to the pesthouse, what would you do with the remaining members?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as I am aware, everything is being done which could reasonably be done to guard the health of the members. One very important matter was the water supply. We have had that sterilized, and I am happy to inform the House that I have a report from the analyst, in which he states that there is no trace of injurious bacteria in the water.

Mr. HUGHES. Wellington street is not cleaned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it looks pretty well. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) will take a walk along it, he will be delighted at the wonderful effect the sun has had upon it within the last day or two.

Mr. HUGHES. The sun—not the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am willing to give the credit to the sun. With regard to the fumigation of the official stenographer's room, the Sergeant at Arms informs me that it has been attended to, even though only attended to to-day. My attention had not been called to the fact of an official having been affected with the small-pox.

Mr. HUGHES. Pretty quick work for the government—only nine days' delay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend will be satisfied with what has been done.

UNITED STATES WAR VESSELS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to ask the Prime Minister if it is true, as stated in the newspapers, that another American gunboat or armed vessel has been given permission to traverse the canals and make entrance into the Great Lakes? If this has been done on condition of the withdrawal of any other vessel at present on the lakes, has that withdrawal actually taken place? Also, I would inquire what is the relative warlike power of each of these vessels?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is true that the 'Dubuque' has been allowed to go through the canals into the lakes, but the 'Nashville' is to be removed from the lakes. I understand that the 'Dubuque' is not such a large vessel as the 'Nashville,' but has a more powerful armament. Neither vessel has yet gone through the canals.

NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE—LOSS OF MACPHERSON-YUKON PATROL.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the Prime Minister with regard to a very regrettable occurrence which took place and which has come to our knowledge, I think, only since the House adjourned. I refer to the fatality which overtook the Mounted Police squad which left Macpherson in December last for Dawson City, and all of whom perished on the trail. I may be behind the times, but, speaking for myself alone, I do not know why that expedition was ordered out of Fort Macpherson at that time. If it were for some purpose of necessity, then brave men have lost their lives in a good cause. I think it would be for the benefit of the House and the country if a brief statement of the reasons why that expedition was sent out should be made. Perhaps the Prime Minister might not be able to make that explanation on the spur of the moment, but I suggest that he should make it at as early a time as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am prepared to give my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) now the information he asks for. I am sorry to say that we have received information, that four mounted police, headed by Inspector Fitzgerald met death on the trail between Fort Macpherson and the Yukon river. I have this statement to-day from the Comptroller of the Mounted Police:

I am grieved in having to report the death on the winter trail between Fort Macpherson —the head waters of the Mackenzie river— and Dawson, Yukon territory of inspector Fitzgerald and three other members of the R.N.W.M. Police.

They were all men of experience in winter travelling. They were detailed for the annual winter patrol from Macpherson to Dawson.

On account of their non-arrival at Dawson within reasonable time, a search party was sent out and their bodies were found—two, about 35 miles, and two about 25 miles from Macpherson.

Until particulars are received by mail I am unable to offer explanation beyond the probability that their dogs gave out and they decided to return to Macpherson.

In addition to this calamity the brief telegram I have received states that Sergeant Selig, who has done splendid work in the far north, died at Herschell Island in January.

With regard to the latter, we have no information. As to the calamity on the trail between the Yukon river and Fort Macpherson my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asks on what errand these men are sent on this long winter journey. It has been the policy of the police for ten years to have these northern parts of the country constantly patrolled, summer and winter. Every winter for ten years, a patrol has been sent regularly from the Yukon to Macpherson and from Macpherson to the Yukon again. The same thing is true on the east —patrols going from Hudson bay to Norway House, and Norway House to Winnipeg. These patrols are constantly in motion, and I am glad to say that this is the only casualty we have experienced during the time that these patrols have been on the trail. My hon. friend will see that this was not an occasional trip, but it is part of the policy of the force to have these northern parts of the country under constant surveillance and control. There has been a calamity in this case, but I think it will be explained when we have further news. I think the policy is a sound one of keeping all parts of the country, as far as we can, under constant surveillance of the police.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister might supplement the information he has given, if possible. What actuated the police in adopting this policy, and what has been effected as a result of previous patrols? Is it with a view to saving life, or what is the purpose?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As my hon. friend is aware, at Fort Macpherson, and the same is true of Hudson bay, American whalers hibernate. There are three or four American whalers at the mouth of the Mackenzie river every winter, and it has been our policy to keep surveillance and control over the country. Though we apprehend no trouble from these American whalers as they hibernated in Canadian territory, we thought it preferable to keep our authority constantly in force and our flag all the time waving, asserting our authority and our jurisdiction. I think that policy has been a good one. We had no trouble with American whalers at all, and we have at all times asserted the authority of Canadian law.

THE BRITISH-JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. BURRELL. Before the orders of the day are called. I wish to ask if the government has yet received a copy of the commercial treaty between Great Britain and Japan, and if so, when the government proposes to take action with regard to it.

Mr. FIELDING. Before recess we received a copy of the treaty, and I will be glad to bring it down and lay it on the table of the House. I am not aware as to what action the government may take on behalf of Canada; that is under consideration at the present time, and I would not be able to make any definite statement just now concerning it.

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. FOSTER. By the way, has the Finance Minister any means of getting a copy of the treaty which the United States has lately negotiated with Japan, and which, so far as I know, has not been yet promulgated; I suppose it will soon be promulgated; and the Finance Minister would make this House his debtor if he would obtain two or three copies of it for our use.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will see that since it has not been officially promulgated, even if I were able to obtain a copy, I would not be in a position to present it to the House. But we are not overlooking the fact, I can assure my hon. friend.

Mr. BURRELL. I think my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will have no trouble in getting a copy of it, for I have a copy in my possession.

Mr. FIELDING. A newspaper report is not an official copy. The newspapers contained a general statement of the effect of the treaty. But whether I have a copy of it or not, I will only say at the present moment that I have no copy that I would be free to communicate to the House. But in view of what my hon. friend has said, if he has already obtained a copy, I will make inquiry as to whether it is accessible to the public.

Mr. BURRELL. I think the injunction of secrecy must have been lifted, so far as the United States Senate is concerned, because I have an official copy.

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister says he is not aware that it has been officially promulgated; are we to infer from that remark that he has a copy in his pocket?

Mr. FIELDING. Suppose I had a confidential copy, would I be free to make it public?

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to call the attention

of the government to certain returns that have been ordered, and have not yet been brought down On the 5th of December, 1910, there was an order for a return showing what public buildings were occupied as post offices. I persume that information would be in the Department of Public Works. That cannot be a very difficult return to make, I have spoken of it before, and in the most emphatic way I wish to impress upon the proper department that the return has been too long delayed. I want to make use of it. It is now a matter of nearly four months, and cannot be very difficult to obtain. On the 18th of January, another order was made as to aliens in the service of the government who are living outside of Canada. There is no reason I think why that return should not have been made long ago. These are only two of a pretty long list of orders that have not been complied wih. I want also to make use of this return for a specific purpose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have taken note of my hon. friend's request, and will make inquiry. There is only one remark I would like to make, and that is that while it might not take long to get this return ready, its preparation might be blocked by some other lengthy returns which are in course of preparation. These returns are placed in the hands of certain clerks to attend to. I will make inquiry at once, and let my hon. friend know to-morrow.

SHIPWRECKS ON THE BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST.

Mr. BARNARD. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to two very serious shipwrecks which have taken place on the coast of Vancouver Island within the last three weeks. The first was that of the steamer 'Sechelt,' and the second occurred a week ago last Monday, that of the steamer 'Iroquois.' In both cases there was loss of life, aggregating something like 50. Both these vessels were apparently of pretty much the same type, and the question arises whether they were seaworthy, or whether they had been properly inspected. I may say in case of the 'Sechelt,' which went down with all on board, it is difficult to get at the facts; but in the case of the 'Iroquois' there are some survivors. The chief engineer states that the weather was not extraordinarily severe—I think that was also true at the time of the wreck of the 'Sechelt.' The engineer of the 'Iroquois' says it was only a stiff breeze; another bystander who was there says he has often seen this vessel go out in worse weather without any untoward results. Another witness, when asked if she was top heavy—and I may say that the vessel capsized—said that she was not more top heavy than many other vessels which are plying out of those ports. That would point possibly to some carelessness in the inspection. That is a matter that I would like to see inquired into. The wreck apparently was caused by the improper stowage of the cargo; and the captain, when questioned at the coroner's inquest, stated that so far as he knew he could load his vessel in any way he liked. I think he said to any extent he liked. Of course he is wrong in the latter contention. But if he is right in the former, there is apparently no system of inspection of the loading of these vessels. The minister is now amending the Merchant Shipping Act, and I would ask him to take into consideration whether it is not advisable to have some such inspection as that. There is still another matter I wish to call to his attention. He is directing an investigation into the causes of this wreck, it is the preliminary investigation provided for by the Shipping Act. I would like to point out to him that that is hardly sufficient. Captain Eddy, who has been appointed to make the investigation, is a master mariner, I think the examiner of the pilots, or of the captains and engineers of the city of Vancouver. He is no doubt a very estimable man, but at the same time he has not the training which would enable him to get at the facts as a judge of the Admiralty Court would be able to do. I would ask the minister to pay close attention to this matter. I can assure him that the people of the coast cities expect that the local judge in Admiralty would be asked to make a formal investigation into this wreck.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say to my hon. friend that immediately after the government received news of this accident, we ordered a preliminary investigation to be held. That is the general course followed in all such cases. We begin with a preliminary investigation, and then, if it is found necessary, the minister orders a formal investigation. In the two cases my hon. friend has mentioned, we received a report by telegraph from the examiner of masters and mates, Mr. Eddy, reporting that a formal investigation would be required. Yesterday I appointed Mr. Justice Martin, judge of Admiralty, to hold that investigation. We have followed the same procedure in the other case.

TRANSPORTATION OF FISH FROM MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), asked me to give him a statement of the quantity of fresh fish which had been transported from the maritime provinces to Ontario during the course of last year. I have a statement here with reference to the transportation of fresh fish and it is as follows.

RE TRANSPORTATION OF FRESH FISH.

MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION.

—	Canadian Express.	Dominion Express.	Freight.	Total Amount Transported.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
1907....	.....	.....	59,672	59,672
1908-09.	190,691	173,028	213,723	577,442
1909-10.	1,239,443	1,572,520	157,570	2,969,533
1910-11.	1,599,958	1,837,932	232,310	3,670,200
	3,030,092	3,583,480	663,275	7,276,847

Grand total fish transported 7,276,847 lbs.

The statement for 1910-11 is not complete as further returns for that year may yet be received.

Mr. FOSTER. These are fiscal years?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. MACDONELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) a question regarding the International Fisheries Commission. The minister will recollect that a treaty was signed in April, 1908, between ourselves and the United States. I understand the government of Canada has already promulgated regulations regarding fishing under the treaty, but that up to the present time the United States have made no regulations, and that although the treaty is three years old the statement is made in the press that there are no regulations at the present time binding on the fishermen of the United States with regard to fishing in inland waters. I think, as I have said, that the Canadian government promulgated their regulations some two years ago. I would like to know from the minister if it is so that the regulations, under the treaty, have not as yet been issued by the American government, and if the condition of affairs now is that there are no regulations regarding these matters binding upon the United States?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may inform my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) that in 1908, a treaty was made with the United States in regard to the boundary waters. Before that there were regulations passed by different states of the union, and there were also some regulations, as far as the Canadian side was concerned, passed by this government or by parliament. The treaty provided for the appointment of a commission composed of two men, one to be appointed by the United States government and one to be appointed by the British government. Prof. Prince has been named as the Canadian representative on that commission. The two commissioners set to work and framed a set of regulations which were accepted by this government and also by the government of the United States. The regulations, in order to have the force of law, required legislation on both sides, especially on the American side, because no appropriation at the disposal of the federal authorities in the United States existed to protect the fisheries or for the purpose of putting the regulations into force. On the Canadian side we had also to pass legislation and a Bill was introduced last year providing for the necessary legislation in order to put these regulations into force. The regulations, however, contrary to my hon. friend's information, have not been promulgated. The legislation simply has been passed empowering the government to put these regulations into force when the time should come for such action to be taken. They will be promulgated at a date to be agreed upon by the two governments. I may say to my hon. friend that when, in the month of January, I was in Washington, I took the matter up with the authorities of the State Department there, and they promised that steps would be taken in order to put these regulations into force or to have the necessary legislation passed. Some time afterwards the president sent a message to the United States Senate advising the adoption of the regulations and the passing of the necessary legislation and the matter now stands in that position.

Mr. MACDONELL. In neither country have they adopted these regulations?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the meantime the regulations we had before are still in force.

Mr. MACDONELL. The old regulations?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes; and the same on the United States side.

Mr. MACDONELL. Can the minister give the House any idea as to when these new regulations will be concurred in by both countries?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is very hard to say until the United States Congress has passed the necessary legislation.

Mr. MACDONELL. I understand the old regulations are very unsatisfactory and that they do not protect the fish?

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, those regulations have been in force for a great number of years, and I think they have generally given satisfaction on our side. But, on the American side, the legislation was quite different, and the regulations did not give, in some states at least, the same protection that we are giving on our side.

CANADIAN LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the government if the Canadian Light and Power Company, the lessee of the Beauharnois canal, has submitted to the government plans for the improvement and enlargement of its works upon that canal, and what action the government has taken in respect to the submission of these plans and the approval of the same?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. An application has been received. No action has been taken.

CONTROL OF WATER-POWERS.

Mr. MONK. While on that subject, there is another question that I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister. At the beginning of this session I introduced a Bill respecting water-powers, touching a subject upon which we have no legislation. That Bill was examined by the Conservation Commission at Quebec and its principle was recommended to the government. I would like to ask the government if they intend to take up that legislation this session or to provide any legislation, so as to safeguard our water-powers at this session?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not like to make a promise to my hon. friend that the matter will be taken up this session.

NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). Is it the case that the government has offered some inducement to the postmasters or other officials for the purpose of recruiting for the new navy or for providing cadets for the naval school? If so, when was that action determined upon by the government, and what is the commission or inducement offered?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say in answer to my hon. friend that the postmasters in the most important places have been selected for the purpose of acting as recruiting officers, and it is agreed that they will be paid $2 for each man who enters the navy.

Mr. MONK. Is there any order in council?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not sure, but I think so.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. T. MacNUTT (Saltcoats). Mr. Chairman, before dealing directly with the reciprocal agreement, I wish to draw attention to some remarks that were made by hon. members opposite when speaking on this question having reference to the Grain Growers' Association of the west? I will quote some of these remarks and they will speak for themselves, but they evidently intend to give the impression —in fact, they make the assertion—that the Grain Growers' Association is a Grit machine. I find on page 7057 of 'Hansard' the following:

> Mr. CAMPBELL. It has been brought to the front perhaps since then by a certain element who pose as representing the farmers.
>
> I refer to these men, Roderick MacKenzie and Henders, who stand high in the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba. They say that reciprocity is what the farmers want. Well, they are farmers of a kind I admit, but if any man in this House who knows anything about agriculture should happen to go down to their farms, he would not think they were farmers at all. These men pose as the representatives of the farmers, but in my opinion they are the agents, paid or otherwise, of the Grit party.

Another hon. member occupying a very important position on the opposition side has several times criticised the Grain Growers' Association. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) said of this association:

> Why, Sir, you would actually think it was this gang of leaders; this Grain Growers' Association from the northwest that come down here, the same sort of fellow we find popping up in blacksmith-shop statesmanship.
>
> Mr. LANCASTER. Grit organizers.
>
> Mr. HUGHES. Every one of them a Grit organizer or heeler; not the rank and file of the farmers of Canada, but the men who try to push themselves to the front and whose wives are at home wearing long boots and

cleaning out cow stables and the horse stables, while these fellows are hanging around the blacksmith shops spouting statesmanship for the world over.

Further on the same hon. gentleman said:

It is a plausible cry—reciprocity. Suggestion is a very plausible means of approaching a man. There comes along a chap with a stand-up collar, representing Mr. J. J. Hill, or some other magnate, and he tells the horny-handed sons of toil how he sympathizes with them, and prates about the greatness of the farmers, and labels them grain growers' association or something of that kind, and in that way gets the farmers under the control of the Yankee trust. The farmers of my part of the country are used to the Sheldons, the Bill Miners and the other hold-up men of the United States. Let us not be taken in by any free-trade Sheldons or Bill Miners, no matter in what shape they may come to us.

These grain growers are right in the business. We have been accustomed to lightning rod agents and hay fork peddlars and gold-brick men trying to gull the farmers along that line and failing in their efforts. But, Sir, hope springs eternal in the human breast, and we have these gentlemen going to the farmers and telling them that they are going to improve their condition. Well, although far away hills always look green, yet our farmers are not going to be taken in by any such sophistry. They have had the experience of the days of 1887 when this commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity and patron business swept the country for a time, but our farmers were not to be taken in then, and they will be just as staunch and firm to-day as they were in those days.

Then further on:

Speaking of the Association of Grain Growers, I wish to say a word about the leaders of that association. I may be possibly a little too ardent, but I know the gang and they are the same as those we fought long years ago. I do not believe that one of them is honest at heart. They are to-day, as they were formerly, in the pay of the Liberal party. It will require more than the declarations of that gang to convince me that they are not either in the pay of Jim Hill and the Yankees or of the great Liberal party of this Dominion. At all events their actions are along those lines.

And still further on:

We had before the House recently the question of the Farmers' Bank of Canada—a case in which a lot of financial buccaneers, playing on the name 'Farmers' bamboozled the farmers up and down this country to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars, the money being put into an institution for speculative purposes where it was lost. Here we have, evidently, another instance of buccaneers trading on the name of the grain growers, endeavouring to get the farmers of the northwest engaged in this speculative work.

Mr. MacNUTT.

The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) should know who compose the Grain Growers' Association; possibly the hon. member from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) has not had the same opportunity. They are an organization of both Grits and Tories. Some years ago the movement was instituted, it has spread, and has now become a very strong force. There is hardly a place in Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta that has not a Grain Growers' Association or, as they call it in Alberta, United Farmers' Association. The members found that it was necessary for their own protection to do their own business to a certain extent, and so formed the Grain Growers' Grain Company. Not all the members of the Grain Growers' Association have shares in the Grain Growers' Grain Company, but only farmers are eligible to hold shares in that Company, and their holdings are limited to four shares each of $25. The members of that company appoint these leaders themselves. They also publish a periodical which, judging from its tone last summer, was not particularly friendly to this government. This association is not in any way a Grit organization, although I believe that these two gentlemen who have been referred to by the hon. member for Dauphin, Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Henders, are or have been Liberals. The honorary president of the movement in Manitoba is Mr. J. W. Scallion, who has been a life-long Conservative, who was one of the delegates at the Farmers' deputation, who read a paper here on December 16. The vice-president is Mr. J. S. Wood, of Macdonald constituency, also a Conservative. I have received numbers of resolutions favouring the reciprocal agreement from the associations, some of them from the very hot-beds of opposition at the last election, and I recognize the names of the movers and seconders in many cases as being opponents of my own and Conservatives. I have here a letter from a gentleman who took a very decided stand at the late elections against myself, although personally he is very friendly to me. He says:

You may take it as absolutely certain that reciprocity will carry in Saltcoats riding and generally in the west. I suppose you do not want telling this, but—as an independent—it comes my way differently to the way you get your information. Old-fashioned Conservatives hate like the devil to vote for anything introduced by Laurier, but they are going to gulp Laurier and vote for reciprocity.

Most of these men are members of the Grain Growers' Association.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the name of the writer of that letter?

Mr. MacNUTT. It is a private letter.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member has quoted it.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not a public document.

Mr. MacNUTT. I am using it as evidence that there are others than Conservatives in these associations.

Mr. SPROULE. As the hon. member has quoted that letter he must lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is thinking of the rule regarding state documents.

Mr. SPROULE. No, of the rule regarding papers or letters read in this House. I claim that the rule provides that the name of the writer must be given.

Mr. MacNUTT. I will give the name privately, as perhaps my friend would not care to have his name used in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the hon. gentleman should not have read the letter.

Mr. MacNUTT. I can vouch for the fact that this was written by a gentleman whom I know very well, who took a strong attitude against the present government at the late election, and that he is a member of the Grain Growers' Association.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order and would ask the ruling of the Chair whether since the hon. member has quoted from that letter, he is not at least entitled to give the name of the writer to the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not know of any rule that makes it necessary for a member quoting from a letter of a private individual to give the name of the writer. It is true that when a minister of the Crown quotes from an official document he may be required to lay it on the table of the House. I know of no such rule applying to private members. If the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) knows of such a rule I would be willing to give it consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say I have seen the rule insisted on several times in this House, and if the party quoting from a letter was not prepared to give the name he was not allowed to give the quotation. I remember that very distinctly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule, I think, applies only to ministers of the Crown.

Mr. MacNUTT. I have some other letters that I might quote from, but I do not think I shall risk it. The point I wanted to make is that the Grain Growers' Associations are not composed entirely of Liberals, that there are a great many influential Conservatives amongst them, including some of the leaders who have been referred to as 'the gang,' who are not honest at heart. Here is something else, taken from a Winnipeg newspaper:

GRAIN GROWERS WORTH.

Allegations Against Organization Cause Indignation at Neepawa.

Neepawa, Man, April 9.—A meeting was held here Saturday afternoon to organize a county association of grain growers. Thomas Drayson and Wm. E. Smith were elected president and secretary respectively. They are both Conservatives. The former criticised Hon. Robert Rogers and others for stating that the organization had fallen into the hand of the Liberal machine.

Mr. Drayson stated that A. Meighen, M.P., was in a position to refute the allegation of Rogers, for, of the dozen delegates to Ottawa from this federal constituency who were entertained by Mr. Meighen at luncheon in the commons restaurant, eight of them were Conservatives.

The meeting appointed a committee to interview Mr. Meighen when he came here this week, and ask him what he did with the petitions in favour of reciprocity sent to him. They also have a number of other questions to ask him. One prominent Conservative grain grower who favours reciprocity wants to know by what authority the present leaders of that party have abandoned the principle and policy advocated by Sir John A. Macdonald.

I could give a great deal more evidence to show that many of the leaders of the Grain Growers' Association are anything but Grits. Which party they will support in the future I do not know; but I expect many of them will support the Liberal party, because they are satisfied that it is giving them what they have wanted for a long time, and that is, the opportunity to sell their goods in a better market, or in a third market, at all events.

Mr. HENDERSON. You had better put it that way—a third market, not a better market.

Mr. MacNUTT. We want to have a dozen markets if we can get them, so as to pick out the best of them. With regard to the reciprocal agreement, speaking as a western man, I cannot see how there can be any objection to the opening up of the third market. At one time we had only one market, that was the home market, and at that time it was hardly worth while going on the land. The country was not being settled, as settlers could not sell what they grew. Later on the old country market was opened up, and settlement went on much better than before. I am not going to say that any one is to blame for the slow pro-

gress of the country in its early days. It was in its initiatory stage, and we could not expect a rapid growth. But I cannot see what objection there can be to obtaining access to another market for our products. If that market is not satisfactory, it need not be taken advantage of. As a farmer, I think this arrangement will encourage greater production of certain products which are not now produced to a great extent, but which could be very advantageously produced in the west; I refer particularly to barley and potatoes. Very few farmers in the west raise more of these products than they require for their own use. The farmer is generally careless about barley-growing. He puts barley in late, and does not always take care that the seed is particularly clean. There may be oats or wheat mixed with it; but he does not care very much, because he is going to crush it for feed. But there is no country that can grow barley better that the west if it is properly treated. Many parts of our country, when first opened up, will not grow wheat satisfactorily, because it may not mature. The reason given for this is that the sun does not penetrate the thick sod as it does broken up ground, so that a fall of a few degrees in the temperature in August is enough to affect the wheat; but as the land gets broken up and cultivated, the heat of the sun will be absorbed by the ground during the day and given off at night, and the temperature will be much higher than it otherwise would be. I have been three times at the front taking up new land, and I have always found that in a new part of the country it was very uncertain whether a wheat crop would fully ripen, but later on, when the ground became fully broken up, it was almost certain to ripen. In many localities, barley could be grown at first instead of wheat, if there was a good market for it. Barley would mature early in August, so that there would be very little danger of its being affected by frost. Barley-growing would also be of great benefit to the older sections of the country, where the land is liable to get dirty from weed seeds or from grain seeds being allowed to remain in the ground, where they will not rot and will not germinate. The seeds which are not near the surface will not germinate. Those that do germinate will probably produce more seed to fall on the ground again, and in the course of time the old land will get full of seed. On such land you can grow a lot of barley, and at the same time get rid of these noxious seeds through germination. In the fall you can harrow the ground and bring the seeds near enough to the surface to germinate, and the plants will be destroyed by the winter frost. You can do the same thing in the spring, and more will germinate. In the course of time you can destroy most of the seeds this way, because the crop of barley can be grown and harvested before the weeds will have time to mature seed. If this is repeated a couple of times it will free the ground from noxious weed seeds; and then in the third year there can be a summer-fallow. Very few farmers care to summer-fallow for more than one year at a time, but if a farmer can go on growing crops which will pay him, and at the same time get his ground into better condition, it will be a great advantage to him; and this he can do by growing barley. The same is true of growing potatoes. If he can get a market for them, I would say that the farmer in the west would be wise to grow quite a lot of potatoes on his summer fallow; and in the end he would have his land in better shape than he would if he merely summer-fallowed it. These are some of the practical reasons why I consider that this proposed agreement would be of considerable benefit to the Canadian west.

I want now to give some figures showing the prices of wheat and barley, in Minneapolis and Winnipeg and the difference between the two. Some of these have already been submitted by my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash), who obtained his figures from the speech of a Congressman opposed to the reciprocity deal. That Congressman was arguing against reciprocity from the American standpoint, which is a very good reason I think why we should support it. I shall select only some of these figures taken from the daily market reports in Winnipeg giving the comparative prices of number one Northern wheat and number three barley in Winnipeg and Minneapolis. These figures cover 52 weeks one day in each week, and they show that in every case the Minneapolis prices were ahead of the Winnipeg prices. The smallest difference between the two in favour of Minneapolis was 5¼ cents and it runs up as high as 19 cents.

COMPARATIVE PRICES OF CASH NO. 1 NORTHERN WHEAT AND No. 3 BARLEY—WINNIPEG AND MINNEAPOLIS MARKETS.

Date.	Wheat—No. 1 Northern.			Barley—No. 3.		
	Winnipeg.	Minneapolis.	Difference.	Winnipeg.	Minneapolis.	Difference.
1910.	$ cts.	$ cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
Jan. 3	1 03¼	1 14	9¾	45	66	21
" 10	1 04½	1 16	11½	45½	69	23½
" 17	1 02	1 12⅝	10⅝	46½	69	22½
" 24	1 02⅛	1 13¾	11⅝	47½	69	21½
" 31	1 03	1 13¼	10¼	48½	65	16½
Feb. 7	1 02	1 12	10	.....	64	
" 14	1 02¾	1 14⅝	11⅞	47½	66	18½
" 21	1 02¾	1 15¼	12½	47½	68	20½
" 28	1 03¾	1 16¾	13	48	67	19
Mar. 7	1 02½	1 12⅞	10⅜	.....	64	
" 14	1 04¾	1 15⅜	11	.....	66	
" 21	1 05¼	1 14⅞	9⅜	48	65	17
" 28	1 05	1 15⅞	10⅞	47½	62	14½
April 5	1 04¾	1 13¼	8½	47⅜	63	16⅜
" 12	1 03½	1 12¼	8⅝	33⅜	60	22⅜
" 19	1 00	1 07¾	7¾	.....	61	
" 26	0 98¾	1 09⅜	10⅝	.....	61	
May 3	1 00⅜	1 12	11⅝	.....	60	
" 10	0 98⅛	1 12⅞	14¾	44½	60	15⅞
" 17	0 97¼	1 11⅝	14⅜	45	61	17
" 23	0 92	1 09½	17½	31¾	61	29¼
" 31	0 86¾	1 05	18¼	....	58	
June 7	0 90¾	1 08	17⅜	42	60	18
" 14	0 90⅜	1 05½	14⅞	.....	59	
" 21	0 96⅜	1 15⅝	19⅜	42¼	72	31¾
" 28	1 01¾	1 17¼	15½	43½	61	17½
July 5	1 02¾	1 17¾	15	45	61	16
" 12	1 09¼	1 19¼	9½	48	69	26
" 19	1 14¼	1 25	11¾	.....	68	
" 26	1 13½	1 27½	13¼	.....	65	
Aug. 2	1 03¾	1 16	14⅛	.....	63	
" 9	1 08½	1 19¾	16¼	.....	68	
" 16	1 09⅛	1 13⅜	4¼	.....	72	
" 23	1 08	1 13⅛	5⅛	.....	69	
" 30	1 08⅜	1 13½	5⅛	.....	68	
Sept. 6	1 05	1 12⅜	7⅜	.....	67	
" 13	1 00¼	1 11⅝	11⅜	.....	70	
" 20	1 01¼	1 11½	10¼	.....	72	
" 27	0 99	1 10½	11½	42½	68½	26¼
Oct. 4	0 98¾	1 10⅝	11⅞	47	69	22
" 11	0 97	1 09½	12⅛	47½	72	24½
" 18	0 95½	1 05⅓	10	46½	71	24⅓
" 25	0 94¼	1 04⅓	10¼	.....	69	
Nov. 2	0 89½	1 02⅜	12⅞	43	71	28
" 9	0 90¼	1 03	12⅘	46	75	29
" 16	0 92¾	1 06	11¼	47	76½	29½
" 23	0 95¼	1 05½	10⅛	47	76	29
" 30	0 90	1 04⅓	14½	.....	75	
Dec. 7	0 91	1 04⅓	13⅛	.....	83½	
" 14	0 90	1 03¼	13¼	46½	80	33½
" 21	0 89¾	1 02	12¼	47	80	33
" 28	0 90	1 04⅜	14⅜	47	79	32

Average for Wheat No. 1 Northern, 11¾c. Average for Barley No. 3 for 31 weeks, 23c.

The average difference in favour of Minneapolis was 11¾ cents per bushel for the whole year. But this is not all. There is a difference in the system of inspection between the Winnipeg and the American system. Let me just read what constitutes Number one wheat at Winnipeg and also at Minneapolis:

Winnipeg—

No. 1 wheat, Manitoba hard wheat, shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel and shall

be composed of at least 75 per cent hard Red Fife wheat.

Minnesota hard—

No. 1 spring wheat, hard, shall be sound, bright, sweet, clean and consist of over 50 per cent of the hard varieties, and weigh not less than 58 pounds to the measured bushel.

Then again the Americans use the Winchester bushel whereas we use the Imperial which shows that the Americans are willing to pay considerable more for a smaller quantity.

Winnipeg—

No. 1 northern wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and be composed of at least 60 per cent of hard Red Fife wheat.

The No. 1 Northern spring wheat Minnesota shall be sound, sweet and clean, and may consist of the hard and soft varieties of spring wheat and weigh not less than 57 pounds to the measured bushel.

In the case of similar grades, the Canadian system requires that it shall be a better wheat than the American system. It is generally conceded that there is a difference of about one grade in favour of Canadian wheat.

There is something more than this. The Americans are not so particular with regard to damaged wheat. Wheat a little tagged or bleached will not be 'rejected' as it is in Canada. If it should happen to be out in a rainstorm, after stooking it would probably lose a grade in Canada, whereas that wheat would pass in the States as if it were not so affected.

I have here some figures obtained from the 'Pioneer Express' of Pembina, North Dakota:

PRICES PAID FOR WHEAT IN TOWNS OPPOSITE EACH OTHER IN MANITOBA AND NORTH DAKOTA.

North Dakota.	$ cts.	Manitoba.	$ cts.	Difference.
				Cts.
Pembina	0 91	Emerson	0 81	10
Neche	0 91	Gretna	0 81	10
Walhalla	0 91	Haskett	0 79	12
Hannah	0 90	Snowflake	0 77	13
Saries	0 89	Crystal City	0 76	13
Hansboro	0 90	Cartwright	0 79	11
St. John	0 90	Boissevain	0 80	10
Antler	0 91	Lyleton	0 78	13
Portal*	0 86	North Portal	0 75	11
Kermit	0 88	Estevan	0 74	14
Couris	0 93	Waskada	0 77	16

The average difference was thus 12 cents per bushel in favour of Dakota. The American farmer received that much more for his grain than the Canadian.

JANUARY 10, 1911.

North Dakota.	$ cts.	Manitoba.	$ cts.	Difference.
				Cts.
Pembina	0 97	Emerson	0 82	15
Neche	0 96	Gretna	0 81	15
Walhalla	0 97	Haskett	0 82	15

PRICES PAID FOR BARLEY, JAN. 11, 1911.

Pembina	0 67	Emerson	0 42	25
Neche	0 67	Gretna	0 38	29
Saries	0 65	Crystal City	0 38	32
Hansboro	0 66	Cartwright	0 36	30
St. John	0 67	Boissevain	0 40	27
Portal	0 63	North Portal	0 35	28
		Average		28½

FLAX ON ABOVE DATE.

Pembina	2 32	Emerson	1 93	39
Neche	2 32	Gretna	2 06	26
Walhalla	2 35	Haskett	2 08	27
Saries	2 34	Crystal City	2 10	24
Hansboro	2 31	Cartwright	2 00	31
St. John	2 32	Boissevain	2 14	18
Antler	2 30	Lyleton	2 22	08
Portal	2 33	North Portal	1 89	44
		Average		29⅛

The following were the prices paid for wheat in Emerson and Pembina on the same dates, in October, for the preceding five years:—

1904, Pembina	1 00	Emerson	0 78	22
1905, Pembina	0 70	Emerson	0 64	06
1906, Pembina	0 64	Emerson	0 59	05
1907, Pembina	1 04	Emerson	0 94	10
1908, Pembina	0 93	Emerson	0 81	12
		Average		11

Any stranger going to Portal would think that it and North Portal were the one town, Portal being on the south side of 49th parallel and North Portal on the other side. There is only a street between the two, and the Canadian and American farmers can eat their dinners at the same hotel.

It will be seen that the quotations for barley cover, so far as Winnipeg is concerned, only thirty-one weeks. The reason is that, in the other twenty-one weeks, no quotations are available—evidently, there was no market at all. The figures

show the prices in Minneapolis to be much higher than in Winnipeg. The greatest difference is 33½ cents on December 14, and the average for the thirty-one weeks is 23 cents a bushel in favour of Minneapolis. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) found fault with quotations of figures by a previous speaker on this side, showing the prices of barley, on the ground that malting barley in Minneapolis was quoted against feed barley in Winnipeg. But I have taken the same grade of barley—called on both sides No. 3. The Manitoba grade is given in the Bill as follows:

No. 3 Manitoba barley should include shrunken or otherwise slightly damaged barley, weighing not less than 45 pounds to the bushel.

And this is the Minnesota grade as taken from the pamphlet to which I have referred:

No. 3 barley should include all slightly shrunken and otherwise slightly damaged barley, not good enough for No. 2, and should weigh not less than 44 pounds to the measured bushel.

Thus it will be seen that the grades are practically the same. At the same time, if you give our farmers in the west liberty to grow barley and sell it in the American market, they will grow very little No. 3, but what they grow will be nearly all No. 1.

Another point I wish to dwell upon for a short time is the question of horses. Some hon. members have been claiming that the farmers of Canada would not get as much for their horses under reciprocity as at present. I am a horse raiser in a small way myself, and, as I am in favour of the protection of agricultural implements, and other things being taken away it would be very inconsistent of me to ask for protection on horses. I would be quite willing to accept the market. I do not think that the change will make much difference in prices, except for inferior horses. The western American horses are fairly cheap, but we in the western provinces can raise the same stamp of horses just as cheaply. One point we have to consider is the interest of the consumer. Most of the farmers coming into the country will require horses. A man can get along sometimes with an inferior team. But the money to be made in horse raising is to be made on the better class of horses. In any case, I do not think the farmers in the west are going to object to reciprocity in horses, because very few of them go into the business. Most farmers raise enough for themselves, though some do not. Some raise a small surplus and some make a business of horse raising. Of course, it is an important industry, but I do not think any farmer who is raising horses should complain, even if he has to raise his horses against competition from the United States, because he is asking the government to take away protection from the manufacturer, and as I said before, it would be inconsistent for him to ask protection for what he raises and deny protection to others. There is no doubt that there will be some importation of horses from the United States, and, that being the case, I desire to draw the attention of the government—it may be unnecessary, but it will do no harm at all events—to one very important point. Glanders seems to prevail among western American horses to a very large extent. We have had a number of outbreaks of glanders in the west, and in every case the infection could be traced to American importations. No doubt, more horses will be coming in, and it may be more difficult to have them all tested with the mallein test. But that should be looked to carefully, for it is one of the most important things in connection with horse raising in the west. I have suffered twice from outbreaks of glanders among my horses, and in each case the disease was traced to American importations, though the importations did not directly affect mine. Glanders is a disease which will simply put the farmer out of business if it gets a foothold. The Department of Agriculture should be very careful in the inspection of all horses coming across the line, particularly horses from the western states.

I am very much in favour of this reciprocal agreement. In fact, when I first heard of it, I thought it was too good to be true. But there is one part which is not quite so satisfactory, and that is in connection with agricultural implements. We in the west claim that the manufacturer of implements has done very well; he has had protection for a long time and has got established, and there is no necessity for protecting him any longer. Of course, this agreement reduces very materially the duties on many agricultural implements, but I do not think it goes quite far enough; it is not uniform. I have some figures taken from the catalogue of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, showing the prices of Canadian and American implements in that country, and the figures show that the Canadian manufacturer in some cases undersells the American manufacturer in that competitive market.

	£	s.	d.
Deering Ideal, 5 ft. cut with sheaf carrier	31	10	0
Massey Harris, 5 ft. cut with sheaf carrier	31	0	0
Walter A. Woods, 6 ft. cut with sheaf carrier	32	10	0
Massey Harris, 6 ft. cut with sheaf carrier	32	0	0

In both cases, the Canadian is underselling the American manufacturer in this market to which they are admitted freely, and which is about equally accessible to both. The Canadian manufacturer gets a drawback on his raw material. No doubt, when he sells in England he makes a profit—I think the manufacturers generally do. But compare this with the condition of affairs in the west. I have here also some figures from the price list of a dealer in my own town, a man who has been dealing in implements for many years. He selects two binders of the same character—six-foot binders. He said he could get an American machine duty free in Winnipeg for $122.50, and he could get a similar machine of Canadian manufacture for $122. The freight rates, he claimed, were about the same, $10.50 I think on the American machine and $10.60 on the Canadian. Now, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) figured out that something over $20 was collected in duty on every binder, and some $2.50 were paid in duty on the raw material.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the retail price or the wholesale price?

Mr. MacNUTT. I am not speaking now of the price to the farmer, but of the price to the dealer, who sold these two implements for exactly the same price. It cost him about $4 to get them up from Winnipeg, and he sold them both at the same price, $150 cash for each.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know if the price quoted by the hon. gentleman is the wholesale price at which he could purchase them from the manufacturer to resell again?

Mr. MacNUTT. He was buying outright for himself. If he was working on commission, that would be a different thing. But he was buying outright, and he was getting the American machine laid down at Winnipeg, duty paid, for $122.50, and the Canadian machine cost him I think $122, only 50 cents difference, and he sold them both at the same price. These are the figures he gave to me. Now it does seem strange that the manufacturers of implements can send their stuff to the old country, on the same conditions and sell at the same price as their American competitors, and when they send them west, into our own country, they have to get some $17 or $18 extra profit, and they claim that unless they get this profit they will have to go out of business. That is a problem for us in the west that has never been satisfactorily solved. Now with regard to raising a revenue. As farmers we have got to pay our share in taxes towards raising the revenue, the same as anybody else. But it is a question whether the government has recognized the right principle in developing the west. They offer lands free, or very cheap, to people who will come in and settle them, and the lands are no use unless they are worked. I think the government should supplement their free or cheap lands by providing the farmers cheap tools with which to work their lands, as far as a government can do this in the matter of duty, and thereby encourage production from the land. I do not advocate that the duty should be entirely knocked off at the present time, but I think at all events it should be brought down to a revenue basis, but I admit it is sometimes difficult to find out what is a revenue basis. I think, however, the duty might be further lowered, and there would be more revenue raised under a lower duty. We find that the Post Office Department, for instance, by reducing the rate of postage, increased the business so much that a large deficit was turned into a surplus. I think that a similar policy with regard to agricultural implements would produce a greater revenue from that source, and would at the same time furnish cheaper implements to the farmers. Now I wish to make another quotation from the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), on page 7274 of the 'Hansard':

> It is not many years since the people of this country, at the behest of this government, were given free trade in binder twine. I had the honour of predicting, in a campaign before that unfortunate legislation was enacted, that in case free trade in binder twine was enacted, the farmers of Canada would pay largely through their nostrils to the combines and trusts of that commodity in the United States, and from that hour to this, binder twine has never been so low as it was in the old days before the National Policy. The Canadian farmer has been paying thousands and tens of thousands of dollars to the American trusts on binder twine, on fence wire, and on agricultural implements.

Now it is a puzzle to know whether they are paying these thousands and tens of thousands of dollars on account of free binder twine and fence wire, or protected agricultural implements. I think the point the hon. gentleman wants to make is that lower duties or free trade would not reduce the price. He quotes binder twine in that connection. Now under the old National Policy I paid 16 or 17 cents a pound for an inferior binder twine, and a much superior twine is now being sold for 9 or 10 cents a pound.

Mr. HUGHES. It is not the same twine. Is not sisal to-day dearer than it was then and is not manila twine dearer than it was years ago?

Mr. MacNUTT. I know that what I bought for 16 cents a pound——

Mr. HUGHES. What was it made of?

Mr. MacNUTT. I could not tell you, I am not a manufacturer of twine. I know it cost 16 cents a pound, and it was a very thick heavy twine, and a pound would bind but a small number of sheaves, and broke easily. Now we have twine at 9 or 10 cents a pound, sometimes 650 feet to the pound, which will tie up a large number of sheaves and break with difficulty. In 1897 there was very little difference, but the reason given at that time was that an export duty was put upon American twine by the United States government, and they got control of the Philippine Islands and of the raw material of which twine was made, so they controlled the raw material and made the price a little higher. But if there had been an import duty upon it there is no doubt it would have been still higher.

Mr. HUGHES. Had the United States conquered the Philippine Islands in 1897?

Mr. MacNUTT. I say about that time, it may have been later on. But I know that immediately after it was lowered the price went down, because later on, I cannot tell exactly when—I am not as well posted in military matters as the hon. gentleman is, and consequently I cannot give the exact date when the Philippines were conquered—but I remember the circumstance, that immediately after 1897 the price was lowered. Later on an export duty was put on and the price increased a little. But it came down after that, and it is down now 9 or 10 cents a pound or thereabounts.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the hon. member know the difference? I know the hon. gentleman cannot listen to two or three at the same time. His prompters behind him are getting him all mixed up.

Mr. MacNUTT. I am not at all mixed up and am not aware of any prompters.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the hon. member know the difference between sisal and manila, or the other qualities of binder twine?

Mr. MacNUTT. I know the difference between good twine and bad twine, twine that is capable of tying up a sheaf, and a twine that breaks. I have been there frequently, and know what it means. I do not care what it is made of, provided it is good twine.

Mr. HUGHES. It would be just as fair to compare the price of silk with the price of factory cotton. Factory cotton is much stronger than silk and yet it is not as expensive.

Mr. MacNUTT. No doubt silk would be better as a matter of looks, but we do not care as to the looks when it comes to binder twine.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the hon. member mean to say that he is comparing the price of binder twine made of the same material with the price in 1897? It was lower then than it is to-day.

Mr. MacNUTT. I do not pretend to say that I am an expert with regard to binder twine, but as a farmer I know what is good twine and what is cheap twine and that is all I care about.

Mr. LALOR. Is it not a fact that binder twine is dearer to-day than it was before it was put on the free list?

Mr. MacNUTT. No.

Mr. LALOR. Quality for quality, is it not a fact that it is dearer to-day than it was then?

Mr. MacNUTT. I am not aware of it.

Mr. LALOR. You are trying to make out that it is not.

Mr. MacNUTT. I cannot tell you what it was just before 1897, but I have paid 15 and 16 cents a pound for binder twine myself for years, and after this government came into power it was cheaper.

Mr. HUGHES. What was it made of?

Mr. MacNUTT. I would not say what it was made of. Later on it may have been a little dearer. However, I do not think it matters very much. Now, I can tell you something with regard to the price of cream separators. I know that in 1897 a cream separator cost $110, whereas, a year or so later, the price was reduced to $85 and the price continued to go down until every farmer could afford to buy a cream separator. This has had a very great effect upon the prosperity of the west. This demonstrates that a reduction of duty sometimes, at all events, has the effect of producing a reduction in price.

Canadians need not be ashamed of the quality of their implements. I do not think that the Americans can make anything better than the Canadian manufacturers can. Take them all round, I think the Canadian implements are preferable in many ways, and, while the Canadian manufacturers might not get quite so much profit perhaps, they still would get the business if the duty were reduced. There is another point that I desire to mention in connection with

agricultural implements. I believe it is a fact that a certain plough company in Canada has been shipping gang ploughs to the United States for the last two or three years, paying a duty of 15 per cent and selling them against their competitors in the United States who have no duty to pay. If that is so how is it possible that they cannot sell to the people in their own country without protection?

Mr. HUGHES. Can the hon. member give us the number and value of those ploughs he could get it from the American returns—shipped from Canada to the United States in the last year or two that he speaks of?

Mr. MacNUTT. I do not say I can, but I can tell you that the manager of this particular company informed me some time ago, and he was proud of the fact, that they had shipped a large number of ploughs.

Mr. LALOR. Of a certain pattern?

Mr. MacNUTT. Of a certain pattern. I just give that for what it is worth. Then, there has been some discussion as to the effect that this reciprocal agreement will have upon transportation. I find that Sir Donald Mann, and, I think, Sir Wm. Mackenzie, are in favour of this agreement, that they are going on with their work and that they are not at all afraid of it. Here is a clipping that I find in connection with their work this year, and this statement was published since the agreement was brought down:

C.N.R.'S BILL FOR RAILS WILL EXCEED $3,000,000.

Ninety Thousand Tons to be Delivered this Year—Heavy Sales of Land

The Canadian Northern has made a fair start toward making this a record year in its growth and business development. Up to the present date, the company has placed orders for rails to be delivered in 1911, to the amount of 90,000 tons, at a cost of over three million dollars. These rails will be laid in Ontario and Western Canada. There are at present 520 miles graded and ready for the steel in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Last year 528 miles of rails were laid, but the rails laid this year will greatly exceed that quantity.

I also find that Canadian Pacific Railway stock has been going up continually, and that evidently investors are not at all afraid.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the bounty going to be paid on steel rails for the coming year?

Mr. MacNUTT. I could not tell the hon. member that. It would certainly not be if I had my way. I overlooked one thing that I want to go back to for a moment, and it has reference to the ever present matter of agricultural implements. I find that the duty on a great many agricultural implements has been reduced from 20 to 15 per cent, which represents about a 25 per cent reduction. But, the reduction does not apply uniformly. Take farm wagons, for instance, which not only the farmer, but everybody who has a team of horses uses; they were 25 per cent and they have only been reduced to 22½ per cent. I cannot understand why they were not reduced further. I find that ploughs, tooth and disc harrows, horse-rakes, cultivators, threshing machines, including wind stackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders therefor, and finished parts thereof imported for repairs of the foregoing are reduced from 20 to 15 per cent. That is a good cut; there is no doubt about that. It is a good instalment, at all events. Reapers, mowers, and binders were, two or three years ago, reduced from 20 to 17½ per cent. That has been supplemented by a further reduction of 2½ per cent, making a full reduction of 5 per cent from the duty as it existed three years ago. There are some other articles, however, that have not been reduced, such as manure spreaders, weeders, wind-mills, portable engines with boilers in combination, horse-powers and traction engines for farm purposes. They remain at the same rates of duty. There are some others which have been reduced from 25 to 20 per cent, which is a very good cut too. But it would have given much more satisfaction if the duty on all agricultural implements had been reduced to 15 per cent and the matter made uniform. However, we can look forward, I hope, to having further reductions later on. In the meantime if the farmers are given better markets they can make more money, and it will be a stimulus to them to go on and increase their production, and they can better stand paying for what they have to purchase than if their markets were restricted.

Now, there is just one more point that I shall refer to and that is the loyalty or annexation cry. I need not refer to it at any length because it has already been dealt with. I think it is a very stupid cry to raise. Surely the history of Canadians would not lead any one to imagine that because they are going to be able to sell their goods in a foreign country they must therefore desire to become annexed to that country? It would seem that if any did want that market very badly and could not get it otherwise, they might desire to become annexed. But that incentive is taken away by this agreement. They are going to get that market and they are still going to remain under their own flag. I do not understand the argument which opponents of this measure have advanced on that ground at all. I have here a little clipping with reference to a statement made by the Hon. Lloyd George. No matter what hon. gentlemen may think of his politics they must agree that he is a great statesman and a loyal British subject.

LLOYD-GEORGE PRAISES THE AGREEMENT.

London, Feb. 17.—Lloyd-George, in denying a statement published in a Paris paper that he was antagonistic to the Canadian agreement, says: 'I rejoice that it has been negotiated, and heartily trust it will be carried to a successful conclusion. I regard it as a great triumph of common sense, and an immense stride in the cause of free trade. It is an incalculable step toward the fraternity and co-operation of the English speaking family.'

The whole matter was well summed up by a cartoon published some weeks ago in a Montreal paper. This represented Johnny Canuck behind the counter and Uncle Sam as a customer Uncle Sam prices the goods and then prices the store. He is informed by the storekeeper, Johnny Canuck, that the goods are for sale but not the store. That is about the position we are in, we raise the goods to sell, we wish to get as much money for them as possible and the more American dollars the western man gets the better for all of Canada, the better for any one who has anything to sell to him, the better for manufacturers of all kinds. All they have to do is to give the western farmer value and they will get the money. The farmer is not going to keep his money in an old sock, he will put it into circulation and if the fact is established that under this arrangement he will make more money and have a better market no objection should be raised by any man who is making articles to sell.

In conclusion I would state that I am heartily in accord with the reciprocal agreement, that I hope it will be completed and am satisfied that it will mean much greater prosperity not only for western Canada but for the whole Dominion.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I have listened during the several weeks of this discussion with the most earnest attention to all that has been said in regard to these important reciprocity resolutions hoping and wishing that some reason might be given which would satisfy me, as an ordinary citizen of Canada, that this agreement made with our neighbours to the south might be of some benefit to the country, because it seems evident that the government are determined by the force of its power over its supporters in the House to force this matter through parliament against the will of what I believe to be the majority of the people of Canada. I have been disappointed in that hope; I have heard no argument advanced by any minister or any hon. member on the government side which would satisfy me that there was any reason for making this agreement, let alone any argument to show that it would result in any benefit to Canada.

One or two very grave objections may be made to the agreement irrespective of what may be called the merits or demerits of the proposals. The first objectionable feature is the manner in which this arrangement was made. How was it made? Why was it made? What actuated the two hon. members of the cabinet in going to Washington at the time they did and attempting to make some arrangement with the United States looking towards reciprocity between the two countries? We have to imagine that there was some ulterior reason. Suggestions are made which cannot of course be proved; nevertheless we must draw inferences as best we can as the actual object is not known to us. We do know, for instance, that having tried to ride two horses in regard to the naval policy the government was in trouble in the province of Quebec; it is suggested that they wanted to draw a herring across their trail to distract the attention particularly of the elementary farmers of the province of Quebec, those to whom they appealed to grow nothing but hay and potatoes and not to manufacture their hay into animals or to progress as all farmers in Canada ought to. They had no mandate from the people to introduce that naval policy. Fresh from the people without any mandate on the subject, they undertook to create a navy, not an imperial navy, because on the very threshold of its construction it is enacted in the most emphatic way that it is not to be under the control of the King of Great Britain as the British North America Act enacts Canadian forces should be, but is to be an independent navy for Canada, a navy that would be of very little use to us in any event. I shall not discuss the navy further than to point out that this government introduced that naval policy without any mandate from the country. They have taken the position that they have a general mandate because they are returned to power, that that mere fact warrants them in initiating any policy and carrying it to any length. Such a theory is absolutely unconstitutional absolutely against the principles of constitutional government and of representation of a people in a parliament. If ever there was an agreement between a people and a government there was an agreement and has been since 1897 between this government and the people of Canada that the policy of reasonable protection and of a stable tariff, would be carried out in this country by this government. That agreement was as binding as any agreement which was not absolutely reduced to writing and signed and sealed could be. If two individuals or two corporations had been in the same relation to one another as the government and the people of Canada have been in this matter, the implied agreement between them would be held by any court of justice to be binding. There has been

since 1897 an agreement that the fiscal policy of this government would be a stable tariff affording reasonable protection to all classes in this country.

The country has prospered under that policy, and at every session of parliament and at every election since 1897 the government and the people have emphasized the prosperity of the country, but not the fact that the opposition were assisting in that prosperity; yet the fact remains that the question of protection and free trade has not been in politics since 1897, for the simple reason that the Conservative party, having taught hon. gentlemen opposite the benefits of protection and of a stable tariff have ever since, as consistent people, backed them up; and therein lies the main reason for the prosperity of this country since 1897, and the people of this country will realize that fact as soon as it is stated. No other part of the world that I know of has been in the same position since 1897. A slight majority of the people of this country, although in opposition, undertook in 1878 to create a protective policy to build up Canada. From 1878 till 1896 they were fought in every possible way on that question. The people were told that it was robbery, that it was improvident, that it was no good; but in spite of that opposition, the government maintaining that policy was returned to power every time it appealed to the country upon it, and when that government went down in 1896, it went down without that policy being in question at all, and without any one suggesting that the policy of protection or of a stable tariff should be changed. Then this government came into power, and what happened? It was lucky for them that they were opposed by an opposition who were consistent, and who, from that time on, instead of hampering and attacking them as they had hampered and attacked the Conservative government, loyally assisted them in that respect; and we have never had the question of protection raised since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. It is no wonder that the country has prospered since 1897 with the whole country united on this policy. That is the cause of the prosperity of the country. Now, does that teach us nothing? Does it teach us that we should lightly change or interfere with that policy? It has been shown overwhelmingly in this debate that this country has been more prosperous since 1897 than any other country of equal population in the civilized world. Are we not to draw inferences from this fact? Are we not to infer that the cause of that has been not only the reasonable protection and the stability of tariff that have existed for all classes, but the fact that all public men, Reform, Conservative, and Independent, have united in upholding that policy, and pointing to the benefits that could be obtained in Canada by investing capital therein. That seems to me to be an overwhelming obstacle in the way of the proposition that this government had any authorité for going to Washington to negotiate this reciprocity agreement. As showing that they did an imprudent and unwise thing in discussing the matter at all with the president of the United States, I ask, why could they not wait and see how far the Democratic Party, which has been crying out for free trade and for a revision of their own tariff, would go in revising their tariff without Canada being called upon to do anything in return? Nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side of this question has sneered at any one who fears that this reciprocity arrangement might lead to annexation. Well, one might better fear that than not care a rap whether it did or not. I am not an alarmist in that regard more than anybody else; but I do not want my children and my grandchildren, if I have any, to have their pocket interest pointing in one direction and their loyalty in another. I do not want any policy in this country which is going to get a financial benefit for a man at the cost of his loyalty to Great Britain, I think the Finance Minister ought to have considered the rights of the people of Canada in that regard. He ought to have realized that it is a dangerous thing, when we are doing well, to make an arrangement with any other country for the sake of obtaining entrance to a third market, which would induce the trade of the Canadian people to go to that country, and create a pocket interest in that trade at the cost of their loyalty to the British Crown, and cause them to be commercially annexed and after that politically annexed. When hon. gentlemen opposite sneer at any one for being alarmed with regard to that prospect, they forget that leaders of their own party have been equally alarmed and that some of them still dread that result. They forget that the hon. Mr. Blake, one of their most eminent leaders, left their party on this account. They should remember that Mr. Blake refused to lead them any longer or take any part in this policy of commercial union because he was satisfied it would lead to political annexation. We can therefore point them to very eminent authorities in their own ranks for the alarm we feel on this point. But suppose this thing should not lead to annexation, why should it be done at all? Why should we take any chance? The boys at school to-day will be the public men of this country 25 years hence. The little girls now following their classes will be the mothers of families 25 years from now. They do not understand what we are doing to-day or why we are doing it, and consequently the

next generation will be apt to think that their fathers did not see very much harm in this scheme. They possibly will know very little about the forces and the sentiments which brought about confederation and will be apt to judge, from the very fact that we entered so lightly into this pact, that a closer union with the United States would not be so objectionable or at any rate that their fathers did not view it in that light.

We are told by the advocates of this arrangement that British connection must be very weak indeed if it is going to suffer by anything of the kind. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) sneered at any such notion. My hon. friend is of Scotch descent and it is not gratifying to those who have faith in the old Scottish rugged independence and loyalty to find a man of that descent under the power of the government to such an extent that he will sneer at people who wish to preserve at all costs the tie that now exists between Great Britain and Canada. The fear of annexation to the United States was so distant, he said, that people would stand pecuniary loss, if necessary, under this proposed agreement, and still remain loyal.

Mr. PORTER. He said that we owe Great Britain nothing.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, he said that on the naval question, and on that question he is in a minority just as the government is on this, as they would find out if they would give the people an opportunity of expressing their opinion at the polls.

The hon. the Finance Minister talked a good deal about loyalty, but the loyalty he talked about was loyalty to President Taft, to whom he said this country was bound to carry out the proposed agreement. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition on March 8, last, moved a resolution asking that the people should be consulted on this question before anything further was done with it. The motion of my hon. friend was:

That in the opinion of the House the said resolutions should not be proceeded with until the electors should have an opportunity of pronouncing upon their merits.

The Finance Minister undertook to give reasons why his political supporters should vote that motion down. For my part I am convinced that there was not really a baker's dozen of them who thought the motion was wrong, but they did not believe that if it should carry they would ever come back here. In their hearts they thought the motion was a proper one, but of course they had to follow the lead set them. What argument did the Finance Minister use? It will be found on page 4943 of unrevised 'Hansard.' He said:

The President of the United States has loyally lived up to that agreement. If the government of Canada, or the parliament of Canada which supports this government, should deviate one step from this arrangement it would be a breach of faith which would dishonour the government of Canada——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. A breach of faith which would dishonour the government of Canada and through the government, the parliament and people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Further on at page 4947 he said:

A duty we believe rests on the parliament of Canada, so far as it is willing to give us its support; whether the members agree with this agreement or arrangement or not——

What does he propose?

—whether the members agree with this agreement or not, there should be no division of opinion as to the obligations which we, as a young nation, have entered into with a great nation besides us. The President of the United States is loyally doing his part, it remains with us to loyally do ours.

Then at the bottom of the page he said:

We say, let us put this measure on our statute-book, and then, if within a reasonable time the United States Congress fail to do their part, we shall be free to consider what next. In the meantime, I say that the honour of the Dominion government, and through the Dominion government, the honour of the country is pledged to this arrangement with the United States. While I quarrel with no man for differing from us on the merits of the agreement, I say there is no room for difference as to our condemnation of the motion which the hon. leader of the opposition has placed in your hands.

Just think of the doctrine expounded by the Finance Minister. He and his colleague the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) negotiated this agreement without any mandate from the people. They entered into it in defiance of the understanding of the Canadian people since 1897 that nothing of the kind was to be done in the future. Without any caucus, without any consultation with the members of their own party—as has been said by prominent members of that party who left it on this question—they went to Washington and entered into this pact, and then come back and sneer at the loyalty of Canadians who are afraid of annexation. But has not such fear a good basis? Instead of talking about loyalty to the President of the United States the Finance Minister would do better to let the Canadian people have a chance to give their verdict on this agreement and turn it down, as no doubt they would. Does the hon. minister know the meaning of the word 'loyalty'? Loyalty implies duty to somebody. Now to whom does the Finance Minister owe his first duty? Is it to President Taft or to the Canadian people? Who is it put him

in office? If he is Finance Minister to-day, he owes that position to the taxpayers of this Dominion who returned his leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to power. And if the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs went to Washington, they did so by virtue of the offices vested in them by our people.

The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs go to Washington, but they have no authority to undertake such a mission even from their own side in parliament, for hon. members opposite have stated that this reciprocity agreement was unexpected—that it was a bolt from the blue. Much less had they any authority from the people of Canada, for not only were the people not consulted, but there was the implied agreement since 1897 that nothing of the kind would be done. And yet we are told that the honour of the government, the honour of parliament, the honour of the people of Canada will be impugned if this pact is not rushed through. Why, if a man should go to Washington without any authority from me to give away half my property in St. Catharines, would he be listened to if he said that the honour of my family was injured because I turned him down and refused to carry out the bargain? His vanity might be injured; he might not be able to pose as a Solomon, but that would be all. For the Finance Minister to say that the honour of the people is involved because we suggest that the people should have the right to vote on this matter seems to me a most ridiculous argument—speaking as politely as I can. We are actually told that the loyalty to President Taft of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs requires that parliament should pass this measure and that the people should be bound by it. In my humble opinion, there was no excuse for the Minister of Finance asking the members on this side to support this measure on the ground that he did, and I think that the people, when they get a chance—let it be within a few months or within two or three years—will speak with no uncertain sound their condemnation of it. The ordinary citizen, farmer, workingman, professional man, or whatever he may be, knows better than to be affected by the argument of the Finance Minister that he is bound in honour to President Taft to accept a fiscal deal made contrary to the arrangement of fourteen years ago, and without consulting the taxpayers, who are most deeply concerned.

Why should anyone go to Washington, anyway, to fix our customs tariff? Why should they go to St. Petersburg, or Berlin, or Paris, to fix our tariff? I suppose the Minister of Finance would say that we could stand that much taxation without representation. I do not think that we can; and I object seriously to the constitution being invaded all the time to suit the political exigencies of this government. If you are going to consult other countries as to what our tariff is to be, you are, logically speaking, taking quite a step in the direction of taxation without representation. Carry it out to its logical conclusion, and you place the Canadian taxpayer in such a position that the only way he can avoid taxation without representation is by annexation to the United States, so that he may, by taking his part in the election of Senator or Congressman at Washington have something to say about the matter that is dealt with. Being committed to so much by this agreement, if another proposition is made, desiring not to lose what you have done, you will go a step further, and so on. And the boy at school who grows up under the sentiments and ideas growing out of these arrangements, will say, when he is twenty-five, that it is simply a question of his pocket as against his loyalty to the British Crown. And this is the course by which the evil to which I have referred to in my previous remarks will culminate.

We are able to make our own tariffs here; we are able to do here at Ottawa everything that need be done, and as it has always been done. But this measure that is before us involves about two hundred and fifty items, and not one of them is to be changed. So, this discussion, in one way of looking at it, is a farce. If the government has undertaken its best efforts to get parliament to pass it, parliament must pass it as it is or this government must go out of power. We cannot say, for instance, that the duty on peaches should be restored, although the abolition of that duty is an outrageous attack upon the industry of an intelligent and patriotic class of citizens. We cannot say, as my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) would like us to say, that the 15 per cent on agricultural implements should be reduced, any more than we can say that it should be increased; we must take the whole thing as it is or throw it out. Even where it is inconsistent, even where it is based on misconception, even where it involves injury to Canada, it cannot be changed. I say, and I say advisedly, that I do not believe there are three men on the government side of the House who believe in their heart of hearts that every item in this arrangement is good for Canada. And yet they must accept every one or oppose the whole measure.

Now in what way does Mr. Taft look at this matter? What reasons does he give in his message to Congress for wanting

this agreement to go through? Let me quote a few words from his message to Congress in which he reported what he had been able to do with these two Canadian gentlemen who went down to Washington to negotiate this agreement. On page 5 he says:

We have reached a stage in our own development that calls for a statesmanlike and broad view of our future economic status and its requirements.

It is a pity that our government did not have that idea in their minds when they sent these two gentlemen from Canada.

We have drawn upon our natural resources in such a way as to invite attention to their necessary limit.

This is President Taft's language in his own country to his own people, urging them to make this pact:

This has properly aroused effort to conserve them, to avoid their waste, and to restrict their use to our necessities. We have so increased in population and in our consumption of food products and the other necessities of life, hitherto supplied largely from our own country, that unless we materially increase our production we can see before us a change in our economic position, from that of a country selling to the world food and natural products of the farm and forests, to one consuming and importing them. . . A far-sighted policy requires that if we can enlarge our supply of natural resources, and especially of food products and the necessities of life, without substantial injury to any of our producing and manufacturing classes, we should take steps to do so now.

He had in his mind what our representatives apparently forgot. Then on page 6:

The Dominion has greatly prospered. It has an active, aggressive, and intelligent people.

I am sure that all that is justified regarding Canadians as a whole, but I do not think that President Taft would apply that language to our ambassadors, in view of the easy way he was able to deal with them.

They are coming to the parting of the ways. They must soon decide whether they are to regard themselves as isolated permanently from our markets by a perpetual wall or whether we are to be commercial friends. If we give them reason to take the former view, can we complain if they adopt methods denying access to certain of their natural resources except upon conditions quite unfavourable to us. . . Should we not now, therefore, before their policy has become too crystallized and fixed for change, meet them in a spirit of real concession, facilitate commerce between the two countries, and thus greatly increase the natural resources available to our people.

President Taft means that we have been building up trade east and west, building up our trade with the mother country, and with the other colonies, that we have created a great home market, and unless something is done right away, unless some change is made, Canada will go on and become so great and so prosperous that it will be too late for the United States to get hold of our market at all, and, therefore, he urges Congress to hurry up and make this bargain with Canada, because if she does not make it very soon, it will be too late. He has got a letter signed by the two representatives of Canada, and he says: For Heaven's sake do this now before the people of Canada find out what a foolish bargain their representatives are making.' 'Canada has come to the parting of the ways,' you must hurry up and get this matter settled quickly, and if you do not, the time will have passed for ever, because Canada will become a great nation, and as part of the British Empire, there will no longer be any chance of our annexing her. That is evidently the idea that was running in President Taft's mind.

Free lumber we ought to have. By giving our people access to Canadian forests we shall reduce the consumption of our own, which, in the hands of a comparatively few owners, now have a value that requires the enlargement of our available timber resources.

On page 8:

The benefit to our widespread agricultural implement industry from the reduction of Canadian duties in the agreement is clear. Similarly the new, widely distributed and expanding motor vehicle industry of the United States is given access to the Dominion market on advantageous terms. . . That the broadening of the sources of food supplies, that the opening of the timber resources of the Dominion to our needs, that the addition to the supply of raw materials, will be limited to no particular section does not require demonstration. The same observation applies to the markets which the Dominion offers us in exchange. As an illustration, it has been found possible to obtain free entry into Canada for fresh fruits and vegetables—a matter of special value to the south and to the Pacific coast in disposing of their products in their season. . . The entire foreign trade of Canada in the last fiscal year, 1910, was $655,000,000. The imports were $376,000,000, and of this amount the United States contributed more than $223,000,000. The reduction in the duties imposed by Canada will largely increase this amount and give us even a larger share of her market than we now enjoy, great as that is.

The data accompanying the text of the trade agreement, exhibit in detail the facts which are here set forth briefly and in outline only. They furnish full information on which the legislation recommended may be based. Action on the agreement submitted will not interfere with such revision of our own tariff on imports from all countries as Congress may decide to adopt.

President Taft had not forgotten about these twelve favoured nations that Canada

was tying herself up to. I cannot say that the hon. gentlemen who went to Washington forgot about them, but one would be justified in supposing so, from the hesitating way in which the Finance Minister spoke of them. Instead of his saying yes or no, the leader of the opposition was obliged to put him a distinct question in regard to each one of them, he had to cross-examine him about all of them, and one would suppose that the Finance Minister was not very sure whether they were affected or not. President Taft had no doubt about it, and took care to point out to Congress in his first message that while this agreement was binding as between the United States and Canada, it left the United States open to the whole world to make any arrangement they chose with any other country. There again was a most improvident step on the part of our representatives, in not only tying Canada up to the United States, but in tying her up to twelve other foreign countries, because of the favoured nation clause, and at the same time to Australia and New Zealand, who are our competitors. But the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs, by tying Canada's hands, left us nothing with which we could barter with any one of these foreign countries. Now entanglements and misunderstandings of all sorts must arise, differences will occur, chaos to a certain extent must be created, people who are now carrying on one sort of business, after our trade relations are changed, must hesitate to carry it on in the same way, or to change their investments into other lines of commerce and industry. There was no reason that I can understand for making any deal with the United States. As I have said, if our tariff needed to be changed, it could be changed in Ottawa, as it has always been changed before. If this government thought that the duty on agricultural implements should be lowered from 17½ per cent to 15 per cent, there was nothing to prevent the Finance Minister from bringing in the Bill to amend the Customs Act in that regard, and there was no need of asking the leave of the President of the United States, or any other country, to do so.

The government claim—and here is, it seems to me, the only argument that one can dignify by the name that has been used in support of his agreement by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—that there will be a third market created and that for the most elementary kind of farmers only, not for all the farmers, or for any one else in the country. They have been driven by the discussion at last to say: Well, the wheat growers and the potato growers are going to get more for their stuff than they now receive—the most elementary kind of farmers, not the factory farmers, not progressive farmers, not farmers who want to develop and to display enterprise, energy and intelligence in building up the country, but farmers who simply want to sell the most elementary kind of raw material, with a minimum of labour and a minimum of money circulated in Canada, at the biggest price that they can get no matter where it goes in order that it may be manufactured with a maximum of labour in another country and that the prosperity derived therefrom may inure to the benefit of the people in the country that it is manufactured in. From the third market then what will be obtained? Either they forget, or they do not mention, that the third market is not an additional market. It is not a total gain by any means because you are opening your own market to the people that you now say are giving you another market. If your own market being open to these people is going to take away from you what is all your market then you are gaining nothing and there is the great danger of this pact. Has it been demonstrated with regard to any one of the 250 articles dealt with in this agreement that the new market—not the Newmarket canal—but the new market in the United States is going to be of more use to us than our own market, or any more use than the Newmarket canal will be? It is about the same sort of thing. Think of the wanton expenditure to get the stuff there, just as wanton an expenditure as trying to make water run up hill where the Newmarket canal is to be constructed, the wanton expenditure represented by transportation charges and the middlemen's profits before you get into that market in a foreign country, a market that is now controlled by 80,000,000 of people to which you want to make 8,000,000 contribute and place them in a position of partnership.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I do not wish to be pernickety, but I notice that when a Liberal is addressing the House the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and other hon. gentlemen on the other side are very patient listeners, but the condition is very different when an hon. gentleman on this side of the House is engaged in the discussion of any question. This is not the first time that this has occurred. I notice that it has occurred this afternoon. I do not object to the Minister of Finance talking but I take exception to the loud tone in which his conversation is carried on.

Mr. FIELDING. I must take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes). I

have listened with close attention to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), but, ministers have their work to do and if members come down and ask questions they cannot be rudely refused an answer. Up to a moment ago I had listened with the closest attention to what the hon. member for Lincoln had to say.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister was talking to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Low), in loud tones. I do not object to these hon. gentlemen talking, but it is the tone of voice in which they carry on their conversation that I do object to. I would ask the minister to lower his tone. He gets excited; I know this is a very hot subject, but if he would lower his tone so as not to interrupt hon. gentlemen who are addressing the House it would be very much better.

Mr. FIELDING. If there is any hon. member of the House who is noted for obstructing and interrupting the proceedings while other hon. gentlemen are speaking it is the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes).

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid I cannot allow a discussion. The hon. member (Mr. Hughes), has raised a point of order. On that point of order I can only say that interruptions of any speaker who has the floor are not in order. Conversation is evidently considered by the House permissible if carried on in such a tone as not to interrupt the speaker, who has the floor or to prevent other members from hearing him. I cannot decide that the rule of the House is so explicit that one member cannot speak with another in his seat, but I do feel that I should take this opportunity to state that there is a growing habit throughout the House generally of members gathering in little groups and speaking in a tone of voice rather too loud while some other member has the floor. I do not localize it to any particular point, but I hope that members generally will refrain from conversation carried on in too loud a tone.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a question of privilege. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance, I shall not say that they are impertinent——

Mr. FIELDING. You only suggest it.

Mr. HUGHES—but I think that it is quite improper for the Minister of Finance to interrupt the proceedings of the House. The whole country knows that the hon. gentleman is in such a condition of mind —I do not know what the cause is—that he is not responsible half of the time for the words that he utters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that is not a correct statement to make.

Mr. HUGHES. Then I will bow to your ruling.

Mr. FIELDING. I should think the hon. member should be allowed to stand by it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Now, I have had a little breathing spell I can get back to the question. I am much obliged to my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), for giving me this chance to get a little breath. Before six o'clock I have just about time to put upon 'Hansard' the opinion of the Minneapolis 'Journal' and I do this for the consideration of those hon. gentlemen who have sneered at us with regard to being afraid that this was going to lead to commercial union. No sooner was this pact announced than, on January 30, the Minneapolis 'Journal.' a newspaper published in Minneapolis, said this in its editorial column:

Not since the Civil War has a question of more tremendous import presented itself to the American people for settlement than is now presented by the proposed reciprocity agreement with Canada.

I would interject there that just as they speak about the civil war we speak about confederation. Since confederation this is the most important matter that we have dealt with. They say that since the civil war it is the most important matter that they have dealt with.

In its largest and simplest aspect, the question simply is, shall we have free trade with Canada? The agreement negotiated by Secretary Knox and Minister Fielding.

It is too bad that they left out the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). He did not speak loudly enough for them and therefore they forgot that he was there.

Will, if ratified, be the first great step toward absolute freedom of trade between these two countries.

That is the way they look at it.

Whose borders march together for three thousand miles, whose two peoples are one in blood, in institutions, in aspirations, in everything but the accident of political boundaries.

I do not agree with that. I do not think that we are of the same blood or that we have the same aspirations and the same conditions as those people. They choose to say so and they would like to get into good company by saying so, but I do not agree with them.

Evidently, then, Canadian reciprocity is a large question, one requiring to be treated

with a large view, with careful consideration and in the most statesmanlike manner. It is not a question to be decided by the petty interests of the individual, or even the considerable interests of a section. The prosperity of the Republic, its whole future for years to come, is bound up in the decision.

We stand at the parting of the ways.

That is what Mr. Taft says.

One path leads to practical if not political union with Canada, and the development of the entire North American continent as the heritage and the possession of a great and free people. The other path leads to the hardening into two distinct political entities, two hostile or at least unsympathetic peoples on this continent. It leads to a closer relation between Canada and Great Britain. It means the carrying out of Joseph Chamberlain's great dream of a British imperial federation, bound together no less by trade than by sentiment, with preferential tariffs on either side, with Canada taking the place of the United States as chief purveyor of food products and manufactures to Great Britain.

To-day England is our best customer, and Canada is our third best customer. But our foreign trade wanes, and that of Canada grows. If we push Canada into England's arms, the trade arrangements between the two will tend more and more to shut us out.

How long will our trade with these two customers last, if reciprocity fails? Our Canadian must drop off, as the east and west channels of her commerce are scoured by use. And Canada will more and more supply English needs in our stead.

The Journal is aware that objection is made to reciprocity by those who fear they will suffer—by the farmers of the northwest, and of New England. It does not believe that they will suffer, but rather that in the general prosperity which will ensue they will emerge the gainers. These are questions to be taken up in due course. Just now what impresses the Journal is that a broad view, a patriotic view, a statesmanlike view is necessary.

I wish the Minister of Finance would consider the sentiments here set forth from our standpoint. The sentiments there expressed are good from an American standpoint, and if I were an American citizen I would cheer when that editorial was read and say that it was the proper spirit in which to enter into negotiations with another country, protect your own country and do not enter into unfavourable agreements just for the sake of saying you are friendly with another nation.

At six o'clock committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at six o'clock I was illustrating, by some quotations from authorities in the republic of the United States, the way in which those people viewed this pact or agreement; and in that connection I desire to add an extract from a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States government, addressed to the legislative committee of the National Grange of that country, wherein that gentleman points out to the farmers of the United States the advantages which he thinks this agreement will be to them, and the corresponding disadvantage, one must say, from the reading of this letter, that it will be to Canada. The document I am reading from is the official document sent to the 61st Congress, marked Senate Document No. 829, and headed: 'Letter of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Legislative Committee, National Grange, Concord, N.H., in reference to the proposed Canadian Reciprocity Treaty.' On page 2 of that document is the following:

This treaty is not one-sided, giving our markets for meats and grains to the Canadians with nothing in return. We get into the Canadian woods, 90,000,000 or more of us, for timber products, things very much needed, as our home supplies are so much reduced that prices have gone up markedly in the last few years, and our development in the future will draw heavily on what remains. Much building has halted on this account. The Southern States have a new market for their cottonseed oils, which will be valuable to them. Canada opens her doors to our fruits, which will give to our orchardists a growing market for their products. Fish comes into the United States free, which will mean quite as much to our people as the opening of our markets to Canadian poultry products. We are to have free trade in seeds, which is well, because many seeds are more valuable coming from northern latitudes. We do not grow enough of flax to make our oils and will derive benefit from the free introduction of flax seed. Free barbed fencing wire will be a boon to our farmers.

At page 3 of the same document, referring to the position Canada was in at confederation, he continues:

Since that time the Canadians have been rapidly building up their country along all lines. There is just as much opposition in localities there now to letting in American manufactured goods at lower rates as there is in localities on the American side to letting in Canadian farm products at lower rates or without duty. If this reciprocity treaty becomes the law of both countries, our relations with Canada will become more intimate and our trade with her will extend and increase. The trains that bring farm products to the United States will take farm, orchard and manufactured products back; we will become more and more one people, developing along similar lines and supplementing each other in many respects. The raw material that comes from the Canadian farm will be manufactured in the United States and what is not needed will be sent to foreign countries. If this is desirable on the part of Canada, it certainly should be desirable on the part of the people of the United States.

Just reflect, Mr. Chairman; he can hardly imagine that this is desirable to Canada, but he says if it is desirable on the part of the people of Canada, it should certainly be desirable on the part of the people of the United States. He goes on:

Distance from markets has much to do with the prices of grain.

Some of our farmers seem to think that so much a bushel for their wheat in Minneapolis is just as much as it is in Winnipeg. When they send it there, they will find that a great deal of the price will have to be taken off to cover the cost of transportation. The Secretary of Agriculture goes on:

Distance from markets has much to do with the prices of grain. So this proposition is modified by proximity to markets and cost of transportation. While Canada is exporting wheat or other grains and the United States is also exporting wheat there is no particular reason why Canadian wheat should come here, unless it be that a mixture of Canadian and American wheats may be desirable on the part of our milling exporters and our millers may find it profitable to handle the Canadian surplus; but the price to the Canadian for this surplus wheat will be substantially the same whether sold in Europe or the United States. However, if the handling of Canadian wheat by United States railroads, merchants, and mills has a tendency to reduce the price it will be reduced to Canadians; and if it should reduce the price of bread to the American consumer, wise statesmanship may find it necessary to do that to avoid greater evils.

Then on page 5 he says:

We can handle the Canadian export grain crop with facility. If it is brought inside our borders and milled, as it would be, our dairymen could use with great profit the by-products of the mills. This is the feature—bran and shorts—that makes dairy products and robs the soil. If we cannot increase our yield to meet the demands of increasing population, free wheat from the nearest fields would be desirable. The influences at work are enabling the American acre to yield more, but it is a question whether this increase will meet the requirements of our rapidly growing population. Wheat growing for sale from the farm, as the pioneer practises it, can only be temporary. The land refuses to yield profitable crops after a few years, when recuperative farming must be resorted to to build up the soil where the soil robber has reduced it by grain growing. This is the reason the older prairie states turn to grass, corn and domestic animals as soon as they can bring about the change.

The United States could, with great profit and benefit to the land, take all the grains Canada has to sell and devote its lands to less exhausting crops, as is evidenced by the older prairie states farmers, who grow no grain to sell, buy their flour, and thereby keep up the fertility of the soil. In the Western States, where the farmer has turned from grain raising for sale to the production of crops to be fed to domestic animals on the farm, the new departure has been so profitable that lands in those states have risen in value to $100 and $200 per acre and rents from $4 to $6 per acre.

From this we derive one lesson which it seems to me ought to have been learned by our representatives at Washington before they made this pact, that is, that it is not fair to the farmer nor the kind of education which ought to come from prominent men to those less blessed with education, as from a government to the elementary farmer, to argue that if he can get a little more temporarily for the grain he grows, he is as well off, instead of being much worse off, besides impoverishing the soil, as he would be if he manufactured his products into more profitable things, such as cattle, sheep, hogs, and the like, as is done by the progressive farmers in both the United States and Canada. We find that not only did the United States take note of all this, but the Tariff Commission of Great Britain has also noted it. I hold in my hand the report of that commission, dated March 6, 1911. It is sent with the compliments of the secretary, and I presume has gone to every member of the House. This whole document of some 38 pages is devoted to the discussion of this proposed reciprocal trade arrangement between Canada and the United States, and is divided into various sections, as follows: (a) character and origin of the arrangement; (b) analysis of the schedules; (c) effect of the arrangement upon British food supplies and British industry; (d) bearing of the arrangement upon the trade and policy of the British Empire; (e) statements by British authorities. Upon page 27 of this document we find this:

The agreement between Canada and the United States institutes an entirely new departure in the policy of the British Empire, inasmuch as one state of the empire now becomes party to an agreement under which it receives preferential treatment in a foreign country which is not to be shared by the United Kingdom and other parts of the British Empire.

In 1892 the United States government offered Canada an exclusive arrangement of this character, and it was refused by Canadian ministers on the ground that they could not be a party to an arrangement which differentiated against the mother country. In the arrangement now proposed the United States will be levying higher duties upon a number of British products than upon any corresponding Canadian products entering the United States, as for instance—cutlery, clocks, motor cars, plate glass, leather purses, &c., asbestos manufactures, crude feathers, pickles and confectionery.

This differential treatment in the United States market arises because of the special interpretation given by the United States to most-favoured-nation treatment. (See Tariff Commission MM. 43 on 'Most-Favoured-Nation Arrangements and British Trade.') The United States regard the concessions given

to Canada as payment for equivalent concessions received from Canada, and it is the practice of the United States not to extend concessions granted in this manner to any other country unless a corresponding concession is received from that country. The United States may for example, extend these concessions to Germany or France or any other tariff country in return for what they may regard as equivalent concessions; but inasmuch as it is impossible for the United Kingdom (having no negotiating tariff) to grant such tariff concessions, the United Kingdom is permanently excluded from these benefits unless she is prepared to give other equivalents of value.

The trade of other parts of the British Empire outside the United Kingdom is also affected by the proposed arrangement. Thus the Royal Commission on the trade relations between Canada and the West Indies (of which Lord Balfour of Burleigh was chairman, and the Hon. W. S. Fielding and the Hon. W. Paterson the two Canadian negotiators of the Canadian-United States arrangement, were also members) has recommended the establishment of inter-preferential trade between Canada and the several parts of the West Indies. All the legislatures of the West Indies (except that of Jamaica) have since passed resolutions accepting the principale of mutual preference. The main products upon which Canada desires preference in the West India market are flour and fish, and the question now arises whether the diversion of Canadian supplies of these products to the United States market under this reciprocal arrangement would not deprive any reciprocity arrangement with the West Indies of any practical value to Canada. The Canadian exports of wheat flour and fish to the West Indies in 1909-10 were of the value of £241,000 and £294,000 respectively.

I am reading from the report of the Tariff Commisison of Great Britain sent to the government of Great Britain on March 6, 1911.

Mr. FIELDING. When my hon. friend says that this was sent to the government of Great Britain he is mistaken. It is not an official publication. I am not expressing any opinion about it, but I am merely pointing out that it is not official.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understood it was.

Mr. FIELDING. It was issued by the Tariff Reform League of England in support of their movement. My hon. friend will not object to that correction.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it be a correction; but with all due respect to the Finance Minister, he has made a great many mistakes in this matter, and I am not sure that I am prepared to accept his statement on this point.

Mr. FIELDING. The Tariff Commission is not an official body, but a political organization hostile to the present government. Whether this publication be right or wrong is not the question, but it is not official.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is not.

Mr. LANCASTER. With all deference to the hon. minister, I say it is. I do not accept his statement that the Tariff Commission of Great Britain is only a political organization. It is not in the sense my hon. friend wants to imply, if he means that it is a political party organization.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is a commission established for the purpose of making reports to the British public in the interests of trade, and the hon. gentleman has no right to say here that this is a political organization in the sense he implies. It is political only in the sense that anything done in the interests of trade is political.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a political organization supporting the views of one political party. Of course I am offering no opinion as to the merits of the organization or its report.

Mr. LANCASTER. That would bring us into a long discussion of the views of one political party. What political party was the hon. gentleman supporting in 1898 when he abandoned the policy of reciprocity?

Mr. FIELDING. What has that to do with it?

Mr. LANCASTER. Only to show the folly of my hon. friend's interruption. In 1898 he abandoned the policy of reciprocity for a policy of reasonable protection and stability of tariff. The views stated by this Tariff Commission in Great Britain would be accepted by anybody in that country though possibly not by those hon. gentlemen who went to Washington and there went it blind. The statements in this report are facts of history in Canada, and this commission, no matter of whom it may be composed, is composed of very respectable people, and what these people have printed is correct. This report shows that the Tariff Commission of England were more alive to the effect and the results of this proposed agreement than these two hon. gentlemen who went to Washington and who made this deal for the purpose of binding Canada. If the hon. Minister of Finance thinks that this Tariff Commission were not justified in printing what are the facts and in emphasizing them and showing their importance with regard to trade within the empire, he can settle that point with gentlemen on his own side of the House who do not agree with him and there are several.

I wish to draw attention again to what has been mentioned by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), be-

cause I think to a certain extent the opinion of Mr. Beveridge, an authority in the United States, has been overlooked. How did Mr. Beveridge view the fact?

There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbour. That policy already has driven American manufacturers across the Canadian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workmen to supply trade.

That capital should be kept at home to employ American workingmen to supply Canadian demand. We should admit Canadian wood pulp and Canadian paper free in return for Canada's admitting our agricultural implements, our engines, pumps and other machinery free. We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada freely admitting other American manufacturing products to Canadian markets.

The argument of Mr. Beveridge there was that the minimum amount of benefit is to be gained by Canada and the maximum by the United States. Canada's raw material is to be sent to the United States, there to be developed and manufactured and the workingmen of the United States are to get all the profit. That is the way in which Mr. Beveridge views that pact.

Before six o'clock I said that the so-called additional market which this pact is to give us is not really an additional market, but a substituted market. It is giving us a foreign market as a substitute for our home market, so that it is not an additional market for our farmers at all. It will give the 80,000,000 people of the United States every opportunity to come into Canada and take from our farmers nine-tenths of the benefit of their home market, which they have spent money to establish, which belongs to them and which they are not prepared to lose. I propose now to give a few details which our ministers apparently did not have when they went to Washington and made this agreement. As my hon. friend the leader of the opposition pointed out in the earlier part of this debate, we have paid dearly to establish this home market. The Dominion government paid to our railways in cash subsidies $437,000,000; the provincial governments paid them $36,000,000; and the municipalities $18,000,000, or a total amount of cash subsidies of nearly $500,000,000.

In addition, bonds guaranteed by the Dominion and provincial governments for construction, $127,000,000; lands to aid construction, 55,000,000 acres. Besides, the government is now committed to a further expenditure of $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 to complete the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Then they propose to spend $30,000,000 more on the Hudson Bay railway, and $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 upon the enlargement of the Welland canal—if Canada is going to trade within her own borders and with the British dominions beyond the seas. But all this expenditure is not required if our trade is to go north and south, as this government now contemplate. Now for what purpose has all that been done? Let me quote the language of the Finance Minister in 1903. The quotation is a little lengthy, but it is necessary to read it in view of the contention they now make that it is a matter of no consequence whether our trade goes north or south or not. Let me show what the Finance Minister said when he was advocating the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, on pages 8561 and 8562, vol. 4, 'Hansard' of 1903:

Though we may be independent in a limited degree of our American friends, I think we ought to make it plain to them that we are determined to be even more independent than we are . . . The best possible way to live on friendly terms with our brothers to the south of us is to have them understand that we are determined to be absolutely independent of them. It is true that in some respects we have been more independent of them as regards the bonding privilege than perhaps they were aware of. But we have been told that, because it is of advantage to American railways as well as to the railways of Canada, we need not be alarmed that any change will take place. . . If it suited the policy of our American friends to carry out the threats they have repeatedly made of the abolition of the bonding privilege, the fact that such action would be injurious to one particular set of men or to certain railway companies would not prevent them from carrying out that policy.

This is the language used in 1903 by one of the hon. gentlemen who went to Washington in January last. He goes on:

Therefore in the interest of Canada to-day, as well as in the future, it is well that we should let our friends across the border understand, that whatever measure of independence of them we have now we shall maintain, and that we shall increase that measure of independence by the line that we are now proposing, and should the neccessity arise, we shall not shrink from providing another.

Then he proceeds to read section 42 of the contract made with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway:

Section 42. It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its franchises, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be

greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

Then the hon. gentleman proceeds to say:

Here is an absolute undertaking on the part of this company that they will do everything that any reasonable man would ask in this connection. Ah, but we are told, they may dodge and evade this, you will allow them to ship traffic through American ports which is specifically routed; you do not prevent that . . . The suggestion is thrown out that this company will humbug us and deceive us, and will take care that the freight is specifically routed so that it will not come to Canadian ports. That is the suggestion which has been made by some honorable gentleman, but, what does section 43 say?

'The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects' in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely—the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.'

There was the policy of one of the hon. gentlemen who went to Washington in January, and made a contract with President Taft which undoes entirely the whole scheme he was then building up, and for which he argued so logically in 1903. The hon. gentleman possibly in forgetting other things, forgot that. He may have forgotten his intention in 1903, as he seemed to have forgotten his policy since he came into office, the policy of protection to home industries. Now the Finance Minister discussed this question entirely on the basis of conditions being the same now as they were in 1866. I think on one occasion he did become a little more modern, and said that in 1879 Sir John A. Macdonald did the same as this government was doing now. But he based his main argument on the contention that in 1866 this country had reciprocity, and that they were doing no worse now than the government were doing then. Well, this government generally claims that this country has prospered during the last fourteen years, and we do not dispute it. Before six o'clock I gave what I thought was the main reason for that prosperity, namely, that both sides in this House had endeavoured to maintain the country's prosperity by a stable tariff and a reasonable measure of protection. But the hon. gentleman has spoken as if this was the same policy that was inaugurated in 1866, notwithstanding the changed conditions in this country that I have already mentioned.

Now, this pact, by taking in twelve foreign countries, besides Australia and New Zealand, amounts to this, that we have tied ourselves up, with the United States, to twelve foreign countries, and to all the British possessions, with every one of whom we are now to be prevented from negotiating. They not only have free access to our markets, but every one of them, except the United States, gives us nothing in return. They get our markets because the United States gets us, these countries get us because we become tied up. In that sense they come to us, and the United States gets us. Now let us reason this out as it affects all our farm products except wheat, potatoes or hay. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) can have his hay if he likes; he can tell the farmers of Quebec that $2 extra a ton for hay is a great boon to them. Let me tell him that any intelligent man from Ontario or the west can go down to Quebec, and in a week can convince those farmers that it would be far better for them to feed their hay themselves, to raise horses and cattle on their own farms, and thereby make four or five times as much as the $2 extra a ton on hay, and he would create a better class of Nationalists than some of those that we have heard of.

If the Minister of Agriculture would tell the people of his province that instead of selling their hay for $2 extra a ton, it would be far better for them to use it in raising calves to cattle, in raising lambs to sheep, and colts to horses, and selling them for good prices in Canada, he would be doing a better service to the people of his province than he is doing now. They need to be told that it would be far more profitable for them to use up their raw material in their own country than to send it to the United States. But in regard to all farm products except wheat, hay and potatoes, everything comes into Canada free. They come into our home market which we have built up with so much toil and expense, and we get nothing in return. The Prime Minister, I do not think, is yet able to make two people stand on the same spot at the same time, and if these people come in here, they take what belongs to us and give us nothing for it. When we have let all these other fourteen countries, with the United States, come in here and share our home market with us, we will have no place to go to trade except the United States. Now, I want to read for the benefit of the Finance Minister what the 'Canadian Century' says. I do not know whether he will say that this is a political organization. The 'Canadian Century' of February 25, of this year, says, under the heading 'There is no winter there':

In the severe Canadian sense there is no winter in Australia, New Zealand and the Argentine Republic. Cattle can live outdoors throughout the year, so the farmers of those

countries do not have the expense of winter shelter and winter feeding. They are consequently able to produce butter, cheese, eggs and meats much more cheaply than Canadian farmers can. No part of New Zealand is far from the ocean, and, while Australia has a vast interior, the farms of Australia are all near the sea coast, so that the railway haul to ocean ports is not great. In spite of the fact that they are very much farther from the British market than Canada is, immense quantities of food from those countries are sold in the United Kingdom. Now the Canadian market is to be freely opened to them as the result of the reciprocity compact, and we getting nothing in return.

That is a Canadian authority that perhaps will not appeal to the Finance Minister as much as many of the Yankee authorities that he and his friends have been quoting. I do not know what sort of authority will appeal to him to induce him to change his mind on this matter. I spoke before six o'clock of the opinions of the Hon. Edward Blake. Let me mention another strong political friend of the Finance Minister and of this government, now occupying a seat in the Senate, the late Premier of Ontario, Sir Geo. W. Ross. A short time ago he issued a pamphlet upon this question. I suppose the Finance Minister will say—though it would not be respectful to Sir Geo. Ross to say it—that he used this language before he knew what his political friends were going to do in Washington. That would be true, because this pamphlet was issued in November, 1910, when no one expected that these two gentlemen were going to make such a deal as they did make. Sir George Ross possibly issued this pamphlet in hopes that it would deter them from doing this very thing. However, this is an independent statement, because it was made before the question became a political issue. I commend it to the House as the statement of a gentleman who has some knowledge of the subject, and who is a friend of this government. I will read from page 8 of his address on reciprocity, delivered to members of the Toronto Board of Trade at luncheon, November 3, 1910. He heads this section 'Alluring but unreal.':

> Canada is undoubtedly prosperous, but suppose the markets of the United States were thrown open to us, would that not greatly enhance our prosperity. The United States lie along our border for 4,000 miles, with a population of 90,000,000. If we have anything to sell, there is an unlimited market for us—why not let us enjoy it? This is a fascinating picture, but there is another side to it. The boundary is just as long for the Americans as for Canadians, and a reciprocity treaty that opened one side of the line would also open the other side. While our 7,000,000 were getting into the American markets with their merchandise, the American 90,000,000 would be getting into Canada, and the home market, always the best where not glutted with goods, would be rendered practically valueless. The fruit grower would find American fruit in the market before him, and everywhere so abundant that this trade would be ruined. The flour merchant, the seed merchant, the dealer in provisions, such as bacon, butter and cheese, would be similarly situated, and an occasional sale that he could make in the United States would be poor compensation for the losses incurred on account of the surfeit of the home market by American goods.

If the government want an authority to afford them an excuse for withdrawing this pact, I do not know what better authority they could find than this. Let them tell the government of the United States that after due consideration, and after submitting this pact to the House of Commons, they have found that the country does not want it. Now the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) gave this House some figures which are worthy of serious attention. He pointed out how this trade with Canada had gone on, he pointed out the rising prices in the Canadian home market during the last decade. He pointed out that during the last decade grain and fodder had risen in value in Canada 49·9 per cent; that cattle and cattle products, hogs and their products, and sheep, had risen in value during the same period 46·6 per cent. That is the home market which both parties in Canada have joined to build up during the last forty years. Then the member for Brandon pointed out that total crude or elementary—he used the word 'crude,' but I would say 'elementary'—farm products, that is unmanufactured products, had increased in value 37·3 per cent, and manufactured farm products 34·1 per cent. So we find that during the last decade, during which time there was no controversy in this country about our fiscal policy, no question about the stability of our tariff, these farm products increased in value to the astonishing extent I have mentioned. Yet we find this government taking no notice of that, deliberately ignoring our home market, and letting in the United States and fourteen other countries to share it.

The government, with regard to this question, however, strangely, it seems to me, the other day voted down a proposition that we should get more information before we undertook to pledge the people to it. The Minister of Finance and I had a little bit of fun for a minute or two while it was going on. We often have a little bit of fun across the floor of the House and I think we both enjoy it; I know I do. The Minister of Finance stated that at the time Sir Charles Tupper, or Sir John Thompson —I do not know which he meant—went to Washington to see what deal Canada could make with the United States they had no more information than the present gov-

ernment have. I do not believe that Sir Charles Tupper or Sir John Thompson, if they could have made a deal, would have signed these papers and come back and intimated to us that the whole of the rest of the cabinet, the whole of the rest of their own party following in the House of Commons and the whole of the rest of the country should agree to it simply because they had signed it out of loyalty to them. But, the Minister of Finance said that they had not more information, that they did not know all these things when they made that deal, and I was obliged to tell him that I did not understand why they had not when I had, because, when these hon. gentlemen were talking unrestricted reciprocity before they came into power in 1891 and when I was upon the hustings arguing the same as I am arguing now, not contradicting myself as they have been contradicting themselves during the last 25 years, I had that information with regard to the cost of production of these various commodities which the Minister of Finance said we did not have and which we now require for the purpose of understanding this pact that this government have entered into. We get these things, and I am ashamed to say we have to get them now from Washington. If we have not any witnesses on our own side we might as well call the witnesses the other side produce and take the evidence from them in regard to these matters. We want the facts as to the cost of production and other things and we get these from a White-book issued at Washington from documents sent by different authorities in the United States to Congress for the purpose of informing Congress before they vote upon this matter at the very outset, and it is the very kind of information that we are refused by the government before we are asked to vote upon this question. The members of Congress seemed to think that they were entitled to information upon this matter, they got it and we are obliged to get it from that source. I have here a copy of 'Senate Document No. 849, issued by the United States Senate, published at the Washington government printing office, March 1, ordered to lie on the table and be printed with accompanying illustrations.' On the front page appears the following:

Message from the President of the United States, transmitting in response to Senate resolution of February 23, 1911, a report from the Tariff Board relative to various commodities named in the proposed Canadian reciprocity measure.

This is a document of 132 pages, condensed, closely printed and full of information, and I propose to point out to the House some things that I have learned from it. It shows the production in various countries. It is intended for the information of Congress when dealing with this matter and there, I see, they are treated in a different way from the way in which the government treat this parliament. If we do not get any corresponding blue-book we have to accept this as correct, as I believe it is, but we have no corresponding blue-book to show whether it is or not. If it is not correct it is the government's fault, at all events, because parliament has to get along, as far as this government is concerned, without information.

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL.

Office of the Tariff Board,
Treasury Building,
Washington, Feb. 23, 1911.

I do not know whether the Minister of Finance would say that this is not an official document—I care not, I am going to read the document. I believe it is official. It is published at the government printing office, it is issued by the tariff board and it is accompanied by a message from the President. It says:

The President,—Complying with your instructions, pursuant to the resolution of the Senate, dated February 23, 1911, calling for information secured and tables and statistics prepared relating to various articles and commodities named in the Canadian reciprocity measure, we beg to submit certain statistical material with accompanying comment, regarding pulp wood, pulp, and newsprint paper, farm products, including live stock, together with relative farm values and farm wages in Canada and the United States, and current relative prices in Canada and the United States of wheat, barley and food products of the farm, including meats, poultry and eggs, dairy products and vegetables.

The first thing I want to point out to this government and which apparently will be news to many hon. gentlemen on the other side who think that the grain growers are going to get so much benefit out of this agreement, is that I find, as they will find if they look at page 107 of this document, that in Canada there were shown to have been produced 323,500,000 bushels of oats in 1910, and in the United States 1,127,000,000, Canada producing a little over one quarter as much as the United States and having a yield of 1¾ bushels more per acre than the United States; that is 32·79 as against 31·09 in favour of Canada, per acre, and an average price for the year of a cent and a half per bushel more than the average price in the United States. Where is the benefit of the agreement to the oat grower in Canada?

I can see none. He is getting a better price and raising more grain to the acre, but he is only growing about a third as much as they are in the United States. He is asked to trade away his good price and to pool it with the United States. Where is the practical benefit to the oat grower? Did hon. gentlemen opposite ever take the trouble to find that out? The information is there and I am satisfied it is correct. I do not think the tariff board would dare print it for Congress if it were not absolutely correct. In the absence of any information and with the government refusing to give the people of Canada the facts, we must assume that this statement is correct. If that be so we must conclude, in so far as oats are concerned, that this agreement is no good to Canada but that it is a loss to us. We now get the best price and under this arrangement we will be forced to compete with them.

Now, take wheat. We hear a great deal about wheat. I wonder if the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt), looked into that book. If he looks at page 123 of that same United States official record he will see that they have tabulated for their information the figures to show them if the farmer got a better or less price in Canada than the United States or vice versa. And would you believe it, in view of the arguments which have been made by those representing purely wheat growing parts of Canada, they give 27 comparisons and in 13 out of those 27 the price of wheat was higher in Canada than in the United States. That is stated for the benefit of Congress in dealing with this matter. So, you see there is no benefit to this country even if you do not consider the cost of transportation and the middleman's profit in sending the wheat over to Minneapolis to be ground into flour instead of grinding it in Canadian mills, affording employment to Canadian labour and giving young men in Canada that instruction in the milling industry which they will otherwise have to go to a foreign country to acquire. Agricultural products are also compared there. The prices of them are given in different places in the very same section of the document that I have just quoted from. Let me give some examples. The prices last year in Buffalo and Toronto of apples and potatoes were:

	Toronto price.	Buffalo price.
Apples	$5.30 per brl.	$4.30 per brl.
Potatoes	46 per bush.	47 per bush.

To hear hon. gentlemen talk of potatoes you would think they were worth two or three times as much in the United States as they are in Canada, when as a matter of fact the prices are practically the same, the difference of one cent being inconsiderable. They give another comparison of potatoes, as follows:

	Prescott.	Ogdensburg.
Potatoes.... ..	$1.20 per brl.	$1.10 per brl

Thus, the average price of potatoes for the year was 10 cents a barrel lower in Ogdensburg, on the American side of the St. Lawrence, than in Prescott, on the Canadian side, and in Buffalo they were only one cent a bushel more than in Toronto, yet they talk of this being a great boon to the potato-grower.

The comparison in regard to hothouse tomatoes is even more striking. Hothouse tomatoes are of course the product of the man who is energetic, who invests money in hothouses, giving employment to glaziers, plumbers, steamfitters, builders, and the men employed in managing the hothouses. The prices of hothouse tomatoes in Toronto and Buffalo were as follows:

	Toronto.	Buffalo.
Hothouse tomatoes.. ..	60c. a lb.	45c. a lb.

Why do we want to interfere with that? Why should not the rich man in Toronto who is able to pay this price, pay it to the Toronto grower? Do we want him to go to Buffalo for his hothouse tomatoes? He can get them from Buffalo by express in an hour and a half or two hours. Do we want him to do that or to have the energetic raiser of tomatoes at Toronto secure the advantage of this trade, with the indirect benefit to those employed in erecting and maintaining his hothouses?

In onions, eggs and milk the prices were as follows:

	Toronto.	Buffalo.
Onions..	67c. a bush.	55c. a bush.
	Prescott.	Ogdensburg.
Onions..	84c. a bush.	80c. a bush.
	Toronto.	Buffalo.
Eggs..	36 c. a doz.	33c. a doz.
Milk..	16½c. a gal.	15⅗oc. a gal.

Potatoes are compared in seven different ways, and in six of these comparisons the Canadian prices were equal to or higher than the United States prices, and yet we hear of this being such a great boon to the Canadian potato-grower.

Mr. TALBOT. Are these comparisons of prices at the same period of the year?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, the information is compiled in that way. These statistics are apparently prepared so as to be of the greatest possible benefit to the people to whom they are submitted.

At page 129, eight comparisons of the prices of eggs are given. In all the eight the Canadian price was equal to or higher than the United States. In milk, eight comparisons are given, and in seven of the

eight the Canadian price was equal to or higher than the United States.

The same book gives information as to live stock. Of horses, it says there were in Canada last year 2,000,000 horses, and in the United States 21,000,000 horses; that is to say, the United States has ten times as many horses as Canada. Of dairy cows, Canada had 2 8-10 millions and the United States 21 8-10 millions, eight times as many as Canada. Of other cattle than dairy cows Canada had 4½ millions and the United States 47½ millions, eleven times as many as Canada. Of sheep, Canada had 2¾ millions, and the United States 57¼ millions, 21 times as many. Of swine, Canada had three millions and the United States 47¾ millions, 16 times as many.

What was the average price per head of Canadian horses? It was $133, and the United States price $108. The highest prices in Canada were in the province of Saskatchewan. Hon. gentlemen from the west have repeatedly murmured, I think not very patriotically, at the prices the people of the west pay for horses. If they are good farmers they can easily raise their own horses, they can put their farms in good shape, as the farmers in Ontario and other places do, and grow a series of crops instead of raising wheat all the time and so impoverishing the soil. But they have not the grievance they think they have, and they would not think they had it if we had the same information that the United States Congress have, without which, in fact, President Taft would not dare to ask them to pass this agreement. They will not go it blind there.

The average prices of horses in the different provinces of Canada were:

All Canada	$133
Prince Edward Island	107
Nova Scotia	113
Manitoba	107
Saskatchewan	156
Alberta	126
New Brunswick	131
Quebec	$139
Ontario	133

Thus the farmer in Alberta, for whom some gentlemen are so anxious to get cheaper horses, last year was paying less than his fellow-Canadian in Ontario, Quebec or New Brunswick. What right has he to object to the price of horses when he is making so much money out of his wheat fields, paid for by Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick without a murmur as Canadians, in order to build up the country as their sons and grandsons and greatgrandsons will strive to do? They have no grievance in Alberta in regard to horses. The Ontario farmer, if he was small enough to grumble, could say to the Alberta farmer: Do as I do, raise your own horses or pay some one else to raise them while I raise sheep or swine or something else that will pay me better, but let us both do what we can to benefit and build up Canada and do not let us build up the United States at the expense of any of the provinces of confederation.

Then, let us see what the average prices of cattle were:

	Canada.	United States.
Dairy cows	$43.00	$35.75
Other cattle	31.00	19.50
Sheep	6.00	4.00
Swine	11.00	9.00

And this is the system of farming that President Taft or the United States government want to break up in Canada for the benefit of the United States. They want us to stop raising the profitable things, such as horses, cattle, sheep and swine, and send the raw stuff to the United States; and the reason they want us to do that is the very reason why it is against the interests of our farmers to do it. I will give some further information taken from this same book, at page 130. It gives the comparative producers' prices of some of these manufactured products in January, 1911, at certain points in the two countries, as follows:

Articles.		Canada.	Amount.	United States.	Amount.
			$ cts.		$ cts.
Beef cows	Per 100 lbs.	Toronto	4 75	Buffalo	4 80
"	"	Windsor	4 65	Detroit	4 00
Stockers and feeders	"	Toronto	5 00	Buffalo	4 75
" "	"	Windsor	4 90	Detroit	4 15
Calves	"	Toronto	7 30	Buffalo	6 55
"	"	Windsor	7 25	Detroit	8 75
Milkers and springers	Per head.	Toronto	71 00	Buffalo	61 00
" "	"	Windsor	70 00	Detroit	47 00
Lambs	Per 100 lbs.	Toronto	5 70	Buffalo	5 90
"	"	Windsor	5 65	Detroit	5 60
Sheep	"	Toronto	4 15	Buffalo	4 00
"	"	Windsor	4 15	Detroit	4 70
Hogs	"	Toronto	9 30	Buffalo	7 75
"	"	Windsor	9 20	Detroit	8 40

Now, the Chicago 'Tribune' had something to say about this, and here is a good place to quote it. This is from an editorial of April 9, 1911, which is pretty well up to date. It is headed 'A help to the farmer' and says:

Every American farmer will admit that there are provisions in the Canadian reciprocity agreement which are likely to benefit him. There is, for instance, the greatly reduced duty on lumber. But when it comes to the lowering or entire removal of the duties on numerous articles which are the product of the farmer many farmers imagine that they would be harmed thereby. The assurance of their old and tried friend, Secretary Wilson, to the contrary do not satisfy them. But he is right and they, are wrong. Reciprocity in farm products, far from injuring, will benefit them.

There are a few important facts which they fail to take into consideration. One is that of the foodstuffs which can be grown in both the United States and Canada. This country, thanks to its greater area of cultivable land and its much larger number of farmers—12 to 1—is much the larger producer. Owing to its more extensive range of climate it raises many things which cannot be grown in Canada. If it were a question of the farmers of one country capturing the markets and driving out of business the farmers of the other, those of Canada would be routed in the unequal contest.

And so say I, and the government ought to have seen it, and the gentlemen who went to Washington as our representatives ought to have seen it. The article goes on:

The Canadian farmers are not more industrious and intelligent than those of the United States; but they are quite as determined as their American brethren to get all they can for their products and will not cut prices. Ask the thousands of American farmers who have emigrated to Canada what is the difference in cost of production of farm products between the two countries and they will answer that it is nominal. Since it costs no more to grow a cabbage on the right than it does on the left bank of the St. Lawrence river, why should the farmer on the one dread the competition of the farmer on the other?

The American farmers who distrust reciprocity should bear in mind that protective duties are a game two can play at. They are protected against the Canadian farmer, but he is protected against them and the great surpluses with which they might in theory flood Canadian markets. The American farmer does not realize the extent to which those duties have closed the Canadian markets against him. As it is he sells some of his potatoes, onions, hay, &c., to the Canadians. They are, indeed, off and on more liberal purchasers of American farm products that we are of theirs. With the duties removed they would buy more.

That is, they would buy more from the American farmer and less from the Canadian farmer.

Consider the farmer as a fruit grower.

I wish the premier had considered the farmer as a fruit grower before that big delegation of people from the Niagara peninsula had to come down here to interview him.

The reciprocity agreement sweeps away the Canadian duties on the apples of New York, the peaches of Delaware, the apricots of California, and melons of Georgia, and the strawberries of Louisiana and Illinois. The market gardeners of this country from Florida to Vermont would be gainers by reciprocity.

Of course, the Canadian fruit grower and market gardener is the loser.

There are surplus products of the American farmer which he has to find a market for in Europe or South America. He could find one in Canada were it not for the Canadian duties.

That is, he could dump his stuff on the Canadian market if both parties in this country had not been united in upholding a stable tariff for the protection of the Canadian farmer.

The nearer home his market is the better it is for him as well as the consumer.

The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs did not seem to consider that from the Canadian standpoint when they went to Washington.

Thus it is better for all parties that Ontario barley should go to Buffalo, and Minnesota barley to Winnipeg, than that Buffalo should be supplied from Minnesota and Winnipeg from Ontario. Railroad freight rates should be eliminated wherever possible.

Now, I am going to refer to what has already been shown so ably and well by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). He pointed out that the exports of butter last year from Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Russia, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and the United States amounted to 450,000,000 pounds. The exports from the United States were 6,000,000 pounds. There is at present a duty of 4 cents a pound on butter coming from all these countries to which Uncle Sam has induced us to open our doors, and what will be the result when butter is made free? Eggs were exported from the United States to the number of 6,000,000 dozen last year; from Denmark, 32,000,000 dozen; from Russia, 215,000,000 dozen; and from Sweden, 3,000,000 dozen; a total from these four countries alone of 256,000,000 dozen, with a duty now of three cents per dozen. What is the trade going to be as against our farmers when that duty is taken off? Of hams and bacon, last year the United States exported 472,000,000 pounds, Denmark 210,000,000 pounds, Sweden 6,000,000 pounds, or a total of 688,000,000 pounds from these three countries. With a duty of 2 cents a pound now proposed to be reduced to 1¼ cents, how much of these products are go-

ing to come to Canada from these countries at the cost of our Canadian farmers? Then, with regard to barley, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) and others representing farming constituencies have shown that last year Russia, Argentina, Austria-Hungary, Australia, and the United States exported a total of 118,000,000 bushels. Hon. gentlemen claim that reciprocity is going to be a benefit to us in barley growing.

But the barley from these countries is going to come in here, and we are going to be cut out of our own market; and our barley growers will have to send their barley to the United States where they will be at the mercy of 80,000,000 people. They have also shown that we only exported $10,000,000 worth of cattle last year while the United States exported $18,000,000 worth, and that the United States exported also $16,000,000 worth of beef and $15,000,000 worth of canned beef. Australia exported 71,000,000 lbs. of frozen beef, and 23,000,000 lbs. canned beef. New Zealand exported 54,000,000 lbs. frozen beef. The Argentine exported 461,000,000 lbs. frozen beef, also 25,000,000 lbs. jerked beef, and 14,000,000 lbs. pressed beef—or over 625,000,000 lbs. from Australia, New Zealand and the Argentine alone.

What is going to become of the Canadian market if all these are to come in free? The same thing may be said with regard to mutton and lamb, 485,000,000 lbs. of these foodstuffs were exported by these same three countries last year, and we are to have no protection to our Canadian farmers on their wool.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk a great deal about the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba, and my hon. friend who preceded me (Mr. MacNutt) apparently had a great grievance against the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) because the latter said that the leaders of those grain growers were political speculators, and not bona fide representatives of the grain growers. But the hon. gentleman's quotation from the speech of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was not quite correct. He gave that quotation as if my hon. friend had spoken of all grain growers as being agitators. In 'Hansard,' however, I find that he did not apply that term to grain growers in general but only to their leaders. I think I would be quite within my rights in saying that every member of the Liberal party is not in favour of this pact even though the right hon. the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McLean) are. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) for instance, rose in his seat and said he was not. So did the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). Because we accuse a man's leader of being something he ought not to be, it does not follow that we are making the same accusation against the man himself and every follower of that leader. But if I wished to make a charge against these leaders of the grain growers, I want no other evidence than the circular they sent out themselves. In that circular they evidently do not know what they are talking about, just as I believe our two ministers who went to Washington did not really realize what they were doing. The leaders of these grain growers issued a circular which the Finance Minister referred to the other day, and in that circular they ask two things absolutely contradictory. They say:

> Resolved that we, the executive officers of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association emphatically assert that the above mentioned gentlemen and public bodies,——

That includes the Manitoba government and the whole legislature—

> ——by their public utterances and resolutions upon the question of reciprocity have absolutely misrepresented popular opinion in Manitoba; and we further declare and reaffirm that the tariff resolution placed before the government by the Canadian Council of Agriculture on December 16, 1910, is a correct representation of the opinions of the people of Manitoba to-day; and we further declare——

This is something in the style of the manifesto of the three tailors of Tooley street speaking for the people of England. The president of this Grain Growers' Association, the secretary and somebody else sent out a circular signed by a man named Henders, and not one of them had any franchise to represent anybody but himself:

> ——that the people of Manitoba will not be satisfied with anything short of the following action by the Canadian parliament during the present session:—

What do they want us to do? They want:

> First the ratification of the reciprocity agreement now before parliament; and second a complete abolition of the duties on agricultural implements and machinery.

But this proposed pact provides that the duty must be 15 per cent. So that these people want both the ratification of a pact which says that the duties shall be 15 per cent, and they also want the duty taken off. Is it not evident that they do not know what they are asking for, but are simply trying to make some pretense of appearing to be earning whatever they get from the association in the way of emoluments.

Mr. WARBURTON. Might I ask my hon. friend a couple of questions? First, has he any objection to the enlarged market for our agricultural products which the

reciprocity arrangement will give us and second, is he prepared to support the abolition of the duty on agricultural implements?

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought I made it quite clear that we are not getting any increased market, but are handing over our own market to some 80,000,000 of people and are getting practically nothing in its place. We are handing over our Canadian market, which our Canadian people have built up and paid for, and are getting in return nothing but a share of the market of 80,000,000 people where we will be swamped by those 80,000,000 who are competing against us. As to my hon. friend's second question, I have no right to speak for the Conservative party, and I am not going to undertake to declare a policy for it; but he knows that the Conservative party has always stood for reasonable and adequate protection for everybody from the manufacturer down to the labourer. He knows that the government which he supports adopted that policy in 1897 because they dared not do anything else, and he knows that they have had no mandate from the people to do anything else.

Mr. WARBURTON. Does that mean that my hon. friend is in favour of reducing the duty upon agricultural implements?

Mr. LANCASTER. If I were supporting a government which made a pact with another government, I would know what I was doing without asking a member of the opposition what he thought of it. I do not blame the hon. gentleman, because the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have told him that that is all they know about it. But these hon. gentlemen have no policy on tariff matters. They are only tyros and apprentices as yet on tariff matters. You cannot get any two or three of them to think alike. One is a free trader, the other is an extreme high tariff man, not necessarily a protectionist, and another is for free trade as they have it in England, another wants commercial union, and still another unrestricted reciprocity. Each one of them has some fad or new fangled notion of his own, and the Liberal party itself has never been a unit on any general policy. In one part of the country they will argue that they are not laying hands on the manufacturer. As the Minister of Finance has said to his friends: You must not set the manufacturers against us because we are afraid of them and we want them left alone; but we care nothing about the fruit growers, we forgot all about them, and it would not be loyal for you to say that we should favour them. But do not say a word against the manufacturers for we are not going to hurt them, and by the manufacturers they mean those who manufacture in stone buildings with tall chimneys.

They do not seem to know yet that the farmer is a manufacturer and a manufacturer just as intelligent and able to build up the country as any other manufacturer. I would say to the hon. member from Prince Edward Island that I am not here to educate him, that I could not undertake the task of teaching him how to make a tariff. If that gentleman joins this party and condemns the government because it is handing over the country bit by bit to the country to the south of us, if he joins the great national party that has built up this country under the National Policy to such an extent that when the other party got into power on a fluke and adopted that policy they were continued in power several times because of the same consistency of the Conservative party that has always existed, if my hon. friend will come in, unite loyally with us and get into the caucus of the Conservative party, he will find out what Conservative policy is upon these things and he has no right to vote for this pact if he does not know what the policy of his own party is with regard to it. He had better find out what the policy of his own party is before he bothers with what the policy of the Conservative party is on this and every other question and he will find that we do not say one thing in Prince Edward Island, another thing in Quebec, another thing in Ontario and another in British Columbia. He will find that we have the same policy all over the country, that we declare it in the same way, both in French and in English in every part of the country. I have no sympathy with him and I refuse absolutely to enlighten him.

Mr. WARBURTON. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. LANCASTER. If you ask sensible questions you may ask all you like.

Mr. WARBURTON. I only ask it with the hon. gentleman's permission. I do not propose to ask him anything about Prince Edward Island. I want to ask him if he and his friends have any policy under heaven on this matter.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance went to Washington, apparently they went blindfolded, and if the bandages are still on the eyes of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island I am not surprised at it. He cannot see any policy anywhere in this thing. He wants to know if we have any policy, but has he not heard over and over again from every speaker on this side what our position is with regard to this matter? Does he know if any half dozen men on his own side agree as to what their policy is?

One of them is emphasizing free trade, another is trying to claim that it is protection, another says that produce will be cheaper to the consumer, that the labouring man will get his products cheaper, another represents to us that the farmer will get more for his products. The hon. gentleman had better get his leader to call another caucus for the purpose of finding out what the policy of his own party is and what he is voting for before he worries his head about what the leader of the opposition will do when he gets into power. He will find out very emphatically, very effectually when the ballots are counted at the next general election, not only what the policy of the Conservative party is, but how quickly they will carry it out, settle this question and put an end to it. I am going to speak, with the consent of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, and all the other hon. members, for a few minutes upon a matter that I know more about perhaps than any hon. member in this House does.

Mr. TALBOT. What is that?

Mr. LANCASTER. And I will prove it before I get through.

Mr. TALBOT. It will be something new.

Mr. LANCASTER. It would be very new if the hon. member for Bellechasse knew anything about it. The fact that he had learned about it would be a most novel, a most extraordinary thing to be made public. If the hon. member for Bellechasse knew anything——

Mr. TALBOT. I have forgotten more than you know.

Mr. LANCASTER. And if he could prove the fact before the people, he might get a patent on it and sell it for a large price, because it would be an extraordinary thing, a curiosity that no museum had ever exhibited before. The hon. gentleman does not like me saying I am going to speak on an industry that I know more about perhaps than any other hon. gentleman does. It would not be hard to know more about it than the hon. member for Bellechasse. This is an industry that perhaps the hon. member for Bellechasse never heard of. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) heard of it, but forgot it and that industry is the industry of growing tender or semi-tropical fruits in this country. The Prime Minister, when this deputation of 800 or 1,000 people came down here to point out how their industry was being ruined by this pact, told them they had come too late. He ought not to have told them that. They could not have come too late if the Prime Minister had properly instructed his ministers or if they had not been asleep or forgetful. The Prime Minister had a farmers' deputation down here before this pact was made, before these hon. gentlemen went to Washington at all. He had a delegation of farmers down on December 16 and in the blue-book reporting the proceedings of that interview I find upon the eighth page of it the following telegram:

St. Catharines, Ont.,
December 15, 1910.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa.

A large meeting of the Niagara Peninsula Fruit Growers' Association held in this city to-day, following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved that whereas the United States government have made overtures to this country for reciprocal trade relations, and whereas a large delegation of those interested in products of the soil is now in session at Ottawa with object of petitioning the government for the removal or the substantial lowering of the tariff against United States products, and whereas the tariff of the United States against Canada products is in the aggregate greatly in excess against them, resulting in some cases to the detriment of the Canadian grower, and whereas the present Canadian tariff has on the whole proved satisfactory to the upbuilding of our fruit industries and the same, if continued, will develop them to the advantage of the country as a whole, therefore, it is the opinion of this association that any reciprocal treaty with the United States be given the most serious consideration, and that only done after consultation with the official representative of our fruit industries, and that in regard to each and every other industry they should be consulted and their respective bearings upon each other be fully considered, and that in the final adjustment of any tariff with United States that all possible preference be given to the mother country.

C. E. FISHER,
Secy. Nia. Peninsula
Fruit Growers' Assn.

The signer of that is not a Tory, but he is one of the staunchest Reformers of the Niagara district, a man who was appointed registrar of the county by the late defunct government, and the right hon. gentleman knows that they never appointed any to public office but the most faithful henchmen. Mr. Fisher was appointed by his political party as the registrar of deeds of Lincoln county, but before he was made registrar of deeds he was a large fruit grower in Niagara township, as his sons now are large fruit growers there. The right hon. gentleman, before his emissaries went to Washington, knew that the fruit growers were objecting and pointing out the injury it would be to their industry if any interference took place with these duties. Mr. Taft, the president, knew very well the great advantage it would be to the United States and the corresponding disadvantage to Canada to allow their fruits to come into Canada. At the top of page 9 of his mes-

sage to Congress, dealing with this agreement, he says:

As an illustration, it has been found possible to obtain free entry into Canada for fresh fruits and vegetables—a matter of special value to the south and to the Pacific coast in the disposing of their products in their season.

Now, the Prime Minister said, on more than one occasion—but I will quote it only once against him—that he would not interfere with established industries. Here are his words, taken from what, I suppose, may be called his main speech on the very measure that is now before us, and reported at page 4859 of 'Hansard' of this session—March 7:

There are men who believe that we are going to recklessly ruin industry and capital. Capital is timid under all circumstances, and the man who is at the head of affairs and the ministers who assist him, would not be worthy of the public confidence if they were not always careful to see that capital will be safe whenever it is invested in any industry in this country.

Now, I would like the Prime Minister, and I would like this House, to ponder these words, and apply them to the facts I shall give about the fruit-growing industry. The capital invested in the fruit-growing industry last year was $91,489,268, of which, $69,237,331 was in Ontario. That is the assessed valuationn of the propertiees used for fruit-growing. Some of that is devoted to apple-growing, and it is important to distinguish between apples which are semi-durable and the so-called tender fruits, which must be sold at once after being picked or be wholly lost. The value of the property devoted to apples is $28,000,000, and, in Ontario alone, $22,790,000. In the production of vegetables and garden truck, there is invested in Canada $39,346,000 and in Ontario $16,342,000. Thus, we find that in Ontario there is devoted to tender fruits and vegetables $39,138,000. In Ontario alone, land of a total area of about 200,000 acres is devoted to this industry, and its average value is $195.60 per acre. Of course, there are fruit lands in the Niagara district that you could not buy—that is, you could not buy before this pact was made; I do not pretend to say what it is worth now—for less than $500 or $600 an acre, or, if planted, $800 to $1,000 an acre. These are the lands between Hamilton and the Niagara river and below the escarpment. The land devoted to fruit would represent 10,000 plantations of twenty acres each. This industry employs from 15,000 to 20,000 men, besides many temporary employees during the season.

Now, the government knew about this before sending these gentlemen to Washington. This is proven, if by nothing else, by the fact that they issued a pamphlet for the purpose of making known the facts in England with a view to inducing people to come out here and invest money in fruit lands, and enter upon this industry. I have here a copy of the pamphlet, and the title page reads: 'Canada's Farthest South. A trip through the famous peach orchards and vineyards of South Western Ontario. By H. A. Kennedy (of the 'London Times' staff), London, England. Issued by direction of Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, Ottawa, Canada. There was a little of the irony of circumstance in the time when I received this pamphlet. It came to me through the post office on the very day when the Minister of Finance was declaring in this House that this industry was to be ruined—this very industry that the government was advertising in Great Britain and trying to commend as a field of investment to the people there. On page 14 of this pamphlet, is the following:

It is most exhilarating just to wander about in one of these orchards. You cannot exactly hear the trees growing and the fruit swelling; but hearing is the only one of the five senses that a peach does not appeal to. To the eye, it is a thing of perfect beauty; to the taste, an exquisite dainty; to the touch it is more caressing than velvet; and its scent rivals the most delicate of perfumes. As we walk together through one of these famous orchards between Hamilton and St. Catharines, the owner speaks of the trees as if they were his children; he seems to know every one of them, as he describes their varying characters.

Then, I turn to page 21 and read the following:

Canadians themselves have the good taste to eat so much fruit that—excepting apples—the export trade is not of first importance to the orchardman. Still, it is worth noticing that Niagara peaches have been landed in England in prime condition and sold at prices yielding a big profit to the grower.

Then at the foot of page 22:

I have explained what seems a more than sufficient reason why these orchardmen's energies should be devoted chiefly to peaches and grapes—simply because they can be grown there better than anywhere else in the country. But the same climatic reason gives the Niagara men an advantage also in growing other more or less tender fruit.

He goes on to speak of the market gardens:

If you climb the slope or 'mountain' leading to the higher level of Lake Erie, you find a certain area where peaches grow almost as well—wherever the soil is suitable—as on the lower level beside Lake Ontario; and one of the finest nursery gardens is to be found up there. Over a great part of the height of land between the lakes, however, the combination of climate and soil is not quite so favourable, and the cautious farmer, if he grows fruit at all, is more inclined to stick to the hardy apple.

This upper plateau, absurdly described as 'on the mountain,' has not had anything like justice done to it. It is devoted to mixed farming, which there means largely the raising of grain and hay. Even the dairying industry has not been developed as it might be, though a good deal of farm-house butter finds its way down into Hamilton. Presently people will discover that the 'mountain' farms, with their excellent soil and climate and nearness to big markets, are capable of a rich and varied productiveness now undreamt of.

The Canadians, even well-to-do folk in the great cities, used to be content with whatever vegetables were 'in season' when grown in the open air. When winter closed in they had to put up with potatoes and such other vegetables as would keep, or else canned goods. The Dominion has now reached that stage of development at which a large number of citizens can afford, and demand, vegetables raised under glass. Instead of accommodating themselves to the season, they insist on the season being artificially prolonged to accommodate itself to human requirements.

And on the next page:

It is the white men, our own kith and kin, who have covered the country with wide-stretching, leafy vineyards we are now passing. These vineyards, with newly planted peach orchards are interspersed with fields of modest potatoes and beets, and the graceful, towering maize, and tomatoes in all their scarlet glory. Comfortable little cottages with significant little baby carts waiting at their doors, and here and there a more pretentious house with its well-kept lawn and standing serenely among their maple trees or behind little fences of young pine hedges.

On page 34, he tells of the wages men get, and of the money that can be made by the careful attention to fruit-growing. He points out that it was not a lazy man's job, but that the man who was prepared to be energetic and to use his brains and education can make a living and do well on fifteen or twenty acres.

With this pamphlet circulating in Great Britain to induce people to come out and invest in fruit lands, we find these gentlemen going to Washington and making an agreement to put all these tender fruits on the free list, and the result is, what? Let me point out the change that has taken place within that section within a generation. When I went into that country, twenty-nine years ago, it was the ordinary thing for one man to make a living on a hundred acres. There was one small house and the farmer was engaged in ordinary mixed farming. To-day, five or six men are making each a better living off that hundred acres. There are five or six handsome houses, well kept, and the children whose homes these are attend the high school. There is prosperity there and employment for many men. The energy, industry, enterprise, philanthropy and patriotism of these men have, in effect, added land to the country. When men have created a condition of things under which five or six families can live on an area formerly occupied by one family and live better, it practically means increasing by five or six times the territory for farmers' occupation. Consider those facts, and apply to them the words of the Prime Minister: 'The man who is at the head of affairs and the ministers who assist him, would not be worthy of the public confidence if they were not always careful to see that capital will be safe, whenever it is invested in any industry in this country.' I say the Prime Minister must stand convicted of that very lack of duty to the people. According to his own words, he is no longer worthy of public confidence because he has not been careful to see that capital shall be safe and industry protected. The people in that country have discovered means by which in spite of some climatic difficulties they can grow these semi-tropical fruits. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) said—and the Prime Minister was authority for the statement—that it would be a benefit to the fruit-growers of Canada to have reciprocity, because the Canadian fruit-grower would be able to sell in the American market after the American fruit is gone. Unfortunately for the argument of these gentlemen, the facts are not with them. The Prime Minister, with all his political ingenuity, with all his astuteness, and even with all his sunny ways, cannot make the climate of Canada different from what it is, he cannot give us the climate of California or the middle south. The fact is that there are three fruit seasons in the United States. The Californian and extreme southern fruit comes in from six weeks to two months ahead of our own. In three or four weeks—and still three or four weeks ahead of ours—comes the fruit from the middle states. Canadians have this fruit on their tables, and, by the time the Canadian peach is ripe, they are pretty well satiated. I agree with the Prime Minister in this, that there is no comparison in quality with the southern peach and that of the Niagara district. And if they could be brought into the market on the same day, there could be no question about which would control that market. But, unfortunately, they do not come in the same day—the Canadian peach does not come along for two months, six weeks, or at least a month after the other, and it comes after two fruit seasons in the United States have poured their products into the market. And when the Canadian peach is ripe, it must compete in the market with the crop of New York, Michigan and other states of the north. So it means that the Americans get our market to themselves for the products

of two great areas, and, when our own crops are ready they must share our market with the fruits of the northern portion of United States territory. So, if it were possible to conceive a policy which would put our fruit growers out of business this is that policy. No wonder that President Taft, in his messages to Congress, and the newspapers of the United States, emphasized the statement that the southern fruit-growers are going to have their lands increased in value by reason of this pact. We cannot compete with them for the reason that our climate will not allow it. If there is any condition more than another which makes the protection of industry necessary, it is the condition of climate. The Minister of Finance has told us that Canadian manufactures should not be exposed to the competition of the stronger and longer-established industries of the United States. How much more, then, should he protect the people who have given of their substance, their energy and their brain to build up an industry such as I have shown this fruit industry to be..

If that kind of industry, if that kind of energy, if that kind of enterprise is to be knocked down for the sake of friendly relations with the United States, then I say we want no friendly relations. What kind of friendly relations are we going to have with anybody the price of whose friendship is that when he needs our products for his own benefit he will deal with us and when he thinks he can get along without us he will have none of us, and who will not deal with us unless he can show his family that he is going to make a profit at our expense? I say out on such friendly relations. We can be more friendly with him if we can run our own show and demonstrate that we are able and determined to protect our people.

I would like any hon. member to point out any industry with the number of millions of dollars that have been invested in the fruit industry that has not been better protected in the past than the fruit industry. The average protection on tender fruits has been about 18 per cent. With that small protection and with the amount of money invested in it, is there any industry in Canada more deserving of a continuance of that protection, than the one I have spoken of? Those engaged in that industry have made great sacrifices for the benefit of their fellow Canadians. Take, for instance, fruit baskets on which there is a duty of 20 per cent. These baskets last year could be bought in the United States for $22 a thousand and in Canada they cost $45. There are several fruit growers who ship 20,000 baskets of peaches and they paid the extra price on these in order to keep up the basket industry in this country so that the workingman making baskets should be Canadian. I know one man who is paying in baskets alone $450 more than he would have to pay with free trade in baskets, and in addition they who went to Washington never thought of seeing when they were striking off the duty on fruit that it would be only fair to let the fruit grower get his raw material cheaper. This government have caused to be circulated in England such pamphlets as I have produced, setting forth the advantages of the Niagara fruit district. They invite English capitalists to invest money in fruit farms because of the fertility of the district and the quality of the fruit. This has done more to advertise Canada than even the Prime Minister himself could do if he lived to be 500 years old. The fruit growers have paid almost twice as much for baskets as they would have to pay with free trade in baskets, and in addition they have had to pay from 15 per cent to 40 per cent on every article they use, and the fruit grower uses and wears out more machinery in one year upon 25 acres of fruit land than the farmer in the west uses in 10 years on 640 acres. He buys all sorts of implements which he has to use to fight the enemies of the trees, insects and other pests, to spray, to prune, to cultivate, to plant, to replant, to do everything that has to be done with all sorts of fruit. He has been willing to pay these duties in order that Canadians in other lines of industry may be profitably employed. The fruit growers have been National Policy men believing in the principle of give and take. Conservative, Liberal and Independent in the Niagara district ever since 1897 have been in favour of a stable tariff and reasonable protection not only for themselves but for every class of people. They are Canadians first, last and all the time. This may not please the Finance Minister but the originators of the fruit industry in the Niagara district were United Empire Loyalists, men whose ancestors gave up their farms and all they had in the United States for the sake of sticking to the British Crown. They hewed out their farms from the primeval forest; they did not go to the west where they could raise crops by simply ploughing the land. They hewed down the forest and took out the stumps and were glad if they could work out five acres a year. They cleared their farms by the greatest pioneering enterprise and hardship. If to-day they put forth their efforts to raise wheat they could raise larger crops than are raised even on the fertile lands of the northwest. The first settlers were energetic and branched into dairying and then into the fruit industry. At first they had great difficulties in carrying on this

industry. Sometimes for two or three years there would be no peaches. The fruit growers by study, experiment and co-operation learned what conditions caused these failures and just in the last few years they have had a crop every year. Then just as they are able to get some profitable reward for what they have done, two gentlemen go down to Washington and hand over the whole thing to the southern fruit grower. Then when the fruit growers of the Niagara district spoke to the Prime Minister protesting against such treatment they were told baldly: We do not care anything about you, you have come too late. They should not have had to come at all. This pamphlet, which was circulated widely in Great Britain last year, to induce capitalists and those for whom I have even more sympathy, labourers, to come to the Niagara district on account of the chances of profit and the high wages, is to be branded in the future as unreliable, as a libel on Canada. To-day it is not a libel, it is truthful in its statements as to the prosperity and fertility of that district and the intelligence, energy, enterprise and history of Canada's furthest south. It was a strange coincidence that on the day on which the Minister of Finance announced in this House that this industry was to be knocked sky-high, I should take out of my post box this pamphlet, 'Canada's Furthest South.'

With the duty of 18 or 20 per cent against them, in the last fiscal year the fruit growers of Michigan and New York state were able to share the Canadian market in competition with the fruit growers of the Niagara district to the amount, in round figures, of $1,000,000. If they can do that with the duty against them, what is going to happen when the duty is taken off? The figures are taken from the blue-book, the only Canadian authority I have got any information from—the tariff regulations, correspondence and statistics issued by this government while this debate has been going on. On page 22, in statement No. 2, it is shown that the imports of peaches, grapes, blackberries, cherries cranberries and plums last year amounted to $945,000 against an average duty of 18 per cent in competition with our farmers. When the duty is removed, the whole American crop will come into the competition. The result will be that the products of the fruit farmers of the Niagara peninsula will go to the canning factories in competition with that much more than they do now. When our peaches are ripe theirs are ripe too, so that as they have already the early market from us, they will now have the later market also.

Now, I am not going to apologize for taking up a longer time than I have ever before taken up in the eleven years that I have had the honour and pleasure of occupying a seat in this House, because the subject upon which I have been speaking, it seems to me, is vital to Canada, and to Canada in the future. If we pass this compact, we shall, in my humble opinion, be sowing the seeds of disintegration of confederation and very likely the seeds of annexation to the United States. But if not, we shall certainly be doing no good by passing the arrangement, and we can do no harm by voting it down. I am going to oppose it tooth and nail as long as I can see any sense in doing so, no matter how many times or how late I may happen to speak. In that regard, I am in the hands of Providence. I broke my arm the other day, and I suppose that as long as I do not break my jaw I can say something more or less about it. I am opposed to these resolutions and to this agreement for four main reasons: First, because I believe the people of Canada want tariffs to be made by this parliament alone, so that every item can be amended after discussion and without interference by any foreign country to prevent such discussion or action; secondly, because I believe the large majority of the people of Canada want no playing with fire in regard to British connection and so placing it in jeopardy; thirdly, because I want to preserve Canada for the Canadians, both now and, so far as I have power, for ever more; and, fourthly, because the agreement taken altogether is not in the interests of Canada as a nation and will retard its full development by its own people.

Mr. JAMES A. ROBB (Huntingdon). Mr. Chairman, the proposed trade arrangement now before the House and the country has been so widely discussed and so favourably received that those of us who support the government have no reason for prolonging the debate. Before discussing the trade arrangement itself, may I make a short reference to the lengthy speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) who has just sat down. Until this afternoon I considered my hon. friend to be a well-read and observant man who went about with his eyes open; but his repeated references this afternoon to the elementary farmers of the province of Quebec lead me to believe that he is somewhat in ignorance of general conditions of agriculture even in his own province. Had my good friend been watching the course of agricultural matters, he would have known that no later than last fall, at the great national exhibition in the capital city of his own province, many of the best prizes for Ayrshire cattle went to the province of Quebec, and at the same time other farmers from the same province were in St. John, New Brunswick, where they also captured

some of the best prizes for Ayrshire cattle. Had he looked a little further, he would have learned that at Seattle in 1909, the farmers of the province of Quebec captured some of the best prizes for Ayrshire cattle. My hon. friend, who has been a considerable time in public life and has noticed the progress and prosperity of this country, perhaps remembers that in 1893, at the world's fair in Chicago, the province of Quebec did honour to herself and to all Canada by sweeping the board and taking the best prizes, winning the gold medal for butter and cheese, and bringing it to Canada. In view of these facts and the fact that many of the best men throughout Canada, even among those in the hon. gentleman's own party, graduated from Quebec farms, it seems to me that his references to-day to the elementary farmer of the province of Quebec were not justified.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the 26th of January the Finance Minister submitted for the consideration of this parliament a proposed trade arrangement with 90,000,000 customers. They are thrifty, honourable, industrious, well to do people. Their credit is good, their rate of credit high. They are prepared to buy liberally of the surplus natural farm products of this country, and are prepared to pay the highest cash price for them on delivery, because they are wanted to help to feed a population of 90,000,000 people, more than half of whom are non-producers of farm products. It is no great stretch of imagination to believe that when our Finance Minister first entered upon this trade arrangement, the proposition submitted was not exactly that before us to-day. Our United States neighbours are good traders. They have developed and systematized a manufacturing industry that should be able to compete with the world, but for one obstacle, that is, the high cost of living, the result of the high tariff—the tariff that has called the New England boy from the farm to the factory, leaving the farm to grow up neglected in weeds, and leaving the New England boy short of the products that a man requires for his daily bread. So it is evident that for a long time our United States neighbours have been looking for wider markets for their manufactured products in return for a reduced tariff on farm products. It has been evident for a long time that they have been looking to Canada for increased and, shall I say better food supplies, and so when our ministers, who acted as our representatives, sat around the table to discuss the trade relations with the United States, they knew just what the southern men wanted to swap. David Harum, a prosperous banker and successful horse trader, had one rule which he called the golden rule in horse trading, and that was: Do to the other man what you know he would do to you and do it first. That is about the rule which our ministers followed; for after having listened during the past two months to the debate on this question, I am convinced that this proposed agreement is a good bargain for Canada. It is a better one than many of us hoped to obtain. There can be no dispute about the fact that it is along the line of policy of both parties since Sir John Macdonald proclaimed in 1878 his policy of reciprocity of trade or reciprocity of tariffs with our American neighbours.

I propose now to deal briefly with the conditions as they exist in my own province. Early in the debate my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) offered an amendment, and in presenting it he said that the feeling of the province of Quebec was that this reciprocity arrangement required to be looked into, and he asked that our government should give further opportunity for consideration of this question. I recognize that my hon. friend is the leader of a party in his province. Indeed, Sir, the result of the vote on his amendment would justify us in the belief that he is once more the first lieutenant, if not the actual leader, of the opposition, in this parliament; but, when he says that this is not a good bargain for the province of Quebec, does he truly and fairly represent public opinion in that province? Does he represent the opinion of the farmers there? Does the man behind the plough in that province believe that we are making undue haste in promoting better and more common sense trade relations with our great neighbours to the south? Representing an agricultural constituency in that province, I wish to raise my voice against the statements of those opposed to the government, those who say this measure is not in the interests of our people, and who further allege that we have no mandate to readjust our tariff. Surely they who say we have no mandate must have forgotten the issues in every school house and on every platform since 1896 when the Liberal party were accused of not having reformed the tariff. But I am willing to give the opposition credit for this, that they are opposed to anything and everything in the shape of tariff reform. They opposed the British preference and to-day would oppose an extension of that preference; but I submit that the people will not soon forget the party which granted the British preference and which, notwithstanding opposition from the Conservative party, is promoting better trade relations with our neighbours to the south.

In answer to the question who wants reciprocity, and to justify my own position, I wish to place on 'Hansard' a few resolu-

tions which were adopted unanimously by the farmers in the county of Huntingdon. They were adopted at a public meeting held on the 10th December, 1910, for the purpose of naming delegates to the farmers' delegation which waited on the government on the 16th of December last. The resolutions are interesting to the people in my part of the country because the majority of those present and who unanimously supported the resolutions, were men who, in the elections of 1908 and 1904, opposed the government candidate. The gentleman who for four years from 1904 to 1908 had the honour of representing the county which I now represent, and who during those four years gave a loyal support to the Conservative party, voted with them on every occasion when there was a vote, was not only present at that gathering of farmers and supported these resolutions, but made a speech condemning this government for having failed to give tariff reform. The resolutions are as follow. In view of the attitude of his Majesty's loyal opposition, is it too much to hope that when the next election takes place, be it sooner or later, the men who voted the following resolutions in Huntingdon will support the government policy:

1st. Moved by John Crutchfield, seconded by Joseph Holmes:—That we are in favour of our government meeting the advances of the Washington authorities for a reciprocity treaty, and of its completing the same without delay, always provided that any concession granted the United States be also extended to Great Britain.

2nd. Moved by David Vass, seconded by James T. Elder, that while acknowledging our duty to contribute towards the proper expenditure of the Dominion, we protest against being any longer taxed for the benefit of manufacturers and ask that the tariff be for revenue only.

3rd. Moved by Jos. O. Kelly, seconded by James McCracken:—We declare in favour of maintaining the British preference and of increasing it to 50 per cent.

Here, Sir, at least is one important district in the province of Quebec which is in direct opposition to the views expressed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and those who voted with him for delay in tariff reform.

It will be asked what benefit will the proposed tariff reductions be to the province of Quebec. Well, take the dairy industry. Just about one year ago when the Finance Minister announced the favourable conclusion of the negotiations with President Taft, hon. gentlemen opposite were loud in their criticisms particularly of the Minister of Finance for having visited Washington and Albany, to discuss trade relations with the president. On May 3, 1910, page 8752 of 'Hansard', the hon. the leader of the opposition warned the government against any further negotiations which he feared might weaken the ties of the empire. Well, one indirect result of those negotiations of last year was the market for Canadian cream in the United States. Men qualified to know, men in the business, say that the farmer who sold his cream to the United States market netted 10 to 20 cents per 100 of milk more than in the Montreal market. And if we had free trade in dairy products, Canadian farmers would get 35 cents to 39 cents per 100 pounds more for their milk. The demand for cream from the United States market is closing up our butter and cheese factories, this proposed measure will enable us to ship butter and cheese.

I have here a few figures which, I am assured by reliable men in the business, are correct. They show the prices paid last year for milk to New York State farmers and to Quebec farmers.

The prices paid per 100 pounds for milk at New York State butter factories, skimmed milk returned, were as follows:

	Per 100 pounds.
At Fay, N.Y., for season..	$1 32
At Chateauguay, N.Y., for season	1 35
At Malone, N.Y., for season....	1 31
At Bombay, N.Y., for season.. ..	1 29

This makes an average of $1.31¾ per 100 pounds. The Canadian who was shipping cream to the United States received an average of $1.14, with the skimmed milk returned, that is 17¾ cents less than his United States neighbour. In the district I have the honour to represent, there are located twelve miles apart a condensed milk factory on the Canadian side and on the New York side shippers of milk and cream. The prices paid in Canada by the condensed milk factory for the month of October was $1.40 per 100 pounds of milk, while the price at Chateauguay, N.Y., was $1.75. A man living six miles south of Huntingdon would be as near to the Chateauguay market as he would to the Huntingdon market. These figures show the relative prices of these two places:

	Huntingdon. Que.	Chateauguay, N.Y.
October..	$1.40	$1.75
November..	1.40	1.90
December..	1.50	2.05
January..	1.70	2.05
February..	1.70	2.05
March..	1.40	1.70
April..	1.40	....
Balance season	1.00	....

The man who gave me these figures did not supply the price for the balance of the season at Chateauguay, N.Y. I understand

that this year the Huntingdon factory has arranged to pay the farmers $1.10. Farmers are not all situated where they can take advantage of the high prices paid by condensed milk factories or shippers of milk and cream. A fair comparison would be the prices paid by butter and cheese factories. In New York state, the price was $1.31. The Montreal market gave back 92 cents per 100 pounds to the farmer producing butter and cheese for that market. Thus, the House will see that the United States farmer has an advantage over the Canadian farmer of 39 cents per 100 pounds. If you take 4,000 pounds as the average production per cow—and that should be a low estimate—this would mean that, with access to the American market, the return of the Quebec dairy farmer would be $15.60 more per cow. The farmer with twenty cows would thus receive $312 a year in excess of his present return. That means the hired man's wages; it means one-third the cost of feeding the cow, and feeding her well. And it means proportionately more to the farmer who has a good herd of well-fed cows, that possibly average 6,000 pounds of milk in the season, instead of 4,000 pounds. Instead of gaining $15.60, his gain would be $23.40 per cow, or $468 for the herd.

Mr. BLAIN. And what will happen to the condensed milk factories and the cheese factories on the Canadian side?

Mr. ROBB. Are the milking cows for the benefit of the factory owner or for the benefit of the farmer?

Mr. BLAIN. Both.

Mr. ROBB. But let us look at it a little further. Let us get away from the individual farmer, and see what this means for the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) seemed to be in doubt whether this was a good bargain for the province of Quebec. The Census and Statistics Monthly of July, 1910, gives the number of milk cows in the province of Quebec in 1908 as 884,896. I take that estimate because, while there was a shortage of cattle last year, there will be a considerable increase this year, when there is plenty of feed. If these cows earn $15.60 more apiece owing to better markets, it will be giving back to the farmers of Quebec the nice, tidy sum of $13,804,377.60 per annum. I do not claim that the new markets will give us these full prices. There will be a little lowering in the United States, and a considerable increase in Canada. But, if prices are adjusted to about the basis of our relative population, Quebec dairymen will still be over $11,000,000 to the good. Where will this increased revenue go? Is it going to hurt anybody for the farmers of the province of Quebec to have their cows earning $11,000,000 more than if they were milking them for the Canadian and British markets only? I claim that this money will go into more comforts for the home, better schools and better roads. Some of it will go to the manufacturers and to the wholesale houses in the cities.

Mr. RHODES. What about the workmen in Valleyfield?

Mr. ROBB. They will be taken care of, if the statement of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is correct that this country will be flooded with goods from other countries.

Directly associated with dairy farming is stock-raising. The farmer who runs a good dairy farm, sending the milk to the butter factory, getting back any skimmed milk and buttermilk, has generally on the same farm a nice lot of young cattle, some pork and a few good horses. In my country, we call it bad farming if a man, in the course of the season, besides the revenue from his dairy products, does not take in some money by the sale of stock in the shape of hogs, sheep, young cattle and horses. For the year ending March 31st, 1910, the average duty collected on horses shipped into the United States from Canada was $35.09. This tariff measure proposes to do away with that duty. I would ask hon. members opposite if that is going to hurt anybody? The farmer of the province of Quebec knows the value of the American market for horses; he does not need statistics to prove it to him. He knows that every business day in the year there is an American trotting up and down the concessions looking for horses. He knows that the American will give him probably not all this $35, but a fair share of it if the duty is taken off.

Now, I want to say a few words about the hay crop of the province of Quebec. There seems to be an effort made to create the idea that we in Quebec are the only people who are interested in the sale of hay from this country. There seems to be an effort made to create the idea that we in the province of Quebec are the only people who are interested in the hay question. Now, if you start out from Ottawa and go to Montreal, or go from here west, at any time during the hay season, you will find cars loading with hay in the province of Ontario before you get into Quebec. In the province of Quebec, it is true, we do grow large quantities of hay, and what we have to sell we want to sell in the best market. I have been talking with a good many prominent farmers since this question

came up, and I find that the farmer in the province of Quebec who has the most hay, or at least has the best hay, for sale, is the farmer who keeps the most cows and the most stock on his farm. In our province we have a system of farming whereby through ensilage and silos the farmer feeds his cattle largely during the winter season. He feeds them corn ensilage and grain, and he finds that in so doing he feeds them cheaper, and can keep and feed a better and a larger herd; and the fertilizer going back to the land, he produces more hay and grain. In the province of Quebec we have two good markets for hay; we have our northern lumber camps that take a considerable quantity of hay, and we have the large cities. Incidentally, I would like to say that some of the dairymen who live near the large cities are considerably interested in buying hay as cheaply as they can, because they have to go out into the country districts to buy hay for their stock. But the best market for hay on this continent is the American market, that is not disputed. Any gentleman who looks at the quotations will see that in New York and Boston the price for hay is generally $7 to $8 higher than it is in Canada, and the duty on hay going into the United States is $4 a ton, or almost just half the price of the hay.

Mr. EDWARDS. How does the price in New York and Boston compare with prices in England?

Mr. ROBB. I have not looked up English prices; but I may say this, that the English market is willing to pay almost as much for our clover hay as they do for our timothy hay; and they do not want our timothy hay, they want our clover hay. It is almost impossible to sell timothy hay on the English market.

Mr. EDWARDS. If hay is $7 or $8 higher in Boston and New York than it is in Canada, is it not a remarkable thing that Canada would export more hay to England than it does to the United States?

Mr. ROBB. Because, as I have said, the English market is looking for cheap clover hay, of which we have an abundance, they do not want our timothy hay at all. But the United States market puts up a high barrier against our timothy hay; when we get that barrier lowered our timothy hay will go in there. Now it has been stated here that if this proposed trade arrangement goes into effect the millers of this country will be wiped out of business. I do not believe that any intelligent man in this House is sincere in making that statement. I am prepared to admit that the millers in western Canada will have more competition in buying their wheat, but that is not going to put them out of business. The western miller will be able to buy his wheat just as cheap as any competitor that comes along. He is the first man on the ground, he knows the farmers, he is living alongside of them, and he can make his selection better than any miller who comes in from the outside to buy our wheat. The greatest competition the Canadian miller has to-day in the export business is the British miller, who buys his wheat in the markets of the world; he is the keenest competitor the Canadian miller has. It has been said that some of our large Canadian millers, recognizing this, have lately been considering the advisability of putting up mills in Liverpool where they can buy their wheat from the markets of the world. Now this proposed trade arrangement will give our large millers, not only, our own great Northwest where production is increasing every year, but it will let them into the large markets of the southwest, where they produce a considerable quantity of wheat; and with these large markets to go into, they will be able to export to advantage, if any one on this continent can do so.

Under the proposed tariff changes, the United States miller will have the advantage in that he can import a certain percentage of our number one and two hard wheat, blend it with the softer United States varieties, mill it in the United States and market a 30 per cent or 40 per cent best patent at home, export the bakers, on clears, and the price received for his best flour at home will enable the United States miller to sell the lower grades for export at reduced prices. The Canadian miller, having a smaller home market, will be that much handicapped on the export trade. On the other hand, the Canadian flour will be better, because the domestic market is limited, and cannot consume more than a small percentage of high grade patents, thus Canadian flour will be preferred by buyers of high grade flour, because it will rank with Hungarian and other high grade flour. For my part, I cannot see that the Canadian miller would have been hurt much if our ministers had gone a little further and put all the millers on this continent on the same basis. I think that the Canadian miller, with the large purchasing market he has for his wheat, and with his superior water-power and intelligent labour would have been able to compete with any miller, and it would be a great advantage to him to get into the large cities of the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says he doesn't think it will hurt the Canadian miller. There are two or three hundred mills in the province of Ontario and a few

in Quebec which grind from one-third to one-half more western wheat than they use in the year. If that wheat commands, as is claimed, from ten to fifteen cents a bushel more in the United States, will not that wheat be most likely to go to the United States instead of coming this way? And if so, will the Canadian miller not be injured by making it impossible for him to get the supply of wheat which he requires to mix with the soft wheat of Ontario?

Mr. ROBB. The Canadian miller will buy all the wheat he wants and buy it at the market price. He has just as good a chance to buy it as the United States miller and he will have this advantage. My hon. friend comes from Ontario. He knows that the millers of Ontario have been at a considerable disadvantage in recent years because the farmers of Ontario refused to deliver their wheat at the market price; that is the market value of the world. The Ontario miller will be able to go into Michigan, Kansas, Missouri, Ohio, anywhere they grow wheat, and buy it at the market price.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the hon. member know that he is very much handicapped by the freight rates as between Winnipeg and Duluth and Winnipeg and Toronto? They are very much higher on grain to Toronto than to Duluth.

Mr. ROBB. Yes, but the flour has not got to Toronto yet. You are only talking about wheat there. When the wheat gets to Toronto the flour is there.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the Canadian miller would not be injured. I am free to say that he will be injured. I can give an example from personal knowledge because I happened to be in the business for a time. We were obliged to get half of the wheat that we required to keep our mills running from the west. If that wheat goes to the United States is the Ontario miller likely to get it?

Mr. ROBB. Why should it go to the United States if the Ontario miller has the money to pay for it? His money will be just as good as the American money.

Mr. SPROULE. But it is claimed that the wheat will be sold to the United States miller before the Ontario miller has a chance to get it.

Mr. ROBB. I was in the milling business for thirty-five years, and when I hear my good friends telling us about what this arrangement is going to do to the millers I am reminded of the conditions from which we suffered under the great National Policy of the Conservatives—the grinding and bond regulations of those days whereby favoured millers located in favoured positions were able to buy wheat in the United States and grind it in bond and there were no other millers in Canada who could compete with them, the corn regulation whereby the millers and farmers of this country were taxed 7½ cents a bushel on their corn while the brewer only paid ¾ of a cent a bushel and the fake kiln dried regulation that also enabled some favoured Canadian millers to obtain all the business, largely in Quebec, to the detriment of the other millers. This condition was only cured when there was a quarrel between two of the large millers who were both supporters of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman does not know much about the milling business.

Mr. ROBB. Perhaps not.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be as he says in his part of the country but it is certainly not so in Ontario.

Mr. ROBB. One objection put up by those opposed to better trade relations, is 'the way it was done.' They tell us that Canada was not properly represented, that two very ordinary men, represented Canada. Why did we not consult some one competent and pick out two men qualified to look after Canada's interests, men heavy enough and big enough to hold up our end, and send them to Washington instead of the two very ordinary men who did go, and who brought back the biggest trade order ever offered to Canada.

Why did we send two ordinary men, when so many extraordinary men were available? Well, could we have sent two men better qualified to handle this trade, and look after Canada's interests? Had we available two men who were something more than very ordinary men, and who could be trusted to work together, 'play a team game' for the best interests of Canada? Could we have sent the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), or the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Forget)? Could we have sent the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), an ex-Finance Minister, who had been there before and who knew the way? Whom could we send with him? Could we send that genial old gentleman who was once his leader, or could we send with him the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)?

We might have sent the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, (Mr. Ames); they two working together could have given our United States friends an illuminated lecture on the great resources of this country, and where to find them.

But, Sir, looking it all over, calmly and quietly with the treaty before us, are we not justified in believing that Canada was well and ably represented and that this trade bargain is one that will prove beneficial to our people?

For my part I am prepared to support it without any fear of annexation or weakening of the ties that bind us to the mother land. I come from a district where in 1866, and again in 1870, the farmers left the plough, and the seeder to take up arms in defence of their homes and country. It was just following ten years of reciprocity with the United States from whence the invaders came. Sir, some of the men of 1866 and 1870 have gone the way of all humanity, but those who remain are as loyal to-day as they were in 1870. I am not one of those who believe that the son is less loyal than his sire. Their patriotism is not measured by an extra thirty cents on milk or fifty cents on apples, and while they do not make much noise, they are just as willing and as ready to defend their homes and country to-day, as their fathers were forty years ago.

On motion of Mr. Henderson committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the debate go on to-morrow again?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the motion for Ways and Means will be made again.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, April 20, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 178) respecting the pollution of navigable waters.—Mr. Currie.

Mr. ROBB.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PAPAL ZOUAVES.

*Mr. SPROULE:

1. Are the Papal Zouaves of Quebec authorized Civilian Rifle Associations under the Militia Act and King's Regulations? If not, under what authority are they organized?
2. Are they furnished with arms, clothing, and ammunition for practice? If so, to what branch of the militia force do they belong, for what purpose is the force intended, and are they under the King's regulations?
3. What is the number of those Rifle Associations, where are they located, and what is the strength of each?
4. When were they first organized, and for what purpose?
5. Have they ever been called out for service? If so, when, how many responded to the call and where were they engaged?
6. How much have they cost the country since first organized?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1, 2 and 3. The 'Papal Zouaves of Quebec' are not organized as authorized Civilian Rifle Associations, under the Militia Act and King's Regulations, except in the case of Civilian Rifle Association No. 155, known as the 'Zouave Rifle Association of Quebec.' All other Zouaves are presumably organized as private associations. The Civilian Rifle Association, No. 155, has been furnished with obsolete M. H. Rifles. They have not been furnished with any clothing, or ammunition for practice. The association does not belong to the militia force, and is intended for the same purpose as other civilian rifle associations, and to the same extent as they are under the King's Regulations—see paragraph 62 (c), Militia Act, under which the Governor in Council may make regulations for furnishing rifles and ammunition for the training and practice of persons, whether they are or are not members of the militia. This association is located in the city of Quebec, and, according to latest returns, has a membership of 142.

4. Organized by general order 100, May, 1905, for the purpose of a civilian rifle association.

5. No.

6. Nothing, so far as this department is aware, except the obsolete arms which were supplied, as stated above.

ALBERTA RANGERS.

Mr. HUGHES:

1. When were the 23rd Alberta Rangers organized?
2. When was the Macleod Squadron organized?

3. Was an officer named Duncan J Campbell captain of the Macleod Squadron, authorized in 1909 to organize three more squadrons for that corps?

4. Did Captain Campbell so organize these squadrons?

5. Did Captain Campbell recommend officers for the new squadrons?

6. Were these approved by Colonel Steele, the then D.O.C.?

7. What are the names of the officers recommended by Captain Campbell for the other squadrons?

8. When was Captain Campbell placed in command of the corps?

9. Why was Captain Campbell passed over and another officer placed in acting command of the corps?

10. What officers were appointed to the three new squadrons?

11. Why were those recommended by Captain Campbell not confirmed in their appointments?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN :

1. Authorized April 1, 1908; organized April 1, 1910.

2. Authorized April 1, 1908; organized April 1, 1910.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. Yes.

6. Yes.

7. As Major: Messrs. W. C. Bryan, W. H. Irwin, A. C. Kemmis; as captain: Messrs. P. H. Douglas, H. A. Donovan, J. E. Wright; as lieutenants: Messrs. D. C. Davis, H. B. Brown, A. J. Stoddart, D. D. Spencer, R. H. Ormond, F. W. B. George, N. Nicholson, D. H. Gordon, H. D Cyr, G. A. Buchanan, J. A. Haslam.

8. Never.

9. It is not known that this was done.

10. Prov. Major W. C. Bryan; Prov. Major, W. H. Irwin; Major, A. C. Kemmis; Prov. Captain, P. H. Douglas; Prov. Captain, J. E. Wright; Prov. Lieutenant, F. W. B. George; Prov. Lieutenant, N. Nicholson; Captain, H. B. Brown; Prov. Lieutenant, R. H. Ormond; Prov. Lieutenant, D. H. Gordon; Lieutenant, G. A. Buchanan.

11. All officers were confirmed who qualified.

BURLINGTON BAY DREDGING.

* Mr. SEALEY:

1. Is it the intention of the government to perform dredging work in Burlington bay in the vicinity of the works of the International Harvester Company of Canada and the Oliver Chilled Plough Company Works of Canada?

2. If so, will the proposed action of the government be based on expectation of the continuance and prospective enlargement of the output of these companies?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.

2. This question cannot be properly answered by a simple affirmative. I may inform my hon. friend that a few months ago, when the reciprocity agreement was first made public, it was announced in a portion of the press that the Oliver Plough Company had given orders to discontinue work upon their undertaking at Hamilton, and I felt it to be my duty to make careful inquiry as to the plans of the company, so far as their works at Hamilton are concerned. I learned that there was no truth whatever in the report referred to, but on the contrary, that the company intends to proceed vigorously with the completion of its works, which will have a capacity for turning out at least one thousand ploughs per day.

I am in receipt of the following letter from the company. which will best answer the second part of the question of my hon. friend:

To the Hon. Wm. Pugsley,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I beg leave to submit some further particulars regarding the channel leading to the proposed dock of the Oliver Chilled Plough Works of Canada, Ltd., and the uses to which the channel will be put.

Our product in Canada is marketed by the International Harvester Company of Canada, Ltd., and the arrangement is such that we deliver the product to them on our dock. Under this arrangement, they are jointly interested in the early completion of the facilities for water shipment from our plant.

The plans of the Harvester Company for shipping this product to the northwest involve the services of several lake carriers, who will also be benefited by the completion of the proposed channel. These lines are as follows:

Inland lines, owning approximately 20 vessels; Merchants' Mutual lines, owning approximately 20 vessels; Canadian Lakes lines, owning approximately 12 vessels; independent owners, owning approximately 5 vessels.

It is estimated that this season's business of the International Harvester Company will require the services of 50 boats—equivalent to 2,000 carloads—for their outbound traffic. Our northwest business during this shipping season will amount approximately to 900 cars, which, at the same ratio, will require 22 boats. Next season this amount will be increased to about 45 boats.

These figures are based upon the arrangement that boats will arrive at our docks with a partial load of other merchandise, and that they will each load the equivalent of 40 cars of our product. In addition to this outbound traffic, the Harvester Company will require about 10 boats of inbound merchandise, and out plant will require from 6 to 8 boats. Thus the total number of vessels between the two plants will be in the neighbourhood of 100 for the season.

This estimate of the size of our plant and the volume of shipment is based upon the assumption that the facilities for water ship-

ment in accordance with the plans which have been submitted to you, can be obtained. It is our expectation and desire upon the completion of these plans to transfer a portion of our large export business from South Bend to the Canadian works, thus augmenting the volume of traffic already mentioned.

We have orders on hand at this time for some 30,000 ploughs to be shipped during the present navigation season, and these shipments will begin during the latter part of April. Until such time as proper arrangements can be made for water shipments, we will be obliged to make shipments by rail.

It may be of interest to you to know that there has thus far been spent upon the plant over $500,000, that a like investment will be added during the coming year, and that the value of the completed plant, according to plans already under way, will be in the neighbourhood of $1,500,000.

With assurance of our appreciation of the service already rendered our company, and the courtesies extended to the writer on the occasion of his recent visit to Ottawa, I am,

Yours very truly,

R. J. SMART,
Works Manager.

Mr. SEALEY. Has the answer any application to the canal entrance in the Hamilton harbour? The work under consideration is to facilitate the shipping from these new industries there, and in view of this enormous increase of traffic——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order. He will have to wait until the orders of the day are called.

ST. CHARLES RIFLE RANGE, WINNIPEG,

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Has the old rifle range near St. Charles, Winnipeg, been sold or has any arrangement been made for the sale thereof? If so, to whom and at what price?
2. Was the property valued? If so, by whom, and what valuation or valuations were placed thereon?
3. Was the sale advertised? If so, in what manner and for what length of time?
4. Generally speaking, what were the conditions and circumstances under which the sale was conducted or arranged?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. The old rifle range near St. Charles, Winnipeg, comprising 221 acres, has been sold to Messrs. Pellatt & Pellatt of Toronto for the sum of $123,000.00.

2. The property was valued by Mr. George Pope, Right-of-Way and Claims Agent, Land Department, Grand Trunk Railway, who stated that he considered $600.00 an acre a good outside figure for the property on a cash basis. Lieut.-Col. J. Lyons Biggar, Director of Transport and Supplies, an officer of the Militia of wide experience in valuing lands, was sent to Winnipeg to specially inquire into the question of the value of the property. Lieut.-Col. Biggar concurred in Mr. Pope's valuation, and endeavoured to obtain tenders, whilst in Winnipeg, for the property, but without success.

3. The sale was advertised in the public press as follows:

Manitoba Free Press	6 insertions
Canadian Farmer, Winnipeg ..	2 "
Norwestern	2 "

4. The sale was authorized by parliament, the proceeds to be used for the purchase of a site for the new range. In due course, an order in council was passed, and the sale advertised as above. The highest tender obtained at that time, which complied with the conditions, was for the sum of $44,650.00. This tender was considered too low, and was not accepted. Later a tender was received from Messrs. Pellatt & Pellatt of Toronto of $123,000.00 for the property, and, subsequent to that tender being submitted, another was obtained from a firm in Winnipeg of $133,000.00. An order in council was then passed authorizing the sale of the property to the last referred to firm, and they were given a certain time to pay ten per cent of the purchase price—a usual condition of such a sale. That time was several times extended, and, the instalment not being paid, another order in council was passed authorizing the sale to the next highest tenderer, Messrs. Pellatt & Pellatt, for the sum of $123,000.00.

ST. PETER'S BREAKWATER.

Mr. FRASER:

1. Is it the intention of the government to repair or extend the breakwater at St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., during this season?
2. If so, will tenders be called for same, and what amount of money will be expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.
2. $2,500 for repairs which will be done by contract or by day's labour on the recommendation of the Chief Engineer.

BRITISH COLUMBIA IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES, AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND.

Mr. LAKE:

What were the quantities and values of wheat, beef, mutton, eggs and butter, imported into British Columbia from the United States, Australia and New Zealand, respectively, during each of the months of October, November and December, 1910, and January and February, 1911?

Mr. PATERSON:

—	United States.		Australia.		New Zealand.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
Wheat—Bush.		$		$		$
October	11,404	10,345				
November	20,037	17,957				
December	10,971	8,435				
January	6,209	5,539				
February	10,489	7,528				
Eggs—Doz.						
October	6,989	2,572				
November	7,614	2,892				
December	38,760	10,814				
January	22,511	8,061				
February	161,525	39,511				
Butter—Lbs.						
October	2,106	764				
November	2,171	776	2,800	695		
December	3,68C	998	63,280	14,883	19,600	4,815
January	806	291	108,416	25,542	110,600	28,916
February	5,311	1,127	15,008	3,000	163,626	37,200
Beef—Lbs.						
October	229	24				
November	856	198				
December	1,086	115				
January	144	30				
February	675	120				
Mutton—Lbs.						
October	74,792	6,892	213,050	14,208		
November	33,760	3,251	180,962	12,191		
December	71,720	6,063	174,379	11,646		
January	54,665	5,027	125,676	8,521		
February	78,755	7,555	136,379	8,769		

CONDITION OF PARLIAMENT GROUNDS.

Mr. HUGHES. I have the honour again to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the condition of the grounds and parliamentary buildings and of the street in front of the parliament buildings. The minister assured me yesterday that the drinking water used in this building was sterilized. May I ask, has he had, and will he produce, an analysis of the water, the so-called sterilized water, being supplied to the members in this building, and will he furnish us also with information as to the system of sterilization used? He can bring that statement down at his convenience. I desire also to call attention to the clouds of dust that have been hovering round these buildings to-day and especially along Wellington street. I take the liberty of suggesting to the minister that the opinion is held by many that that street has not been even swept for a number of years. It has been suggested that the pavements around the buildings might be either oiled, or washed with water from the hydrants, every night, some time after midnight. The gentlemen conducting that operation might be allowed time to take it easy. Their work in the day is so arduous that it would not be well to hurry them. In the late hours of the night is the proper time to wash the streets, for then it can be done with a minimum of inconvenience to the public. I am satisfied that it is only necessary to draw the attention of the minister to this matter. I am sure he himself, when going to his office this morning, must have noticed the clouds of dust on Wellington street and around these buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As to the analysis of the water, I have in my possession the certificate of the gentleman who makes the analyses. I get these analyses week by week.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is the analyst?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Higgins. He is in the pathological department of the laboratory at the Experimental Farm. I shall be glad to submit that to-morrow, and, if possible, to give also the description of the process of sterilization. With regard to the other matter, I appreciate the valuable suggestions that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has made from time to time with the desire of improving conditions, and shall take care that his present suggestion is conveyed to the proper official of the department.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to request the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that yesterday he promised to give me information with respect to two returns. One return was ordered on December 5.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The return is not so easily made up as the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) seems to think. The motion was in this form:

> Return showing the number of public buildings occupied in whole or in part as post offices, giving in the case of partial occupation only, the other services to which the building is applied and the part and proportion of the building used by each service; the name of the place in which the building is situated and its population; the total amount of public money expended on each building; including site and equipment, down to the end of the financial year, the postal revenue in each case, and the revenue, if any, received by the government from the buildings as rentals, or otherwise, and the sources of such revenue.

The hon. gentleman will see that this means that every building that is rented for post office purposes throughout the Dominion must be inquired into, the rent paid for it, the space occupied, and its value. Also with regard to buildings erected by the government, not only since confederation, but before confederation. I would like it if the hon. gentleman would think it over and see if he really wants all this information. A return in the form in which it is called for would involve inquiry in all parts of the country and would take months to prepare.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the minister puts an unnecessarily broad construction upon it. I do not want as much information as he indicates. There is one part, however, in which he is quite right. The return calls for information as to how any building occupied by the Post Office Department is also occupied by other departments. I could dispense with that. I want particularly to know what public buildings—I do not say anything of others—and I do not think the return includes any others——

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does.

Mr. LENNOX. If it does then I am wrong. I want to ascertain what public buildings or portions of public buildings are occupied by the postal service, and where it is a portion of a building, what proportion, whether one-third, one-quarter, or whatever it may be, and the revenue received. I do not think the minister will find it difficult to furnish that information. And I may say that I think the time for the government to consider matters of this kind is before the order is made. It is unfortunate that this matter has been allowed to go on for nearly four months and nothing done. I hope the minister will facilitate the preparation of that information, confining it to public buildings that are used in whole or in part for post office purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With the motion limited in that way, it will be infinitely easier to get the information.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a pity the minister has not done anything before. I understood he was to give me information as to the other return. Perhaps I was wrong; but I have not found out whose duty it is to furnish the return to which I refer—regarding aliens employed by the government and residing outside of Canada. I have asked several times for that information, and I think the Minister of Public Works intimated that he was going to deal with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, will the minister who is charged with it please rise and tell us what he will do?

Mr. MURPHY. While I have no special charge of the matter, I would like to expedite the preparation of the return. Will the hon. gentleman please give me the date of the order?

Mr. LENNOX. It was the 18th of January. Will the minister (Mr. Murphy) please mention it to-morrow?

Mr. MURPHY. I will have attention drawn to it and will try to have some information for my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) to-morrow.

BURLINGTON BAY DREDGING.

Mr. SEALEY. Referring to the question which I asked as to dredging work in Burlington bay, I desire to ask if, in view of the enormous increase in vessel traffic in Hamilton harbour, coupled with the general increase in business there, it is the intention of the government to make a be-

ginning at the widening and deepening of Burlington Beach canal which forms the entrance to Burlington bay and Hamilton harbour, in order to avoid the congestion of traffic and consequent danger. This danger is quite serious, for last year there were a couple of collisions and some groundings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The subject of widening and deepening the Burlington canal, which, as my hon. friend (Mr. Sealey) knows has been brought to my attention on several occasions, both by himself and by delegations from the city of Hamilton, is regarded by my department and myself as of very great importance, and the subject is now engaging the earnest consideration of the department.

NETHERLAND LOAN COMPANY.

Mr. MONK. On December 5 last I moved for correspondence between the government and Mr. Preston, Trade Commissioner to Holland, with relation to the Netherland Loan Company. That correspondence was brought down, but two letters are missing. Later, on the 6th of February, I moved for additional correspondence, which was brought down. I am informed there are two letters that have passed since that are important to complete the file. Will the right hon. gentleman see that the Department of Commerce furnishes that additional correspondence passed since the last order? It is somewhat late to make a motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will do so.

WAYS AND MEANS—VICTORIA MUSEUM.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. OWEN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), if he is having an inspection made of the new museum, and if he is, what he thinks about the large cracks in the tile floors of the building, about an inch in width, and the cracks in the wall from the bottom to the top, running in all directions. Now I am not opposed to spending money in the erection of public buildings where they are really needed, but I want the people to get value for their money. I think that building is costing the country about a million and a half, and I claim that we are not getting value for our money. I would like to know if anybody was looking after that building, during its erection, in the interest of the people. The minister has several engineers in his department, and I think he might have spared two or three of them to go down there and look after the public interest while that building was in course of erection. I would like also to know if he is going to take the building off the hands of the contractor in the condition it is now in. It is in a shameful condition for a new building. I would like also to know if the contractor, in entering into the contract, put up a cash cheque as a guarantee that he would carry out the plans and specifications, and if he did not, whether the cheque would be turned over to the government. I would like to know what the minister thinks about the condition the building is in.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that some time ago I went through the building, I have not been there lately. My attention has been called to the fact that there is a crack in the building; I have not heard anything as to the floors which my hon. friend refers to. But with regard to the crack in the wall, I have given instructions to have it examined, not only by the chief architect, but by another competent man with him, from day to day, and to report to me whether there is any further settling, which would be evidenced of course by an enlargement of the crack. Yesterday I received a verbal report from the chief architect that there had not recently been any evidence of settling. With regard to the contract itself, it is in the ordinary form. The contractor was obliged to put up security for the satisfactory performance of his contract, and the building will not be taken off his hands until the chief architect certifies that it has been fully completed to his satisfaction, and in accordance with the contract. I shall make it my business to inquire with regard to the defects which my hon. friend says he has discovered in the floor.

Mr. HUGHES. Possibly it was before the time of the Minister of Public Works, but I would ask if he received any notification from the contractor stating that a clay foundation was not suitable for a building of that weight, and that the area of the foundation of the building should be much greater than was called for in the specifications. Does the minister know anything about that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As this is a matter of some importance, perhaps my hon. friend would allow his question to stand, and I will make the necessary inquiry.

Mr. SPROULE. This defect in the museum has been known to the public for some time, and only to-day the minister says he will make inquiry. Evidently he has made no inquiry up to the present time. It appears to me rather strange that we are spending so much money on a building like that, and yet there had been

no attempt to examine the foundation to determine whether the nature of the soil was such that it would bear up the weight of the building that was to rest upon it. The building is cracking from top to bottom, I have been told, and is really dangerous to those who occupy that building, and no attention is paid to it. I think any architect of ability could have determined pretty accurately what the nature of the soil was, whether sand or clay, or part sand and part clay, and whether it would sustain the proposed column of brick, stone and mortar of the height of that building, containing the number of cubic feet that would be in it. You would naturally suppose that a competent architect would make the foundation wide enough for the purpose. I presume the building is erected according to plans and specifications. There seems to be some fatality attending all the buildings erected by this government, for instance, the Laurier Tower and the Quebec bridge.

Mr. LENNOX. It is the same contractor, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether it is or not. The Quebec bridge and the Laurier Tower showed the same defects until the catastrophe happened. And so it will be with this building; it will probably stand until it finally tumbles down and many human lives will be sacrificed, and after that we will have to go to work and erect it again. Surely the Minister of Public Works, who is apparently a very intelligent man, and would allow no such bad work in a building of his own, should have given more attention to this building than he apparently has done. There must be something defective in the oversight or in the management.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend seems to forget that this work was designed and its construction undertaken and was well along towards completion, so far as the exterior walls were concerned, before I became Minister of Public Works.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You assumed the responsibility of the other fellow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), seems to aim at me personally, because he says I am apparently an intelligent man. I may not be wanting in intelligence, and my predecessor might have had a good deal of intelligence; therefore, I take it he was making his remarks with reference to myself personally. It seems to me that I have done all I could since I have been minister in connection with the matter. The chief architect has not only been giving the erection of the building his very close personal attention, but he has also had an assistant, a member of the architectural staff in the department, on the work from day to day, I think I am safe in saying upon every working day in the year, the assistant architect from the department has been engaged upon the work.

Mr. HUGHES. Are not those cracks all due to the foundation and not to the construction of the wall?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared at this moment to state what is the cause of the cracks. I take it that the cracks in the wall to which I have referred would be due to the settling of a portion of the building, the settling probably of that wall to a little further extent than the other portions of the building have settled. It is not at all an uncommon thing for a heavy building, built upon a clay foundation, to settle, and if it settles uniformly it would be because the consistency of the clay foundation is the same all over and there will be no harm done. It is not at all an uncommon thing for a heavy stone building to settle one or two inches, or perhaps a little more than that even during the course of construction, or after it is constructed. I would assume that where this wall has settled there must have been, down below the level to which it was excavated, some softer material so that there has been a little more settling just at that particular point than at other parts of the building. What I am doing is to have the wall watched with the utmost care. I am informed that there is no danger. The chief architect tells me that the moment he ascertains there is any additional settling he will let me know. I think that is all I can do. I do not see that I can do anything more in the public interest than I am doing. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) undoubtedly draws upon his imagination when he speaks of a fatality accompanying the erection of public buildings by this government.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a matter of history.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be ancient history. We have erected hundreds of buildings all over the country which are a credit to the people of the country, and a credit to those who have had charge of their construction.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, about a year and a little more ago I asked the attention of the House for a short time to the matter of the secretariat of the Imperial Conference, tracing up the history of the Imperial Conference from its commencement in 1887 un-

til the year 1907, or a little later and showing, as I did in tracing up that history, the gradual widening and development of the old Intercolonial Conference in its progress, the larger importance which it gradually assumed, and the greater influence it exercised on the affairs of the empire. I do not make any apology to-day for asking the attention of the House to some matters in connection therewith with the view of bringing the history up to the present time. As I did on the former occasion I propose to do now—treat the matter in an altogether non-partisan spirit, at the same time, not thinking that because I am doing that, I should refrain from criticism of any point which seemed to me to be worthy of criticism, any more than I should abstain from giving praise where any praise is due.

In order to connect the story of to-day with that of a year and a half ago I shall remind the House that at that time the determination had been arrived at to constitute a body which was called for by the overseas dominions, and the necessity for which had been recognized for many years, and was acquiesced in by the British government itself. There was need of something to ensure continuity of work in the Intercolonial or Imperial Conference, to see that information, such as it needed for its work, was prepared, so that when the delegates of the empire, in the short time that was allowed them in London, met to confer together, they should have the very best information possible at their hands; in fact should have this information at their hands long before they met there so that it would be possible for them to digest it, to consult with their colleagues at home with reference to it, and be prepared with their views, and prepared as well with the policy which they would adopt with reference to each of these great questions. There were two views with reference to this secretariat. One was advanced by South Africa, New Zealand and Australia, which was in favour of an independent secretariat under the presidency of the Prime Minister of Great Britain with officials paid by itself, and all the expenses met by contributions from the different parts of the empire which were represented there. They believed that in that way the business of the secretariat, and the business of the Imperial Conference would be carried on under more independent auspices, and that the touch which would be kept between the outlying dominions and the central government would be closer and hedged around by less formality. The other view was taken by the Dominion of Canada, and acquiesced in by the British government, that while something was necessary and they were willing to have something done to meet the end in view, the responsibility of the secretariat to one of the departments of the British government should be kept, that is, that it might be formed in connection with, and under the responsibility of the Colonial Office. As is usual in all these cases where an agreement is not possible a compromise was made, and Lord Elgin at that time promised that he would take immediately in hand the work of providing, in so far as that could be done under these conditions, for that which was deemed necessary by all the dominions. As a consequence, and to make the matter short, the Colonial Office has been reformed. It has been divided into three parts, one called the Dominions Department, which has to do solely with the affairs of the self-governing dominions; the second, which has to do entirely with the Crown colonies, and protectorates, and the third, or general department which takes up the general routine business in connection with the office itself, and with both of these great divisions of the empire. The formation, in brief, is as follows: The senior Under Secretary of State has been made the controller of the Dominions Department. Under him the junior assistant of the Colonial Department, Mr. Just, has been made secretary of the secretariat, and also permanent secretary of the Imperial Conference. The Imperial Conference will not have from session to session a new man and a man unknown to its work as its secretary. This then is, in brief the formation which has been made, and it has been in operation now for about a year and a half. I think it is well at the first to read the resolution which sets out the will or the wish of this conference with reference to its general constitution. The first resolution that was passed at the Imperial Conference of 1907 was this:

CONSTITUTION OF THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

That it will be to the advantage of the empire if a conference, to be called the Imperial Conference, is held every four years, at which questions of common interest may be discussed and considered as between His Majesty's government and his governments of the self-governing Dominions beyond the seas. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom wil be ex-officio President, and the Prime Ministers of the self-governing Dominions ex-officio members of the conference, The Secretary of State for the Colonies will be an ex-officio member of the conference and will take the chair in the absence of the president. He will arrange for such Imperial Conferences after communication with the Prime Ministers of the respective Dominions.

Such other Ministers as the respective governments may appoint will also be members of the Conference—it being understood that, except by special permission of the conference, each discussion will be conducted by not more than two representatives from each

government, and that each government will have only one vote.

That it is desirable to establish a system by which the several governments represented shall be kept informed during the periods between the Conferences in regard to matters which have been or may be subjects for discussion, by means of a permanent secretarial staff, charged, under the direction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with the duty of obtaining information for the use of the Conference of attending to its resolutions, and of conducting correspondence on matters relating to its affairs.

That upon matters of importance requiring consultation between two or more governments which cannot conveniently be postponed until the next Conference, or involving subjects of a minor character or such as call for detailed consideration, subsidiary Conferences should be held between representatives of the governments concerned specially chosen for the purpose.

The adoption of that resolution and the subsequent formation of the secretarial staff in connection with the Colonial Secretary's office marks a distinct advancement in the history of this, one of the great, and I believe destined to become one of the greatest institutions in connection with the empire. What then has been done since that formation based upon that resolution? I hold in my hand a report 'Dominions No. 2' of which I should like to see every member of this parliament and every public institution in this country have a copy. I repeat the suggestion I made a little while ago with reference to another document, that the Dominion government should order from the Home Office—if they do not see fit to undertake the publication here—at least 500 copies of that report, so that a copy of it may be in the hands of every member and Senator, and that a certain number of copies might be distributed to the universities and to our great public libraries. I do not think it would be wasting time to give a very slight digest of what is contained in 'Dominions No. 2.' In the first place it deals with the personnel of the governments of the different dominions, and gives short admirably done sketches containing a great deal of information as to the persons who constituted the governments of the dominions, during the period of history which the book records. After that come the conferences held during 1909 and 1910. The Imperial Conference about which discussion has already taken place in this House; the naval conference in reference to naval defence and a description of what was arrived at, at that conference, and acquiesced in by the dominions and the British government with regard to the defence of the empire by sea and by land. There is given a short sketch of the Imperial Press conference which, although not political, did during that year, and will for years to come as it meets from time to time, wield a very great influence in the empire looking towards the diffusion of information and of what we may call the spirit and essence of the empire—the better spirit and essence of the empire to which it will give interpretation. Then follows a report of the seventh session of the chambers of commerce of the empire held in far away Sydney, Australasia. After that come the reports of commissions and committees: The Shipping Rings commissions about which a great deal of interesting information is given; the copyright commission and what has eventuated from it; and the advisory committee of commercial intelligence which marks a step forward in the history of the trade and commerce of the empire. The British board of trade has appointed a commercial intelligence committee from amongst its members, together with a representative from each one of the outlying dominions in the person of the High Commissioner, and, the secretary of the Imperial Conference is a member of that committee. That intelligence committee has to do the work of scouting for the trade and commerce hosts of the empire; the gathering and collating of information, the making of suggestions which the board of trade may carry out or which may be carried out to a still larger extent by the members of the Imperial Conference in the various parts of the world. Then comes the history of the treaties of arbitration and the agreements with respect to the different parts of the empire. It is pleasing to note that as to arbitration treaties, in the year and a half which is treated of in this report, arbitration treaties have been arranged between Great Britain and Germany, and Norway, and Sweden, and Portugal, and Switzerland, by the extension for five years of previous arrangements It is instructive and a little flattering to see that in reference to commercial conventions and agreements the Dominion of Canada bulks up large in number. There are: the Franco-Canadian Commercial Convention, the agreement with reference to the abolishing of the surtax between Canada and Germany, the arrangement between Canada and the United States of 1910, the boundary waters treaty, the freshwaters fishery treaty, the delimitation of the frontier on Passamaquoddy Bay, the delimitation of the far western frontier between Canada and the United States, and the agreement for the Hague Tribunal arbitration. Outside of these there are but three conventions as between parts of the empire and foreign countries. The delimitation of the southern boundary of the British Empire in Walfisch bay; the delimitation in New Guinea between British and German territory, and the convention between Portugal as ruler in Mozambique and the Transvaal, in reference to certain difficulties which had arisen there.

Then comes a short history and a very valuable compendium of the principal legislation in all the outlaying parts of the empire, that were represented in the Imperial Conference. After that is given a very readable digest of the principal current progress for the year and a half in the British dominions, and what I think is particularly useful, (and I imagine this was placed in this report on the suggestion of the government of Newfoundland), the principal legislation of the different overseas dominions is set out in full. For instance in the case of Australia they give the Naval Bill and the Military Bill which provide for an absolute change in the basis, and methods of defence in Australia. Similar information is given with reference to Canada, industrial legislation, forestry legislation, all the principal items of legislation, all the principal items of legislation in all the dominions of the empire are collated and placed in this book. The whole report is of the utmost value in that it makes clear and patent and easily obtainable by every dominion the outstanding facts of the progress, development and legislation of every other member of the empire, so that we can turn from our own parish affairs, wide as our parish may be, into an atmosphere which broadens our view and enables us to see what the other members of the great British Empire are doing, the lines of their policy, and the methods by which they are working them out. This is all fruitful and suggestive information which may be availed of with mutual advantage. I, therefore, repeat my suggestion to the Prime Minister that a sufficient number of copies of that report, which will now be an annual report, should be obtained and distributed in the way I have suggested. It would be worth the expense, and I have no doubt the Prime Minister will take the matter into his favourable consideration.

I have brought this matter to the attention of the House to show that something has been done. The conference of 1907 met, conferred and parted; but matters did not stand still at the parting of that conference, something has been at work since along the lines which were laid down by that conference, steadily operating towards the embodiment and working out into the active policies of the different parts of the empire of the conclusions which were reached and embodied in the resolutions adopted. I wish to amplify that by a brief allusion to the different parts of the work which have been carried out by this secretariat since 1907. Twenty resolutions were passed by the conference of 1907. One resolution I have read to you. The second resolution had to do with the defence of the empire, and the third with the general staff service of the empire. These have been discussed in the House and I shall not allude to them further. Resolution No. 4 is an important resolution having to do with emigration. No hon. member in this House will object to the statement that the question of emigration or migration of populations within the empire itself is a most important one. Resolution No. 4 read:

> That it is desirable to encourage British emigrants to proceed to British colonies rather than foreign countries.
>
> That the Imperial government be requested to co-operate with any colonies desiring immigrants in assisting suitable persons to emigrate.

The Colonial Office note to that is as follows, and it is somewhat suggestive.

> The view taken respecting the subject matter of this resolution was that, in the absence of any request from one or other of the dominions for co-operation in a particular matter, the needs of the situation were, as stated by Colonel Seely in the House of Commons on 22nd June, sufficiently met by the Offices of the Self-Governing Dominions in the United Kingdom and by the Emigrants' Information Office, which affords full and trustworthy information to intending emigrants to the British Dominions.

No suggestion towards the embodiment of the principle of that resolution in a more active form was made by any of the overseas dominions, even by Canada where the subject is of the utmost importance, and, therefore, the British government rested upon the methods which were already at work, namely the immigration offices maintained by the different overseas dominions and the government emigrants' information office. The Colonial Office end their note with these words:

> The whole question is, however, again under consideration.

Evidently they were not satisfied with the view expressed in the first part of the note, and evidently greater interest has been taken as we quite know to be the case, therefore, the matter is now being again brought under full consideration, and I sincerely trust that the Imperial Conference which is shortly to assemble will not allow such an important question as that to any longer remain without further action and complete co-operation. Emigration or migration of population within the empire affords a wider and better opportunity for healthful and helpful co-operation between Great Britain and her colonies than any other matter of common policy between the different parts of the empire. Then resolution 5 had to do with judicial appeals. In regard to it draft rules for the colonial appeals were drawn by the British Office, and an Act merging these or empowering these was passed. So far as I can learn, while some of the outlying dominions have acquiesced in those rules, in the case of Australia,

there was some difficulty in the way, and in the case of Canada I am quite unable to make out what action was taken, and possibly no final action has been yet taken.

The next resolution is one of preferential trade, and I shall ask the House permission to read that because it is apropos at present as affirming the position taken in 1902. In fact that resolution is simply an affirmation of the proposition passed at the conference of 1902, and is as follows:

1. That this conference recognizes that the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and His Majesty's dominions beyond the seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse, and would, by promoting the development of the resources and industies of the several ports, strengthen the empire.

2. That this conference recognizes that, in the present circumstances of the colonies, it is not practicable to adopt a general system of free trade as between the mother country and the British dominions beyond the seas.

3. That with a view, however, to promoting the increase of trade within the empire, it is desirable that those colonies which have not already adopted such a policy should, as far as their circumstances permit, give substantial preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the United Kingdom.

4. That the prime ministers of the colonies respectfully urge on His Majesty's government the expediency of granting in the United Kingdom preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the colonies, either by the exemption from or reduction of duties now or hereafter imposed.

5. That the prime ministers present at the conference undertake to submit to their respective governments, at the earliest opportunity, the principle of the resolution, and to request them to undertake such measures as may be necessary to give effect to it.

I call attention to the fact that this was a complete affirmation of the ground taken in 1902 and for five years after. After a certain amount of experimental knowledge had been obtained, after colonial sentiment had been canvassed, these Dominions, assembled together, deliberately put their seal to that statement of principle with reference to preferential trade; and I call attention here to the fact that that was not a statement which called for any one-sided preferential trade, but affirmed that the overseas dominions considered it would be advisable for Great Britain herself to give a preference to overseas dominions in return for the preference they were giving her.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the number of that resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. Number 6. It points out the way in which that might be done—either by the exemption from or reduction of duties now or hereafter to be imposed. I do not propose to discuss that, but simply wish to put it on record.

Then resolutions 7 and 8 deal with commercial relations. I shall not read those. They are generally in favour of everything possible being done in order to extend commercial facilities between the different parts of the empire and the empire itself.

In connection with this I think that a step forward of great importance has been made in connection with the Commercial Intelligence Department. I told a moment ago that the British Board of Trade had an intelligence committee, and how it was constituted. That committee reported and recommended a certain course of action, and that action met with the approval of the Board of Trade and has been put into operation. It is this, that commercial commissioners shall be appointed by Great Britain, one for each of the outlying British Dominions, and that in connection with those commercial commissioners there shall also be travelling agents and stationary commercial correspondents for the different dominions. These have already been appointed. Mr. Richard Grigg has been appointed as the commercial agent or commissioner for Great Britain in the Dominion of Canada, and he has a staff which is being constantly enlarged, of correspondents in different parts of the Dominion with whom he keeps in touch, while he himself visits different localities. There are similar appointments in Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. So that we have had for a period of two years this new force at work, and very able, experienced and competent officers they all are. They have been selected because of their ability and experience. One has only to think of the operations of men of that kind, with their staffs in every part of the Dominion, to form an idea of the stimulating and developing power which this method of operating cannot fail to have upon the development and increase of trade within the empire itself.

The next resolution has reference to the coasting trade and navigation laws. Not very much has been done in that connection. I notice that Canada passed an order in council by which coasting privileges were to be taken away. I think, however, that since then that order in council has been withheld from operation. Whether it has now taken effect or not I do not know. But so far as my information goes, it is not yet operative in the whole and it may not be operative at all. However, at that time the Canadian government came to the conclusion that these coasting trade privileges should be abolished in the cases of countries not reciprocating and passed an order in council to that effect. Along with that there is a piece of information, which is no doubt known to the commercial world, and that is that the restrictive laws regarding passenger and freight car-

riage between the United States and Hawaii and the United States and the Philippines —which really had the effect of making those far distant dominions of the United States a part of the territory of the United States as regards the prohibition of foreign carrying trade privileges—were, as regards the Philippines, abolished conditionally and with reference to Hawaii a Bill was introduced for their abolition, but whether that Bill was carried into law I do not know.

Resolution 11 is an important resolution. It has to do with treaty obligations. What has resulted from it? The secretary has carried out the resolution of the Conference, the information has been gathered and published, and will be found in Cols. 3395 and 3396 of the British Reports and in a special volume which contains all the existing commercial treaties. So that we have now in succinct form all that there is obtainable regarding these treaties and preferential arrangements.

Resolutioin 13 is an important one. It refers to uniformity in trade marks, and the object was to have, throughout the empire, as far as it possibly could be done, uniform trade marks. If this could be brought about, of course, it would prevent a great deal of confusion and a great deal of imposition, and would lead to a clearer and more straightforward method of conducting commercial operations, and would tend to prevent impositions from foreign countries upon customers within the empire by the simulation or evasion of trade marks as they exist in British countries. Not very much was brought about in the matter. On March 5, 1909, the whole matter was laid before the overseas dominions. South Africa was favourable, Newfoundland was favourable, New Zealand was favourable, Australia does not seem to have taken much interest in the matter; and Canada came to the conclusion late in 1910 that there would be no advantage in discussing the matter. However, what the secretariat did was to put all this correspondence and all these answers into form and distribute them to the chief governments concerned, which at present have them under advisement.

Resolution 14 is an important one. It has reference to uniformity of trade statistics. Any one sees that that would be of very great advantage for purposes of comparison and of actual knowledge, if it could be brought about. What the British Board of Trade suggested was that there should be a common year—they recommended the calendar year—and that there should be as complete a statement as possible of the countries of origin and the countries of destination, so that the trade reports would really tell how and with whom business was carried on. To a certain extent, that is given now, but not to an extent which makes it actually reliable as to the whole facts of the case. They ask that there should be an amplification of the schedules of the tariffs, so that more definite and detailed information could be given. That was not a count against Canada so much, because the details in Canada's schedules are pretty extensive. With reference to some of the overseas dominions, however, that does not hold good. Another request was that the items should be grouped in at least three great groups—foods, raw materials of commerce, and manufactured goods—if four or more could not be had. Any one can see that if that could be brought about, both for purposes of comparison and for actual information, a great point would be gained. There is difficulty in adopting the calendar year. Australia, South Africa and New Zealand—or Newfoundland, I have forgotten which—have adopted the calendar year, while others have adopted a different fiscal year, and it is difficult and almost impossible to change. But the making of an abstract for the calendar year would not be impossible, and in that way the difficulty to that extent could be overcome. With reference to the groupings, that has been agreed to, and, in fact, the minute of the board of trade has been agreed to with the exceptions I have spoken of, the matter of the fiscal year. This latter, however, is not by any means the great objection, and it will be possible, if that is all, to get not only the groups arranged into what you may call natural divisions, but to get also the groupings of commerce with the United Kingdom, British possessions and foreign countries, which would be a great gain, and also the countries of origin and the countries of destination. To-day, the value of the Canadian statistics are lessened and the facts of the trade are not brought out because of the difficulty of indicating the port of destination. For example, many goods enter the United States though they are destined for Canada, and, therefore, are not clearly shown in our returns as to country of origin. In the same way many of our exports do not go out through Canadian ports and the country of destination is not shown. Thus, some of our trade to the West Indies, for instance, goes to the credit of the United States, and vice versa, I suppose. The House will see that great progress has been made by the Dominion's department in bringing that matter to the position in which it is left at the present time. Without wearying the House, I will just mention the other chief resolutions: Uniformity of company law, which has still some stages to go before a satisfactory solution is reached; reciprocity in the domain of Dominion land surveyors, which, I believe is to be settled, if settled it can be, at

a convention of land surveyors from all the different dominions, which is to meet in the autumn of this year in London; international penny postage, which is gradually moving on, and with reference to which the secretariat has brought out all details of the changes made since 1907, showing the gratifying progress that has been made in the direction of the final stage, which we hope will soon be reached, of complete international penny postage. Then, there is resolution No. 18, with reference to imperial cable communication, which is running along on the principle adopted before 1907, which principle the British government says has guided the policy since 1907. Resolution No. 19 deals with a very important question, that of naturalization. A committee of the imperial bodies, the Home Office, the Foreign Office, the India Office and the Colonial Office, with a secretary, was appointed, and has been at work upon this question of naturalization. A memorandum of the naturalization laws of all the dominions has been prepared and has been sent out to the different governments for their consideration, and a draft Bill has been prepared. This draft Bill and the information which has been collated will be the subject of discussion at the Imperial Conference, which is soon to meet. Then there is the development of communication within the empire, covered by resolution 20. That has been sent to a committee of His Majesty's ministers and is now under consideration. Nothing has been done which is recorded, at least.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you see that the conference, which met in 1907, left behind it the record of its work in the shape of twenty matured resolutions. The working body, so to speak, of that Imperial Conference immediately took up that work which was left, and I must say with commendable promptness and assiduity. Most of the communications began early in 1907, showing that no time was lost in the secretariat in getting hold of these resolutions and pushing them forward into embodiment, and getting information upon them, and in all points urging them forward with all possible speed. Of these twenty resolutions a large number have actually solidified into a permanent policy and operation. When the Imperial Conference meets again it may have something to do with amendments, with re-touching these great questions, in so far as improvements can be made, but with many of them they will have seen the results of their work being actually enjoyed by the empire and the dominions. Others are left over, but with a wealth of information accumulated, printed, all ready in the hands of the ministers from the different overseas dominions, ready for their discussion, and for their decision when they come to the next imperial conference. So much now with reference to the history. It is enough to make us feel grateful that a step was taken in 1907 for permanence and for this actual mechanism of operation and fulfilment. It goes to clinch the statement I made that we have here an institution which has not only come into existence, but which has more than justified its existence, and which justifies to-day our faith in its permanence and in its further evolution.

Now I must relieve the picture a little by some criticism of the Canadian government, given because I think it is proper, and because it may have the effect of preventing laxness in the future. Whilst it is noteworthy that the secretariat jumped at its work, and put its work through, and pressed it to a conclusion with commendable zeal and promptitude, it is quite the opposite with reference to the Dominion government in its dealings with the secretariat. I am sorry to say that the Diminion government has been the most lax of any, the most dilatory, going so far almost as to show an indifference to the work of the very secretariat to which it gave birth. Now I am sure that we must not attach the latter meaning; therefore, we must criticise the laxness and lack of promptness which has characterized the way in which the Dominion government has dealt with these matters. Let me give some particulars. The organization of the secretariat itself was a most important thing, as to the plans for organization, as for its consideration, and as to suggestions. I find Canada was asked on September 21, 1907. Time went on, until May 15, 1908, no reply having been given, a reply was asked. It went on till August 18, 1908, and no reply being forthcoming, again a reply was asked, and up to the present time no reply has been given. So that with reference to the secretariat itself, our government is in the position of having actually neglected to answer the representations of the secretariat with reference to its own organization. Whilst every other one of the dominions was prompt with its commendations and its suggestions, the Dominion government, for some reason or other, was dilatory, and actually did not reply to the communications. Then with regard to judicial appeals; the matter was placed before this government August 29, 1908; February 3, 1909, as no reply was given, a reply was asked; March 5, 1909, as no reply was given it was asked again, and up to this date no reply has been made with reference to that, so far as the books show. With regard to uniformity in trade marks, on March 5, 1909, the subject was brought to the attention of this government; March 1, 1910, nearly one year after, no reply having been given, they were asked again, and so far as we

find in these reports, no reply has been given to this date. With reference to uniformity in trade statistics; on July 30, 1907, the matter was placed before the government; December 14, 1908, no reply; a summary was sent to it of the replies of the other governments, and the attention of Canada was asked to it. Time went on till January 19, 1909, and then the answer was in the negative. On March 3, 1909, they were asked to review their answer, and on April 19, 1909, they did review their answer, and they came to the requirements of the board of trade, giving their adhesion to the proposals of that board. With reference to the uniformity of company laws, on July 31, 1907, a memorandum from the imperial government was sent, with a desire for consideration and reply. February 26, 1908, no reply; a reply was asked; April 21, 1908, no reply still, a reply was asked, and it was given out then that the question had been sent to the provincial governments, which ought to have been done nearly a year before. There again was a delay. With regard to surveyors' reciprocity, the same remark may be made. The matter was brought to the attention of the government April 8, 1908; on October 20, 1908, they were asked for a reply, and it was not until March 4, 1909, that they sent a reply in answer to the first request. With reference to naturalization, on November 9, 1908, the matter was sent to them with a draft Bill, and they were asked for suggestions. On June 17, 1910, no reply, a reply was asked, and up to the present no answer has been given. With reference to marriage facilities, on June 20, 1907, the matter was sent to all the different governments, with a memorandum of the Registrar General and a draft Bill in order to obtain the views of the provincial governments. Well, that went on until September 29, 1908, but no answers were sent, several reminders having been given to the government.

Now that is the criticism I have to make, I think it is a fair criticism with reference to this matter. Considering its importance, and considering the importance of Canada in the conference, it would have been only courteous and right for the government to have been more prompt in its dealings with the correspondence. Now that we have a Minister of External Affairs, there ought to be the utmost promptitude in dealing with those matters. The very reason why the secretariat was demanded by all the dominions was because of the delays in the roundabout methods of communication, and the consequent disheartening that grew up as a result. It is quite too bad, then, that, under the new order of things which was to remedy that, we find one of the principal members lagging behind, dilatory, lax, almost indifferent in the matter of this correspondence. I hope my right hon. friend will not think that I have been too severe in that criticism. I quite know that, the matter having now been mentioned, more care will be taken in the future. That is business sense as well as a proper official treatment.

Now, for one moment, we come to the conference of 1911, and again my remarks will partake of the nature of criticism. Of course, one of the things which was urged with regard to the Imperial Conference was first, that it should be a stated convention every four years. If it was fixed the dominions would look forward to it, they would prepare for it, they would take measures to make it effective. Then, it having once been established, the next thing to do was to select the great questions which were to form the subjects of discussion and in order to get them the secretariat goes to work and corresponds with every one of the outlying dominions, asks each one to make its deliberations, to suggest its questions and therefore help in the formation of the agenda, which could then be sent to each of the dominions in good time before the next Imperial Conference was convened with the information gathered by the secretariat, which alone made it useful, in order that these proposed resolutions might be placed in the hands of the overseas dominions. What was necessary? Why, that these questions should be submitted as quickly as possible in order that the secretariat might gather as quickly as possible the information which was necessary, print that information and distribute it so that the different overseas dominions might have ample opportunity and time to discuss these things among themselves and to come to conclusions as to what would be their policy in reference to these matters. What happens in the case of Canada? On February 12, 1909, in good time, the British government asks for the suggestions that each of the dominions had to make, but no answer comes from Canada. Again, on February 12, 1910, Canada was asked, again on March 9, 1910, again on December 19, 1910. Not until January 30, 1911, was any notice taken of the request and on January 11, the answer came from this Dominion of Canada, the leader, the doyen of the states which make up the Imperial Conference outside of the mother country, that it had nothing to suggest. Well, cannot any one see what kind of a wet blanket that would be in any business, in any enterprise, and what kind of a wet blanket it must be in a matter of this kind? Is it possible, with the foremost overseas dominion, with the great, the mighty questions which are existent to-day within herself and between herself and outside countries, and countries within

the empire, that there was no moving desire, no prompting of spirit, no impulse at all towards helping along the empire's council and conference by this its greatest representative and exponent and that there was nothing at all to propose from the Dominion of Canada? It would almost seem as though every other member would say: Why, the principal boy in the play has refused to play any longer and the game is not worth very much. In the national, in the imperial sense, it would be almost tantamount to saying that Canada has lost her interest. She is the leading one of the dominions; will it amount to much if there is no more interest than that in the leading overseas dominion? So, I think it was a great mistake in the line that I have just been tracing, that the Dominion of Canada made no suggestions, proposed no resolutions and at the last, just before the time of calling the conference, gave the curt reply that they had nothing to propose but would be ready to discuss anything which was brought before the conference. I am free to say that I think a different course might have been taken which would have been more conducive to the interest and success of the conference.

Well, if Canada took no part, the other overseas dominions, South Africa, New Zealand and Australia, were promptly to the front and well to the front. It almost astonishes one to note the vigour, the enthusiasm, the quick impulse with which these other overseas dominions leap into the arena. They are full of suggestions because they are full of the spirit of the Imperial Conference and they give their suggestions. They are not the suggestions of children. I have not time to read over everything which was proposed, but the secretariat in connection with the British government has sifted them out somewhat, and here are the principal ones, which, laying aside those for subsidiary conference and other methods of getting at conclusions, are set down as remaining for the full conference. Just listen to them, Mr. Speaker:

Merchant shipping and navigation laws.

An immense subject.

Cheaper cable rates.

Important to Canada and applying to cables connecting every part of the empire.

The All-Red route.

About which the right hon. Prime Minister was so full of enthusiasm three years ago, and is, I hope, to this day.

The Imperial Court of Appeal, State owned Atlantic cable and telegraph line across Canada; the reconstruction of the Colonial Office, Imperial representation and publicity of proceedings.

Those have reference to the Imperial Conference itself.

State-owned British wireless telegraph stations; double taxation, and stamp duties on colonial bonds; commercial co-operation for the encouragement of British manufacturers and shipping; the declaration of London.

Which vitally affects all food-producing countries in connection with the empire.

Emigration and the position of labour exchanges.

Than which, as I said before, there is no more practical question for the intensest and completest co-operation between the outside dominions and Great Britain itself.

Currency and coinage; co-operation between the naval and military forces of the empire, and the status of the Dominion navies; the position of British Indians in the Dominions.

Outside of those there are others which are mentioned to follow when these shall have been exhausted or taken up and dealt with in so far as the conference goes.

Now, we often hear it said that you must not have any sordid side to your union within the empire; you must not as it were villify it—using that term in its proper meaning—by having reference to matters of dollars and cents, of pounds and pence. And yet, every line of this agenda which is the product of the empire breathes the spirit of trade and commerce and material development. Sentiment or loyalty refined and sublimated and powerful as it may be, takes a place proper for itself but cannot crowd out and has not crowded out those daily business considerations which lie at the heart of the welfare of the humblest individual as at the heart of the highest interest of the nation and the empire. That agenda is a complete refutation of the apt and pat and oft-repeated saying that you cannot bind an empire or a people together by sordid considerations of dollars and cents, i.e. of business and trade. There is a nobility to business and trade as there is its own nobility to patriotism and loyalty; there is a nexus in trade and commerce as powerful and as well diffused as is the nexus supplied by sentiment of birth, of blood, and of nationality, and the nation which forgets either of them forgets one of the prime sources of its power. The nation which joins both is the nation which is the wiser in its plans and which will be the stronger in its ultimate development and progress. There is one sentiment in one of the reports from Australasia over the signature of Mr. Deakin—who I am sorry will not be a member of the coming conference, though in saying that I am not at all derogating from the excellence and worth of the Australian premier who will take his place—and that is that all these matters that he has been treating of in the despatch have in view the keeping of

the parts of the empire 'within touch of each other.' That is a sentence I would like to keep in my own mind and leave in the mind of every citizen of the empire. That is a vital point; it is an affirmation of the centripetal principle; the power of attraction which is as wide as the universe and as strong and as enduring. That is the one aim, the one purpose. No method is good unless it has that idea as the objective point; the keeping in close touch the different parts of the empire. How is this to be brought about? Centrifugal forces there will be and disintegrating forces there will be. There are influences which tend to force us away from the proper unity of the nation and the proper unity of the empire; there are outside attractive forces which tend to draw us away from the national and the imperial ideal. We must fight against these by strengthening the cohesive powers of the nation and the empire, by feeding them with the vital essence from day to day and making them great and powerful to counteract the forces which are drawing us towards dispersion and disintegration. How are you to keep the empire within touch? By, in my opinion, three great instrumentalities will you keep them in touch: First by personality. In the individual life we know what personality means. Two people may correspond over leagues of sea and miles of territory and may be fairly well acquainted with each other but it is not until they touch hands and look into each other's faces and read each other's souls that the strong bonds of union and friendship are forged which become permanent and indissoluble. The very same principle holds with reference to nations and to empires; and, until these Imperial Conferences swept aside to a certain measure the methods of correspondence over thousands of miles of space, and brought the governing men of the empire where they touched hands and looked into each other's faces and read each other's thoughts and hearts; not until then were the strongest bonds of empire forged. Personality between two individuals is strong and powerful, but personality between two individuals who take upon them representative functions is as much greater as is the strength and power of the functions they have taken upon themselves to discharge. And so you put men in official capacities as leaders of the empire—with all the weight of empire and the responsibility of empire upon them—you put them in personal contact with each other and you have a personal bond infinitely stronger than the bonds between individuals. And, that personal contact brought about in the Imperial Conference has done more and is doing more to weld the empire together than probably any other force we know of. Besides the personal power there is conference. What is conference? It is the equalization of facts and information. You in Australasia know the facts of your portion of the empire; you are daily face to face with them, you understand them, you go to the imperial conference and you meet there representatives from every other part of the dominions who are faced by the same facts at their own national hearth fires. These different bases of information are made common, the information is equalized and it becomes the portion of the whole empire and is no longer peculiar to any one part of the empire. Equalization of facts, equalization of aims, equalization of methods; you have to join your facts together and adopt methods to bring out of the facts the achievement of the aims; and so by these facts, and methods, and aims joined in conference, and the conclusions you come to, there is the second great element of force and of power towards a united empire. You have all that and you have not gone far unless you take the final step. You have the personal contact and the fire and spirit that is born with it, the conference and its equalization of facts, of aims, and of methods, but you must also have the third element, and that is co-operation. That co-operation is the final step and the crowning glory of that piece of machinery, shall I call it, that admirable mechanism which we to-day call the Imperial Conference. And what are these lines of co-operation? In regard to communication you have postal, telegraph and steam communications. The greatest anti-imperialist that ever stood on shoeleather could find no fault if all parts of these dominions of the empire, should co-operate on the line of better postal facilities, better telegraph facilities and better steam communication. Then there is co-operation on lines of trade, inter-imperial trade and foreign trade, and the attitude that is to be assumed towards both. No one will deny that, other things being equal, it is to the advantage of the empire that the greatest amount of trade should be done within itself and that while that trade is being done the greatest amount of favour should be given to those within the empire as compared with those without the empire.

Then there is co-operation on lines of development and progress, the migration of capital, the migration of population and the exchange of social and moral uplift. Capital, deride it as we may, love it as we all do, make a political hobby horse of it as many of us are inclined to do, is essential to all development and all progress and between the old country and the new, all the advantage of the capital accumulated in the

old goes to the new which has resources undeveloped, and capabilities rich in possibility and rich in final results. With migration of population there is a double advantage. We have the old country pent up with its teeming millions with scant means of obtaining a livelihood, little breadth of atmosphere and little prospect for the future. They can come from that country to our great manless regions with lands everywhere asking for labour and for population. Therefore the benefit is twofold, but the greatest benefit comes to the new and young country in man power sent to our manless regions develop the prairie, producing nothing, into the rich grain fields and the rich farm lands which are to become the sources of great wealth. Thus in the migration of capital and in the migration of population and in the more elusive but most beneficial migration of social and moral forces which comes from the old to the new and runs back again from the new to the old, uplifting and strengthening, yes and beautifying both countries—in these three lines co-operation will bring about wonders that disunited effort will never see accomplished.

Then there is defence. You may be a peace man or you may be a jingo, whichever you like, it does not alter the fact that in this world of ours at present, and for a great many years to come, so far as we can see, the country which omits to defend itself is a country which stakes its fortunes on chance and neglects to do its duty by its people and by its resources. What kind of defence shall we have? That which combines the greatest economy with the greatest security—and on the line of co-operation surely we find that. With Great Britain and her mightiest navy of the world and these outlying divisions of the empire, all to be defended and protected, where do we get the maximum of security with the minimum of expense, that is the maximum both of economy and security? Along co-operative lines, there is no other possible answer.

Then lastly there is co-operation along the line of organization. If to-day the British empire needs one thing more than another, it is organization, the co-ordinating of all its mightiest elements of power and progress in business-like common sense and effective organization. That is a problem now and maybe for years to come; that problem can never be solved unless it is solved by the concurrence of the overseas dominions and of the mother country itself. To that end these two must unite their councils and their efforts. Heretofore the mother country has been all predominant. Fifty years hence the outlying dominions will come to be equally dominant and one hundred years from now, with all circumstances favouring, the empire outside of the British islands will be the larger, the richer and the more important half. Here again, in the organization and co-operation of all our forces working together, we strike the line of ultimate success. To-day, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to point out to me one single institution in which this work can be carried out? In your British parliament? No, Sir, clogged, often submerged, with parish and petty business, rent and torn with party local factions as it is, the great matters of empire are shoved into the background and get but little of the calm and weighty consideration that should be given to them. In any one of the Dominion's parliaments? No, they lack the power and they lack the scope. There in your Imperial conference you have the representation and the only present representation of empire, you have an actual representation of empire, because it is constituted of the big governing forces of the empire by the will of the people in every part of the empire, and you have that collection of forces which, though it cannot pass an edict and cannot enact a law, can yet come to conclusions which the executive power of the empire, in each different part of it absolutely free in itself, can carry into actual embodiment and make strong and effective in the councils and in the work of empire. I make no apology for drawing the attention of the House to the Imperial Conference, to the work it has done, and work it is destined to do; but I would ask every man who follows these matters to remember that there does stand within the empire one organization as free and as untrammelled as it is possible to be, and yet with a power of executive action distributed throughout its different parts which is possessed by no other body within the empire or within the wide world.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) opened his remarks by telling the House that some 18 months ago he had, in a speech delivered in this Chamber, traced the history of what is now known as the Imperial Conference from its commencement to the stage it has now reached. The speech my hon. friend delivered on that occasion was very able, lucid and clear, and at the same time very impartial; and I can, with a very sound conscience, pay the same compliment to him for the speech he has just delivered.

With the criticisms on the government, in which my hon. friend indulged, I have no fault to find. They were temperate, and I hope I shall be able to answer them at the proper time. He called the attention of the House to the fact that after the conference had been organized in 1907, as it now exists, a line of cleavage arose in its

ranks as to the manner in which the work to be performed by it should be carried out between each meeting. The conference is composed of the imperial government, and also of the overseas dominions governments. It is a conference in a sense between equal and equal. While the dominions governments are not equal to the British government in a certain sense, still, for the purposes of the conference, they were placed entirely on the same footing. A line of cleavage arose as to the manner in which the work prepared by the conference to be distributed among the different dominions should be carried out. Two propositions were submitted at the time. It was proposed that there should be an independent secretariat organized to deal permanently with the work of collating information, attending to the resolutions, engaging in correspondence, and acting generally as the secretary of the conference which was to meet four years hence.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the presidency of the British Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and I may say that this idea was proposed, if I remember rightly, by Dr. Jameson, of the Cape. One of its chief advocates was a man of great ability, but who, I am afraid, will not be present at the next conference. I refer to Mr. Deakin, then Prime Minister of Australia. In the course of political events Mr. Deakin has lost power, and his party has been replaced by its opponents. His successor is a gentleman who has proved himself an able man also, and will no doubt be a worthy successor to Mr. Deakin in that respect, but personally I regret exceedingly that Mr. Deakin will not be present. I had hoped that he would come to the coronation as member of the contingent from Australia, but I find, from the list come to me, that he is not to be there. Not that I share his views in everything; on the contrary, in some things I differ with him widely, but I say without hesitation that although my views clash with his, he is a man of great ability, and his presence at the conference would certainly have been a great addition. He took the view that it would be advisable to have what is termed by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) an independent secretariat. Some other gentlemen, and myself did not share that view. We thought it would not be consistent with our system of responsible government to have at London an independent secretariat. Though nominally under the supervision of the Prime Minister of England, still in many ways it would be independent, and not in full accordance with our constitution. We were prepared, however, to have a secretariat which would be under the direct supervision of the governments responsible. That view was entertained, and a secretariat was appointed. It has been in operation some three years or more, and has done very effective work. I do not think, so far as I can learn from the events, that there is any reason to regret the step taken, or that any mistake has been made in that regard.

The chief criticism offered against the government by my hon. friend is that we have not been as prompt as we might have been. Possibly that may be the case, but we have not been at all idle, and we have had to deal with very important questions. But to come to the more important criticism made by my hon. friend, that in the preparation of the work which is to be dealt with by the conference which is to meet in May next, the government of Canada has offered no suggestion, and has appeared indifferent to the work itself, I may reply that if we have offered no new matter, it is simply because we are of the opinion that there is sufficient left of the work of the late conference to keep the new one busy for the time it must sit.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it correct that the business left over from the former conference will come up of necessity, without being the subject of any agenda being sent in by any of the dominions across the seas, or by the British government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the work which has not been disposed of must of necessity come up again for discussion. Take for instance the matter of defence. That was dealt with at the conference of 1907, and was discussed in the conference of 1909, and no doubt will be a subject for discussion at every conference. At the conference of 1909 the subject of defence was especially dealt with, but no one supposed that it was then exhausted, and that nothing more was to be said about it. On the contrary it is one which I am sure must come up again for discussion.

Then take the trade question. That is in the same position to-day as in 1902. In 1907 the conference discussed that question, but proposed no new resolution. It was content on that occasion to take up the resolution of 1902. It so happened that in 1902 the trade resolution which was adopted did not meet the views of the British government of that day. The conference of 1907 reaffirmed that resolution. But it does not follow that the trade question is exhausted, and that there is nothing more to be said about it. On the contrary it is a permanent question which must come up for discussion at every conference. I might call attention to this resolution which was passed in 1902, and which was readopted in 1907. It states, amongst other things, that it is not possible to have a universal system of free trade between the

dominions overseas and the mother country. I suppose that everybody agrees that it is not possible to have such a system of free trade. But I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, that would be the ideal condition for the British Empire. That is only my own opinion, which, however, I think is based on good reasons which must appeal to every man who gives attention to the matter. But we know that, under present conditions, it is not possible of immediate realization. Does it follow, then, that the discussion of it must be abandoned? Is it not a fact, on the contrary, that this question must come up again and again? It must come before the pending conference. I do not assume that it will be settled then, and I am sure it must come up for still further discussion later on. That is the reason we had no more subjects to suggest to the conference——

Mr. LENNOX. If the Prime Minister will allow me, perhaps I can make myself clear. I understood that the dominions beyond the seas were to send in suggestions of subjects for discussion, and that out of these the authorities in Great Britain would select and arrange such matters as were of immediate importance to form the primary basis of discussion, and that this again would be submitted to the dominions overseas. As I understood it, matters discussed at previous conferences would not come up unless they were submitted for the agenda by some of the dominions overseas.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) will look at the agenda of the last conference and at the work performed, he will find that the conference took up not only matters that were on the agenda, but other matters as well. I am prepared to believe, with him, that the first questions taken up will be those on the agenda, but it does not follow that the business of the conference will be confined to these matters. It goes without saying that many matters may be brought up which are not on the agenda, and that resolutions which engaged the attention of the last conference will come up for further discussion. Take, for instance, the question of migration. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) referred to that at some length and spoke of it as an important question. I agree with him in that. That must come up for discussion. A resolution was passed which, it was thought, would cover the whole ground. But, in practice, difficulties have arisen which were not anticipated, and which must be the subject of further discussion. I agree that there is no better immigration into Canada than that from the British islands, not only because the people are the kith and kin of the great majority of the people of the

Dominion, but because they are a wealthy class, and are excellent citizens and good workers. But it happens that in the immigration we had three or four years ago there were elements which were not of this character, and as to which we have to take strong action. There is this line of cleavage which has come in the immigration from the British islands, some of which is eminently desirable, some not so desirable, and some distinctly undesirable. We have to discuss the matter in all its bearings, and, if possible, come to some conclusion on the subject. This will be one of the most important subjects of debate.

Another question brought up by the Canadian government and which was not on the agenda of the last conference, was that of the All-Red route. We had not put it on the programme, not because we have abandoned it, but because we have not been able to make the progress we had hoped to make on the question. So far as the Atlantic is concerned, the difficulties of carrying out the project are not very great, and it seems to me that I see daylight on that side, and that perhaps we may have a fast Atlantic service of a first-class character between Canada and the United Kingdom before many years are over. The great difficulty is the Pacific, the difficulty being to meet the views of both Australia and New Zealand. So far we have not been able to find a way.

Another subject as to which we have expressed our view is that of naturalization. We have stated that we have nothing to suggest, but we are prepared to discuss everything offered by the conference, drawing special attention to the subject of naturalization. I regard this subject as one of the greatest importance. A Bill has been prepared, as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). This Bill we do not either approve or disapprove—we leave it for discussion. But the state of things in relation to naturalization as the result of our laws on the subject and the laws of the United Kingdom on the subject cannot be allowed to continue, but must engage the attention of the imperial as well as the Canadian authorities. We intend to make it a strong point with the British authorities to have at once uniform laws. We are absorbing from the British islands and other countries from two hundred thousand to three hundred thousand new citizens every year. Those that come from the British islands, of course, remain British subjects. Those who come from other countries may become British subjects after a period of probation which is fixed by our laws at three years. But they become British subjects only so far as Canada is concerned. A man coming from Germany to Canada, and, after three years, naturalized under our laws, would be a British subject, but only while he was

in Canada. The moment he went out of Canada, he would be no longer a British subject, but a German. That is a most undesirable condition of things. Our naturalization laws have been sufficient up to the present time, but they are not adequate for the new condition of things that has arisen. It is our purpose to call the attention of the British authorities and our fellow-citizens beyond the seas who are equally interested with ourselves to this question. It is a question full of difficulty as I know, for I have discussed it with many persons in different parts of the empire. But if there is a subject on which we ought to have uniform laws, it is this very subject of naturalization. Therefore, it is that we do not think it advisable to present more subjects for consideration than are already pending and will be suggested from other quarters. If we have refrained from offering subjects for discussion, it is not from indifference or want of appreciation of the value of the conference, but because we think quite enough work has been cut out to keep the conference busy for the month or five weeks which is the most that many of us can be expected to give.

I am glad, however, to agree with my hon friend as to the importance of the conference. It is not an elective body it is not a legislative body, it is simply an advisory body; but so far as it goes, it has done excellent work, and is destined I think to do better work in the future. It is certainly drawing together all the different parts of the empire, so far apart geographically, so far apart in interests, and so far apart in many other considerations, but which have been brought together every four years, realizing to a large extent the suggestions which have been made by my hon. friend as to the advantage of personal contact and personal confidence. As to the remarks of my hon. friend in reference to co-operation, I think we have gone perhaps as far as it is possible to go at this moment. My hon. friend indulges in a vision which certainly was very eloquently presented, which is very grand in itself, but as to which I am not prepared to offer an opinion. I think we all agree that British history shows that British communities are slow to move. It is characteristic of the British mind and institutions, that British communities never move fast, are never carried away by sentiment, but move step by step, only as the need of change becomes manifest and becomes imperative. Whatever may take place in the future, we may expect to go on step by step in the line of doing the best we can for the moment, for better trade relations, and for the upbuilding of the British Empire which, embracing all the British communities in the world, must tend to the realization of what my hon. friend has in his heart, as it is in mine, the universal peace of the world. If we had a consolidated British Empire, so far as the common interests of British communities will draw them together, certainly we should have a most powerful factor for the benefit not only of the people most nearly interested, but also for the human race.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I am sorry that I cannot agree with the Prime Minister in the position which he takes to-day as to the justification of the government in the attitude they took with regard to the communication of their views for discussion at the approaching conference. As the Prime Minister puts it to-day, if it were in accordance with the actual conditions there would be no great ground for complaint. But I venture to say, with all deference to the Prime Minister, that the assumption he makes that these matters of vital importance that are to come up for discussion at the Imperial Conference would come up without any agenda being put in by any of the self-governing dominions, or by the home government, is not correct. On the 19th of December, 1910, after many previous communications, the Secretary of State communicated with Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Newfoundland—sent a telegram requesting them to send in a synopsis of the matters they proposed for discussion; pointing out that it was important to have the matter arranged as early as possible, so as to select the more important subjects for discussion. It is quite clear therefore that what will form the basis of discussion will not be what remained over from the previous conference, but a selection of the most important subjects presented in the various agenda sent in by these dominions. This was not complied with by some of the over-seas dominions. On November 16, Newfoundland had sent in a statement of subjects for discussion; on November 29 New Zealand sent in their agenda by telegram, deeming it to be a matter of considerable urgency. Then the next step in the transaction was on the 19th of December, when this dispatch I have referred to was sent out to Canada and some of the other dominions. On the 24th of December following, Australia, by telegram, sent in its agenda, and on the 9th of January following Australia supplemented that. On the 20th of January, the secretariat, I presume, communicated to Canada, Australia, South Africa, Newfoundland and New Zealand their suggestions of subjects which should be taken up, and the order in which they should be discussed. But not until the 30th of January, 1911, was there any communication from Canada. Now, coming back to what the Prime Minister says, because this is a matter of great

importance, I would like to say a few words to establish clearly that the Prime Minister and the government of Canada have no right to understand that any important subject will be taken up unless it is contained in an agenda sent in by one of the over-seas dominions, or is contained in an agenda of the conference, formed from all these by the secretariat. On the 20th of January, Lord Harcourt communicated with the various dominions, including Canada, and says:

In my dispatches of the 1st, 15th and 29th of December, and 16th January, I submitted to Your Excellency for communication to your ministers, copies of the resolution to be submitted by the government of the Commonwealth of Australia, the dominion of New Zealand and the colony of Newfoundland at the forthcoming Imperial Conference of 1911. Prints of these resolutions are appended to this dispatch. I have received no information as to the proposals of the Dominion of Canada or the union of South Africa——

He then says:

2. As at present advised, His Majesty's government propose to suggest for discussion at the conference the following subjects:

His Majesty's government considered that, as regards the subjects which can be taken up at this conference, they would have to submit the subjects which would form the basis of discussion, and His Majesty's government proposed to have discussed:

The position of British Indians in the dominions; Labour exchanges in relation to the dominions; Uniform design for stamps; The arrangements for expulsion of undesirable aliens.

Then, after some further remarks which I need not read, this point is made:

5. The principle laid down by Lord Elgin in his dispatch of 4th of January, 1907, was to give preference to subjects proposed by the dominions and to rank such subjects according to the number of dominions proposing them, regard of course being had to the intrinsic importance of the subjects and to the possibility of arriving at a definite result by discussion. I apprehend that these principles may again be followed with advantage; and accordingly the subjects put forward by the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and Newfoundland may be taken provisionally as the basis for the agenda.

In other words, if these dominions across the seas had not sent in any agenda there would be nothing for discussion. It might be then that, like the great quantity of fishes left over in the miracle of the loaves and fishes, the conference might take up what was left over from the previous conference. But there was no basis for discussion unless these subjects were sent in, and certainly those sent in would have precedence.

Proceeding the despatch reads:

6. Two dominions propose what are either the same subject or branches of the same subject, viz.: (a) merchant shipping and navigation laws.

That is New Zealand and Australia.

All-Red route.

Proposed by New Zealand and Newfoundland.

Uniformity of various laws New Zealand and Australia; State-owned Atlantic cable, New Zealand and Australia; reciprocal legislation as regards conspiracy, Australia, and as regards destitute persons, New Zealand.

After having pointed out that those subjects which are proposed by two or more dominions have precedence as subjects for discussion he continues, and gives the subjects that are proposed by New Zealand, and by Australia. Then, pointing out what shall have precedence, Lord Harcourt says:

There would remain for the consideration of the full conference the following matters:
Merchant shipping and navigation laws;
Cheaper cable rates;
All-Red route;
Imperial Court of Appeals, &c., &c.

And having pointed out that it is not necessary that certain subjects should be discussed by the conference, but may be relegated to certain sub-committees, he says:

The subjects above set forth as a basis for agenda of the conference are of varying importance, but it seems clear that there must come first the question of the publicity of the proceedings of the conference and the resolutions of New Zealand on the subject of Imperial representation, the reconstruction of the colonial office, and the interchange of civil servants, which have relation to the constitution of the conference itself. There must follow the subject proposed by two dominions, namely:

This is the order he says the discussion is to take, and if any subject has not been proposed it is not on the agenda at all, it is not a subject for discussion, and had it not been that some of the other overseas dominions have been more alert than the government of Canada we would not have had any of these important subjects coming before the Imperial Conference. The proposition made by Lord Harcourt is pretty narrow. He says:

There must follow the subjects proposed by two dominions namely:—merchant shipping and navigation laws; the All-Red route; the Imperial Court of Appeal; the State-owned Atlantic cable and line across Canada.

So that the order of precedence which shall be followed is laid down in this state-

ment submitted on the 20th January to the overseas dominions as the agenda which will govern the various agenda sent in. Then the government are in this position. When they passed their order in council on the 16th January, 1911, and announced that they had nothing to propose, they left it absolutely to chance, or they left it absolutely to others, what should form the subjects of discussion at this most important conference of the British Empire. This is so abundantly clear from the wording of the order in council itself:

> The minister states that, in so far as Canada is concerned, Your Excellency's advisers do not consider that there are any questions of sufficient urgency to call for suggestions on their part as to what should form the subject of the deliberations of the approaching conference. They content themselves by saying that they will be prepared to take part in the discussion of whatever subjects may be proposed for consideration by His Majesty's government or by those of the other self-governing dominions.

Is that what the first minister understood at the time? Did he understand, as he says to-day, that he thought that all the important subjects that were left over at the last conference would of necessity, or as a matter of course, come up for discussion? I venture to say that when the order in council was passed no such understanding existed, and I venture to say also, as a matter of fact, and as a matter of common sense, that no such thing would happen, and that we would have no discussion of these important matters, such as imperial preferential trade or naturalization, which the Prime Minister thinks important now, but for the fact that some of the overseas dominions have been more alert, more alive to the importance of bringing these matters before the united wisdom of the whole empire at the Imperial Conference than were my hon. friends of the cabinet of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Naturalization was left out.

Mr. LENNOX. Naturalization was left out of the discussion and naturalization was one of the subjects suggested by Australia. But, as a matter of fact, if more dominions had united on any one subject, if the Dominion of Canada had added its request to have certain important subjects brought up for discussion, the fact that there were three dominions making the request instead of only two or one would probably have turned the scale and brought some of these important questions to the front which will not be to the front on this occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. Naturalization is not in Australia's list on page 11.

Mr. LENNOX. It is on page 9.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not included in the list on page 11.

Mr. LENNOX. No, it is not taken up by the home authorities. It is not made a subject of discussion, but Australia by its agenda asks that it shall be made a subject of discussion. If the Dominion of Canada had sent in an agenda asking that it should be made a subject of discussion it probably would have been, because, acting upon the principle set out in the despatch of the 20th, if it had the endorsation of two dominions, it would come to the front. But, it absolutely will not come to the front, I can tell the Prime Minister, it will not come up for discussion under the conditions which exist and for which I, with very great regret, must say that I have to hold the Prime Minister and the cabinet responsible.

I have not sufficient presumption to think I can add much after my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has spoken, but there are one or two points I would like to refer to, and one is in reference to a matter that assumes a new form since the last conference, and which was not the subject of any previous conference in so far as I know, and that is the Declaration of London. Throughout the whole British Empire the commercial world is on the alert on the question of the Declaration of London, and perhaps I am stating it too narrowly and should say that the whole industrial world within the British Empire is affected and intimately affected by the Declaration of London. The result is that in every city in Canada, boards of trade and those having regard for the conditions of commerce are on the alert in reference to this matter. The Prime Minister knew that this matter had assumed definite form since the last conference. He knew or should have known that it was of vast importance to the Dominion of Canada.

He knew, he must have known, that there was a good deal of agitation in reference to it and a pretty strong feeling that it was taking an unsatisfactory shape. I asked a few questions, and they were answered in the House on the 23rd of March last, by the Prime Minister and one reply of his was: The provisions of the declaration of London have been taken into consideration. That is an easy phrase but I pause now to ask the Prime Minister what has the government done; what commercial bodies have the government consulted to obtain their views; have the boards of trade of Canada been consulted? Have the great shipping interests of Canada been

consulted? Have the great agricultural interests of Canada been consulted? Because under this, food products are made 'conditional contraband' of war. Let the Prime Minister tell us what the government did in taking the subject into consideration, a subject which he must recognize is a vital one, not only to Canada but to the British Empire.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We did not consult the shipping interests, nor the farming interests, nor the commercial interests of Canada. The declaration of London deals with international law in regard to contraband of war. Up to the present the rule of international law has been that contraband of war was confined to armament, weapons, explosives, and so on. The rules of international law are simply based on the opinion of eminent jurists and they are not binding. The declaration of Paris in 1856 was confined to a few nations, and it declares privateering illegal, and it declares also that food products should be covered by the flag and should not be liable to seizure. The declaration of London proposes a new condition and makes food in certain circumstance a contraband of war. I do not think any information could be obtained upon that point by consulting the shipping interests or any other of the interests mentioned by the hon. member. I think we have all the information at the present time on that point that it is possible to gather. We have the declaration of the Chamber of Commerce; we have the declaration of the shipping interests of the United Kingdom, and we have the declaration of boards of trade in this country also. I am not aware where we could derive any more information than we have at present.

Mr. LENNOX. As the Prime Minister says, the declaration of London enlarges the scope of what shall be contraband of war, and some of the big items in it are food stuffs, grain for feeding animals, fabrics for clothing, boots and shoes suitable in war, gold and silver coin, bullion and paper money. The first three of these very intimately affect Canada. Boards of trade and other bodies have expressed their opinion as to what the effect of it may be. Boards of trade are not infallable but some of the overseas dominions have also expressed their opinions upon it, and have condemned it. I apprehend that the best way for the government to get information would be to consult with those who are most closely connected with the matter, and I apprehend that it is the duty of the government to consult with those who have special knowledge upon the matter—not necessarily to follow their advice—but for the purpose of enabling the government to form an opinion as best they can.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). How many boards of trade in Canada would understand the principles of international law or the law in regard to contraband so as to be able to give any assistance on the question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Would it be possible by any inquiry we could make at present to obtain any information which we have not. The only thing we could ascertain on any such question is an expression of opinion. As my hon. friend knows it is a very debatable question in the United Kingdom as well as in the overseas dominions, some of which are for and some against. We could not obtain by any possible inquiry more information than we have on the subject.

Mr. LENNOX. I have a higher opinion of the boards of trade of this Dominion than has my hon. friend from Pictou and I think they could give valuable advice on this question. Now, the Prime Minister has or has not an opinion on the subject and if he has any opinion in which he has confidence he should have expressed it in the agenda and forwarded it for discussion at the approaching conference. If the right hon. gentleman has not an opinion, which I think is most likely to be the case——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have my own opinion.

Mr. LENNOX. Then the Prime Minister has not given us the benefit of it. If the right hon. gentleman does not entertain an opinion on the question and has not full knowledge of it, he should endeavour to equip himself before the approaching conference so that he may be in a position to present his opinion in the form of an agenda and discuss it in the best interests of Canada and the empire. Then, on the 23rd of March last when I questioned the government, the right hon. gentleman replied: The government has made no representations in reference to this declaration to the Imperial government. The result is that although Australasia did include the declaration of London in their agenda, they are the only dominion to do so, and they condemn it, but they stand alone and hence according to the principles laid down in the despatch just read, it is not included in the final agenda and will not be the subject of discussion at the approaching conference. That is unfortunate. I want to call the attention of the Prime Minister to another answer he gave on the 23rd of March and see whether

he holds the same opinion now as then. I asked:

Does the government propose to make any representations in reference to this matter to the imperial government?

The Prime Minister replied:

As the whole subject of the Declaration of London deals exclusively with questions of international law, the government of Canada not being a sovereign power does not think itself justified to make official representation on such matters, but the question may be discussed informally with the imperial government at the next Imperial Conference.

There was a time when the First Minister had a much loftier conception of the status of Canada than this answer would indicate. There was a time, I think coincident with the acquisition of the Cobden medal, when the right hon. gentleman realized that Canada was a nation, and had all the rights of a nation, sovereign and otherwise. But the Prime Minister is very modest at this time, and because Canada is not a sovereign nation he would not venture to suggest a subject for discussion at the Imperial Conference. Australia was not so modest.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Does not a perusal of this correspondence show conclusively that there was before the government here in Canada at the date when the minute of council was passed in January 11, a despatch of the 19th of December in which the New Zealand proposals were discussed?

Mr. LENNOX. Quite true, but on the other hand this is not made a subject of discussion on the agenda of the Conference, and it would probably have been made the subject of discussion if this government had added its agenda to the others, and had therefore come within the rule I have already quoted. Thus by our government taking the position that they could not say one word upon this matter either by way of agenda, or by communication with the British government, they have let this matter go wholly by default. Although the government thought they had not the power or the right, not being a sovereign power, to say one word upon this question, boards of trade and others thought they had the right to make their representations, and those representations have been regarded and recognized and dealt with very carefully by Sir Edward Grey. For instance the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. The Leeds Ship Owners' Society——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. The Navy League(Bristol branch), the Belfast Chamber of Commerce, all these thought they had a perfect right to send in representations, and those representations have been very courteously received and discussed. The Prime Minister, I think, is about to say let our boards of trade do the same, but although our boards of trade probably could do the same, it would have come with very much greater force, and have very much greater influence if the government had discharged their duty in this regard, and had themselves submitted something in reference to this matter. As it is, I may say the government have put themselves out of court, and will not be in a position to deal with it even informally when the conference assembles.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LENNOX. I referred, Mr. Speaker, to some statements which the right hon. the Prime Minister made regarding the position in which our representatives at the Imperial Conference would be placed. With the greatest deference to the right hon. gentlemen, I have to register my dissent from the proposition broadly advanced by the Minister, namely, that the work not disposed of at the late conference must of necessity come up again for discussion without being put upon the agenda. The resolution, for instance, adopted in 1902, in favour of preferential trade within the empire and reaffirmed in 1907, he said was a permanent question which must automatically come up at every conference. I entirely dissent from that proposition, and I think I made it clear before recess that such will not be the case. In justice to the right hon. gentleman, I must say that after I had for the second time called his attention to the position of that matter, he said that of course the questions which were on the agenda, as finally prepared by the imperial authorities or the secretariat, would necessarily come up first. On previous occasions, he added, other matters which were not on the agenda were discussed. I am not at all disposed to say that if there were ample time for discussion, any important subject might not, by common consent, be taken up, even if not on the list; but I say distinctly that there is no ground for the belief that these important questions will have any place in the discussion at the approaching conference.

My right hon. friend said that there would be four or five weeks for discussion, but in

that he was wrong. True the period of duration is from the 22nd of May to the 22nd of June, but the correspondence distinctly calls the attention of the government to the fact that there are actually only fifteen days available for discussion; and after sifting the matter out, the British agenda, framed upon the basis of all the agendas put in, excludes the important matters to which my right hon. friend mainly gave his attention this afternoon.

For instance, if I understood him aright, he regards as of most vital importance the question, which was discussed in 1902 and 1907, of closer trade relations or imperial preferential trade among the different parts of the empire. But that subject does not form the baises of any discussion at the approaching conference, so that the very first and most important question to Canada at present will be omitted, and omitted I venture to say, because of the want of diligence and care on the part of the government.

Then my right hon. friend said that the question of immigration is important and ought to be discussed. In that connection, he said that he endorsed the opinion expressed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). But here again we are cut out. This is not one of the questions which is to be the subject of discussion at the Imperial Conference. The government have been guilty of absolute neglect in this matter. That neglect becomes more apparent when we consider that when the report of the proceedings of 1907 was published, the secretariat in England pointed out that if the dominions beyond the seas want co-operation in any way in this matter, beyond what has been done before the conference, it was for them to ask for it. My right hon. friend is, therefore, in this position. He recognizes the supreme importance of this question of immigration and has before him the invitation of the home authorities to take action in the matter, and yet he has absolutely done nothing. It is not even to be the subject of discussion at the coming conference.

Again he said that naturalization is a very important matter, and that uniform laws of naturalization would be very beneficial indeed. Whoever, he said, represents Canada at the conference will point out to the representatives of New Zealand, Australia and South Africa the importance of uniform laws on naturalization. But naturalization will not be a subject of discussion at the conference because our government has not seen fit to ask that it be put on any agenda, but has practically thrown away the situation by its cold hearted treatment of that question. Allow me to read what has been said about that. It cannot be said that our government did not say anything, but it can be said that it did nothing. The order in council goes on in this way:

> Your Excellency's advisers would welcome a suggestion looking to uniformity, as far as practicable in the naturalization laws throughout His Majesty's dominions.

Well, those who have charge of this matter, have not decided that it be put upon the agenda. It is not too much to say that the Dominion government from November to the end of January, when this matter was taking definite form, evidently had their eyes elsewhere, and had their attention centred in another direction altogether away from Britain. They were looking to Washington more than to Britain, and the result is there is not on the agenda one important question in which Canada is interested at present.

I have shown that these matters which the premier acknowledges are all important—preferential trade, immigration and naturalization—are all excluded from the agenda, and excluded because of want of care and attention on the part of the Dominion government.

Referring to the Declaration of London, I want just to read what Australia has to say on that question. Australia says:

> That it is regretted that the dominions were not consulted prior to the acceptance by the British delegates of the terms of the Declaration of London; that it is not desirable that Great Britain should adopt the inclusion in article 24 of foodstuffs, in view of the fact that so large a part of the trade of the empire is in those articles; that it is not desirable that Great Britain should adopt the provisions of articles 48-54, permitting the destruction of neutral vessels.

I will not trouble the House, with a number of quotations from memorials to the government of Great Britain in reference to the Declaration of London which I have before me. The chambers of commerce, of Glasgow particularly, go into the matter very fully and point out the serious effect it may have on commerce in foodstuffs and other articles that were not included before. I might read a line or two of what is quoted here as the language of the Liverpool Steamship Owner's Association in discussing this point.

> Our safety depends upon our being able to keep at sea not only our fighting, but also our merchant-ships. If our trade routes cannot be adequately defended by our navy, then the nation must assume the financial risks to which our merchant-ships and their cargoes would be exposed, for we must keep these at sea. A war which would drive our mercantile flag from the sea and transfer our carrying trade to neutral ships would leave us in a state of hopeless bankruptcy.

I need hardly point to the fact that as Canada is dependent, up to the present time at all events, for her export trade, mainly upon the markets of Great Britain —whatever may be our fate in the future —it is all-important to us that we shall not be put in such a position that our commerce may be seized at any moment, and the onus placed on us of proving that it is not contraband of war.

The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in answer to me the other day, said that the government had considered this question. I am indebted to the right hon. gentleman for intervening this afternoon to tell me to what extent they have considered the matter. I asked him to do so, and he has disclosed, very effectively I think, that he considered it simply not at all. No interest has been consulted, no measures have been taken, practically no consideration has been given to the subject. And in this and the other important questions that should come up for discussion before this conference—a conference which, it is true, has no binding force as a constitutional tribunal, but yet which has great moulding force upon the destinies of the whole empire, I feel that I cannot too strongly impress upon the House the utter neglect of the government in being at the tail of the race in this important matter, when all the other self-governing portions of the empire have been on the alert. New Zealand sends in its agenda covering a wide range of subjects. The first is the reconstitution of the Colonial Office, a subject which, in every one of its subdivisions, is as important to Canada as to New Zealand. Another point is the interchange of civil servants—I have not formed an opinion upon that question. Another subject is universal penny postage, which is as important to Canada as to the rest of the empire. Then there is the question of state-owned Atlantic cable, and state-owned telegraph lines across Canada. Surely, Canada ought to have some idea about a proposition of that kind; Canada ought to be the first in the field in such a matter. Other subjects proposed by New Zealand are the cheapening of cable rates, development of telegraphic communication within the empire, the All-Red route—one would have thought that the government, if they are still desirous in maintaining close relations with Great Britain, would have been active in relation to the All-Red route; but, not a word—and an imperial court of appeal. And there are many other items, many of them with subheads, covering in all about two dozen different subjects in each of which Canada should have a word to say. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says Canada will be prepared to discuss these matters. That is hardly enough. We ought to have a policy upon these subjects, and that policy ought to be known to parliament, and parliament ought to have an opportunity of speaking in a friendly way with the government before sending our representatives, and advising with them as to how much of this programme they approve of, and how much they would urge the government not to advance. Then, when we come to Australia, we find that they have two resolutions on commercial relations, and they propose also the discussion of naturalization, the declaration of London, immigration, naturalization of the Atlantic cables, &c.,—all subjects in which Canada should not be the last, but the leader. I can come to no conclusion—I regret it very much—but that the government has had its attention so completely distracted in other directions, antagonistic in some respects to this principle of closer and more definite relations with Great Britain, that they have been prevented from paying the attention to this great and important subject that it deserves.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Any one who has read the correspondence on the Imperial Conference of 1911, and who has listened to the address of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) must marvel at and admire the ingenuity which enabled the hon. gentlemen to spread over, in an hour's argument his views as to the suppression of subjects for consideration before the conference and to set forth so many grounds of complaint without any justification for any of them. He has taken the ground that the government should have gone into an elaborate agenda of matters to be submitted to the conference. But he has ignored entirely the fact that the government when, in January last, it sent to the right hon. Mr. Harcourt, through the Governor General, a statement of the matters on which they wished discussion, had before them, as indicated by the despatch from the Secretary of State to the Governor General on the 19th of December, 1909, the proposals that were made by the New Zealand government and the detailed statement with regard to the matters proposed by that government and by Newfoundland. Apparently my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) complains that this government did not repeat in detail each and every one of the subjects which he said were so important, and which were contained in the agenda from New Zealand. If he does not mean that, his argument has no meaning. He complained, for instance, that although New Zealand had distinctly and elaborately, in section 10 of their agenda, set forth the proposition for a mail route between England, Australia, and New Zealand via Canada, Canada had said nothing about it. It was not necessary

for Canada to say anything about it. Canada had already before her the proposition made by New Zealand, and the answer of this government in fact expressed its willingness to discuss at the conference the proposition submitted by New Zealand. So with regard to the other subjects mentioned by my hon. friend. For instance, he says it is impossible to discuss at this conference the question of closer trade relations with the mother country. As indicated by the right hon. gentleman, that is a subject which had always been discussed at these conferences, and of course will be again. But that subject is referred to in the different agenda submitted by the other nations of this empire, and stands for full consideration again.

Mr. LENNOX. Although there are a great many subjects suggested by Australia and by New Zealand, we are confined to subjects that are included in the agenda prepared by Britain, and this subject is not included in that agenda.

Mr. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend will read the documents carefully, he will see that in this statement prepared by the Secretary of State to be found on page 10 of the report, the subjects referred to are set forth by him. For instance, my hon. friend indicated that the question of immigration could not be discussed because, he says, this government had not submitted certain statements in response to their request for information. My hon. friend ignores the fact that on page 9 of the statement made by Australia, there are set out in detail the various propositions in regard to the matters mentioned, and it is stated in the final statement of the Secretary of State on page 11 that immigration is one of the subjects that is to be discussed. So where my hon. friend gets a basis for his reasoning, I am at a loss to discover. Take again the question of the Declaration of London, my hon. friend seemed worried because this government had not deliberately undertaken to interfere in what is strictly an international matter, a matter of international law. It is something which this government should not ask the farming interests of this country and boards of trade to offer an opinion upon, because it is a very intricate question of international law. What would be thought of Canada if she should undertake to interfere in a matter which is distinctly a proposition for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs? We were dealing with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, concerning the relations that exist between the colonies and the mother country, yet my hon. friend thinks this government is to be condemned because it did not unnecessarily rush in and express an opinion on a subject which would not naturally come before the conference at all.

One of my objects in rising was to discuss the question of naturalization, which is one in which I am much interested I believe with the government that the proposition is one of the very first importance, and should engage the close attention of this conference. My hon. friend undertakes to say that this conference cannot deal with it, notwithstanding the fact that Australia has mentioned that subject, and that Canada has mentioned it. Let me refer my hon. friend to what the Secretary of State for the Colonies says in his correspondence:

> The resolution of the Commonwealth of Australia as to naturalization leads me to observe that this question of uniformity of law is essentially a technical question, and as such may more properly be remitted to a committee of the full conference sitting as a subsubsidiary conference.

So the Secretary of State distinctly provides for a full and complete consideration of this important question of naturalization all over the empire. It seems to me that my hon. friend is going very far to find a ground of complaint against this government when he urges that they have failed in their duty because they did not sit down and write over again matters that had already been proposed by the sister states. On this question of naturalization, I would like to point out that it is the bounden duty of every man who loves this empire, and is interested in its preservation and extension, to look forward to some action being taken by the Imperial Conference to provide that a man in any portion of this empire, who has been naturalized according to the laws of the state where he is, shall become a citizen of the empire by virtue of that naturalization, and be deemed a British subject wherever the British flag flies. It is one of the greatest anomalies to talk about building up an empire on the basis of tariff reform, and all questions of that kind, when you leave the foundation stone absolutely unlaid, when you have no provision that a citizen of this empire, no matter in what colony he may live, shall have the full and complete rights of any other citizen, whether he be born here or in another country, or in the mother country. The very foundation of a national feeling which would permeate every part of the empire is lacking when a man in Canada, or Australia, or South Africa, is not recognized as a British citizen, once he has complied with the laws of the state in which he is living, and is there regarded as a citizen. It seems to me that is a question which urgently calls for consideration at this conference. We have other problems suggested here, in regard to amendments to the laws, in

regard to provisions for closer communication by cable and by vessel on land and on sea; but if you are going to ignore altogether the essential basis of the empire, that a man who lives in any one of the states or colonies of the empire shall be a citizen of every other part of the empire, there is very little good in providing for fast steamships and state-owned cables. I hope that this question, which this government has brought forward and which has been suggested by some of the sister states, will be solved by this conference. There ought to be co-ordinate action by the mother country and each one of the over-sea states that will settle this question satisfactorily.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). I have the honour to represent in this House probably one of the most strictly rural constituencies in the province of Ontario, if not in the Dominion of Canada; and as this matter is one which affects the agricultural interests of my constituency so deeply, I may be excused if I take up some time in placing my views before the committee. While I do not claim to be a farmer, I have lived all my life in the country and all my people are agriculturalists. I think I am in fairly close touch with the agriculturalists of my county and understand and appreciate their needs and wishes fairly well. Since this matter has been brought up frequent references have been made in the press to several constituencies, and among others to the county of Frontenac. The Toronto 'Globe,' for instance, stated that the member for Frontenac was having quite a hard time of it on account of Conservative pressure being brought to bear upon him to support this present agreement. I have received probably half a dozen letters from my constituents with reference to it. With the exception of four or five of the reeves in Frontenac, all of the reeves have expressed themselves as opposed to this agreement being ratified. There are sixteen municipalities in the county altogether. There has been in that county and in various rural constituencies throughout the province a very determined and persistent attempt to stampede the country people in favour of this compact. Only a week ago the hon. leader of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario addressed a meeting in the court house at Kingston and the same evening he addressed a meeting in my constituency in the village of Sunbury. At his afternoon meeting in the court house in Kingston, by actual count, there were 42 residents from the county of Frontenac present and 49 from the city of Kingston. At the meeting which was held in the village of Sunbury on the same evening, of course, the leaders of the Liberal party in the county did their best to do honour to their Ontario chief, which was quite proper, and a number of Liberals were in attendance. The vote was taken on that occasion to ascertain how many were in favour of reciprocity and less than half of those present rose to their feet in support of the proposition put to them, although the meeting was largely composed of Liberals.

I want at the outset to take exception to a statement made by the right hon Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and repeated by pretty nearly every speaker who has risen to his feet on that side of the House and by the Liberal press from one end of the country to the other, that this agreement is exactly the same as the proposal laid down in the National Policy with regard to reciprocal trade relations with the United States. There was contained in the National Policy brought down by Sir John A. Macdonald a clause with regard to reciprocal trade relations with the United States, but that clause contained some words which have not been dwelt upon by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have made reference to it. That clause mentioned a number of articles which it was proposed that our government would make free or allow to enter Canada at a reduced rate of duty, when the United States permitted all those articles to enter that country free of duty. I claim that there is a very distinct and emphatic difference between the position taken then and this compact. The United States were to allow all these articles into their country free. When they did that our government would take into consideration whether they would allow these articles to enter free or at a reduced rate of duty. I repeat that the words 'or at a reduced rate of duty' have a very important bearing, are very significant and indicate a very strong difference between the position taken by Sir John Macdonald in 1879 and the position taken by this government.

I think I am right in saying that there is not a member of this House who believes that if Sir John Macdonald were at the head of the government to-day he would enter into any such pact as this government propose to enter into. Let us see for one moment the position of affairs. Last fall there was an election in the United States. That election was fought out on very distinct and emphatic lines. The Democrats pledged themselves that if they were returned to power they would reduce the duties very materially on food products coming into the United States. The new

Congress did not take office until the 4th of March this year, and I cannot think for one moment that if Sir John Macdonald had been at the head of the government of this country he would have moved in the matter of reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States until he had given that party that had pledged themselves to a certain line of policy an opportunity of carrying out the pledges which they had made to the people. Therefore, I do not think that hon. members on the other side of the House are justified in asserting as they do that they are endeavouring to obtain just exactly what the Conservative party were trying to get all the time they were in power.

Why was this agreement entered into at the present time? The reason, in my estimation, why this agreement was entered into at the present time is this: I have already said that it would have been the part of wisdom, of common prudence on the part of the government of Canada, to have at least waited a few months longer and given the Democratic party an opportunity to carry out their pledges. About a year ago we had the naval policy introduced into this House and I am firmly of the opinion, and I believe it is the opinion of practically all the members of this House, that the naval policy of the present government is one to which nine-tenths of the people of the country object. It was necessary for the government to obtain some kind of a blanket to cover up their naval policy, their mismanagement of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Aylesworth ditch and things of that kind. Consequently, we find them entering into a pact with the government of the United States when common prudence would have suggested to them the advisability of waiting at least a few months to give the Democratic party an opportunity to redeem the pledges which they made to the people. This is not an agreement which affects our trade with the United States only.

But more than that, if this agreement is ratified, Russia, Denmark, Austro-Hungary, Spain, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Germany, Venezuela, Bolivia, Colombia, Argentina, and Japan in addition to the British possessions have the right to send their products into this country on the same terms as the United States. All that we in Canada get as a return is a freer admission for our products into the markets of the United States. The advocates of this compact have vaunted before the farmers of Canada the market of 90,000,000 people in the United States, and one would imagine to hear them that as soon as this agreement is ratified some 90,000,000 people south of the line are going to sit down and fold their arms and let the farmers of

Canada feed them. Well, these 90,000,000 people in the United States are not by any means going out of the business of producing. There are ten farmers in the United States to every one farmer in Canada, and while this agreement will remove the tariff wall, and permit one Canadian farmer freer access to the markets of the United States it will at the same time permit ten American farmers free access into the markets of Canada. Then, our one farmer in Canada will have an opportunity to get his produce into the market of the United States where it will come into competition with the surplus products of the ten American farmers, but the ten American farmers will have an opportunity of sending their surplus products into Canada where it will compete with us in our home market, the best market we have. Let me refer to some statements made by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech of November, 1906, when he was bringing down his tariff. He said:

> Now that we are approaching the question of a general tariff revision we again wish to keep in mind this idea of tariff stability. We do not desire to make radical changes. We feel that the general condition of Canada to-day is such that no radical changes in the tariff are called for.

But, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite if it is not a fact that to-day the prices of farm produce from one end of Canada to the other are higher than they were when the Minister of Finance uttered these words in 1906, and if there was no occasion for radical changes in the tariff then what excuse can there be for radical changes in the tariff now. In that same speech the Minister of Finance used this language:

> We desire to turn trade to Great Britain wherever we can properly do so, because Great Britain is our best customer, and if, by any arrangement that we can properly make we can turn trade from people who will not buy from us towards people who do buy from us, then we think we ought to do so. We are desirous of doing this in the way of turning trade to Great Britain.

What change has come over the spirit of his dreams since the Finance Minister thus spoke in November, 1906? To-day, instead of turning trade towards our best customer his policy is to turn trade away from our best customer and to direct it towards people who buy very little from us compared with what the people of the mother country do. I call attention to another statement of the Finance Minister made in that same speech, and it has a special bearing on the present situation because of the fact that the favoured nation countries which I have mentioned will also have the right to send their goods into our market. The Finance Minister, referring

to the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties, said:

But the favoured nation treaties remained. Now, if we should bring in one foreign country under the privileges of this new tariff, although that country should give us concessions which would repay us, the effect would be that we would be obliged to give the same advantages without any return from them to a number of countries which possess favoured nation treaties. You can see at once that this raises a very serious complication and warns us that we must not attempt to put this tariff into operation at once. We must conduct our negotiations and try if we can to get several countries to make an arrangement with us, and then if we should bring them in about the same time it would not do us any harm if we had to bring in some half dozen other countries the trade of which is not very important. I think it fair to point out this very important aspect of the matter and it is a very important reason why, while we put this tariff on our statute-books and hold it up as a basis for negotiations, we should not attempt to put it into operation at once, but should only make it the subject for negotiation.

Now, in view of that statement made in November, 1906, by the Minister of Finance it is indeed surprising that he should be one of the gentlemen to go to Washington to negotiate a compact which will result in producing the very effects which he at that time seemed to fear. There is one other utterance of the Minister of Finance in the same speech which is significant at the present time in view of the wonderful friendly feeling the government professes towards the farmers. The Finance Minister then said:

The farmer, as a rule, is a low tariff man; but if you ask him whether he wants the duties on agricultural products abolished, he is apt to be a little careful. Some will say yes and others no. Other will say: Take the duties off agricultural products if you take them off everything else. Well, whenever we have made changes in the schedule of agricultural duties, as a rule they are in the direction of a little increase. We do not want the farmer to say that the changes made are to the disadvantage of the things he himself produces. In fact some farmers are strong advocates of high duties although the general tendency is the other way. Therefore we have not made any changes, and any we have made are in the way of an increase to some extent.

There we have the very frank utterance from the Minister of Finance: That there were some farmers who were low tariff men, and in favour of a reduction of duties, and some who were in favour of higher duties, and that the farmer thought that if the duties were taken off agricultural products they should also be taken off things which the farmer has to buy. The further statement of the Finance Minister that he did not want the farmer to think that the changes in the tariff are to the disadvantage of the things the farmer must produce is very interesting at present, because if this agreement is ratified, with regard to everything which the farmer produces and has to sell, he has practically to compete with all the agricultural countries in the world, while with reference to all kinds of machinery and everything needed to assist him in producing his crop, he has to pay a higher price because of the protection afforded to the manufacturer. Well might the Finance Minister say in this speech that if you ask the farmer whether he wants the duties on agricultural products abolished he is apt to be a little careful.

In this case the government has gone ahead seemingly without consulting any person as to what they were going to do notwithstanding the fact that the Prime Minister himself had repeatedly said there would be no revision of the tariff until all the varied interests in this country had been given a fair and reasonable opportunity to state their side of the case. That to my mind is a matter which ought to receive the condemnation of every fair-minded man in Canada, and I believe will be condemned by the people generally. What state of affairs have we reached in Canada when the Prime Minister will deliberately go back on his pledged word to the people, and tell 1,200 or 1,500 farmers, the market gardeners and fruit raisers of the country, who come to the doors of this parliament and ask for an opportunity to state their case before the government, that they are too late, and that their case cannot be considered.

A great deal has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite of the British preference. What have they done in this direction? The Minister of Finance stated that we on this side instead of criticising their action might very well leave the British preference in their hands. That is a kind of flag waving which is peculiar to hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us see what they have done in regard to the British preference. In 1910 Canada imported from Great Britain $71,822,941 worth of dutiable goods on which a duty of $18,032,629 was collected. That is a rate of duty of 25·107 per cent.

In the same year we imported from Great Britain $23,513,486 worth of free goods, a total of $95,336,427 dutiable and free goods, the average rate of duty on which was 18·914 per cent.

In the same year, 1910, Canada imported from the United States $118,834,173 on which we collected duties amounting to $29,515,836, or an average rate of duty of 24·837 per cent. We also brought in from the United States $98,668,242 worth of free goods. Our total imports from the United

States, dutiable and free, amounted to $217,502,415, or an average rate of duty on all our imports from the United States of 13·57 per cent. Thus on all the goods we imported from Great Britain, dutiable and free, the average rate was 18·914 per cent, and on the goods we imported from the United States, dutiable and free, the average duty was only 13·57 per cent. Twenty-six per cent of our imports from Great Britain are free, and 74 per cent pay duty; 45 per cent of our imports from the United States are free and 55 per cent dutiable.

In other words Canada admitted last year from the United States $75,154,756 more imports free than from Great Britain, or $3,331,815 more free imports from the United States than our total imports, dutiable and free, from Great Britain. Yet we find this government and their supporters repeatedly referring to the British preference. Why, there is no preference at all, the preference has been the other way as their own figures taken from their reports clearly indicate, and if this agreement is carried into effect the preference to the United States will be very much greater. I said in the beginning that this agreement affected not merely our trade with the United States, but that there were several other countries which would have the same right to bring goods into Canada as the United States. I know the Prime Minister has made very light of the importations or possible importations from these other countries, he has referred to that as of very little consequence, but the production of grain from just a few of these countries that I have on my list, is very great. Russia, the United States, India, Spain, the Argentine Republic, Hungary, Australia, Great Britain, and Austria, produced in 1909, according to a statement supplied to me by the Deputy Minister of the Interior 2,369,578,224 bushels of wheat. Our production in Canada that year was 166,752,000 bushels.

Of oats these countries produce 2,501,-120,000 bushels, while our production was 353,451,000 bushels.

Of barley these countries produced 978,-087,000 bushels; our production was 55,377,-000 bushels. Those figures will indicate to you that this country, in case of the ratification of this agreement, will be brought into competition with countries which are producing and producing enormously of these three cereals.

I wish to place on 'Hansard' some figures in regard to the surplus production of some of these countries for 1909, because after all it is what these countries export that will indicate the extent of competition this country will have to face.

EXPORTS BY COUNTRIES.

——	Butter.	Cheese.	Meat.	Eggs.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Doz.
Denmark	196,639,227	261,240	284,348,288	32,011,645
Australia	55,644,925	193,204	322,958,857	10,359
New Zealand	35,964,096	44,867,984	296,277,054	4,838
Russia	112,437,216	981,144	32,651,460	215,709,833
Argentine	8,799,964	.....	679,570,565	.....
Sweden	40,019,414	4,620	7,718,198	3,236,457
Norway	8,445,227	264,881	384,682	6,526
Austria-Hungary	.....	.....	24,992,918	.....
Great Britain	1,032,192	937,440	20,803,440	.....
United States	2,925,730	3,501,214	620,455,967	4,948,435
	461,907,991	51,011,727	2,290,161,429	255,928,103
Canada	4,615,380	180,859,886	60,669,584	160,650
Canada to Great Britain	2,595,357	179,937,468	59,247,031	33,465
Canada to United States	1,103,837	154,490	452,040	35,732

Yet we actually find the advocates of this pact preaching up and down the country and on the floor of this House that Canada will have a market for these commodities in the United States. And they make such statements in the face of the fact that the United States has been shipping into Canada an average of about a million dozen eggs a year and 18 million pounds of meats, and that the surplus production of meat last year in the United States was 620,000,000 pounds. The United States are exporting, besides three and a half million pounds of cheese, nearly three million pounds of butter per year, and yet we have people claiming that a country, which has such a large surplus production to export, will be a first-class market for our Canadian farmer. That certainly does not seem reasonable to me.

I am taking up the articles which I know are of interest to the people of my county and to the agriculturalists throughout this country, and I wish now to place on 'Hansard' another table with regard to animals. The figures are as follows:

EXPORTS BY COUNTRIES FOR THE YEAR 1909.

——	Horses.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
Argentine.....	4,765	132,450	88,636	33
Australia.....	7,801	975	5,315	229
Aust.-Hungary.	57,003	147,965	36,736	7,454
British India...	218	.....	.....	.....
Denmark	22,653	124,903	511	43
New Zealand...	1,602	299	6,987	630
Norway.....	202	16	44	217
Russia.....	82,407	97,715	.....	.....
Sweden	3,991	9,767	1,753	301
Great Britain...	121,072	2,360	7,418	745
United States ..	27,590	184,957	54,618	11,886
	329,304	701,407	202,018	21,538
Canada	2,762	157,386	111,107	390

Canada's exports to Great Britain and the United States were as follows:

——	Great Britain.	United States.
Horses	584	1,906
Cattle	140,424	12,210
Sheep	1,828	104,349
Swine	.....	205

Another table I propose to place on 'Hansard' covers the exports of wheat, barley, oats, hay and potatoes:

EXPORTS BY COUNTRIES FOR THE YEAR 1909.

Countries.	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Hay.	Potatoes.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Tons.	Bush.
Argentine.....	92,352,375	851,578	27,313,523	30,683	114,484
Australia.....	31,549,498	196,818	353,603	2,884	97,219
Austria-Hungary.....	71,255	8,911,734	35,815	29,729	990,646
New Zealand.....	1,419,217	209,437	5,133,473	35	22,176
Russia.....	53,881,627	87,292,008	31,101,457	7,241	2,152,169
Sweden	3,171	2,738	580,765	1,083	7,237
British India.....	39,221,436	1,047,606	52,728	.....	
Denmark.....	213,292	1,383,792	83,317	.....	226,168
Japan.....	734	4,389	37,774	.....	450,946
Norway.....	3,328	29,181	685,167	.....	11,084
Great Britain	439,292	108,399	467,761	.....	6,710,689
United States.....	48,489,674	4,589,397	1,272,294	59,738	882,137
	267,644,899	104,627,057	67,117,677	131,393	11,664,957
Canada	49,741,350	2,044,901	3,401,730	191,098	1,923,595
Canada to Great Britain.....	46,589,228	1,431,922	1,024,491	87,871	201
Canada to United States.....	1,856,181	147,596	1,285,660	86,127	1,678,632

APPLES.

Canada exports.....	barrels	1,604,477
Canada to Great Britain.....	"	1,523,901
Canada to United States.....	"	48,272

My object in reading those statements is simply this. The countries mentioned are those which will, if this agreement be ratified, have the right to send their surplus products into Canada. At present England is the only country in the world which permits foreign countries to send their surplus products into her markets free of duty. But if this agreement be ratified, there will be another country in the same position as England, so far as agricultural products are concerned, and that country is Canada. If the English market at any time becomes glutted, these various countries will naturally turn their attention to the only other country which will permit their products to come in free, namely, Canada. So, we put ourselves in the position of being a dumping ground for the surplus productions from these agricultural countries which the British market cannot make away with. I have another object in stating these figures. I have given the production of Canada in regard to these various things I have mentioned, and I maintain that the production of wheat, barley, oats, hay, potatoes, horses, cattle and various other things indicates very clearly that the agricultural population of the Dominion of Canada is an industrious and intelligent population, and that our farmers are not the slipshod, lazy, indifferent, careless people that the Minister of Agriculture said they were. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) I am glad to see, is in his place, and lest he may have forgotten the expression of opinion he made in regard to the agriculturalists of this country, I will quote from the speech of the hon. gentleman on the 3rd of March, 1909, as given at page 2029 of 'Hansard':

> It is the farmer's slipshod methods in this country which is the limit of our agricultural production . . . The only pity is that the farmers of Canada are not doubling and quadrupling their exports every year. If they do not, it is not for lack of teaching or for lack of knowledge; it is for their lack of interest in their work, their lack of industry, and largely, I believe, for the lack of that labour which is necessary in the carrying on of our farming operations.

The Minister of Agriculture says now that we should be perfectly willing to let the farmers say what they want. He is very willing to rely upon the judgment and intelligence of the farmers when their judgment and intelligence run in the same groove as his own. But I submit that, in view of the production of this country, and of the fact that the farmers of Canada, as shown by undeniable statistics, are producing more to the acre than the farmers on the other side of the line, the Minister of Agriculture was not justified in representing the agriculturists of this country as a slipshod, careless, indifferent and lazy class of people. The figures of the importation from the various countries I have named show that these countries, in the event of the ratification of this agreement, will be very serious competitors of the farmers of Canada. These are figures prepared by the Department of Customs showing the quantity and value of imports entered for consumption in Canada during the past six years in a few articles in which the farmers are directly interested.

IMPORTS INTO CANADA FOR HOME CONSUMPTION FROM MOST FAVOURED NATION COUNTRIES DURING SIX YEARS.

Article.	Quantity.	Value.
Butter .. ..lbs.	2,894,416	685,306
Cheese .. ..lbs.	2,901,815	566,786
Eggs .. .. dozens	4,600,534	944,704
Poultry	.....	276,648
Potatoes .. .. ..bushel	1,422,829	926,693
Beef (salted) .. .. ..lbs.	10,610,533	502,831
Bacon and Hams ..lbs.	35,140,613	4,312,359
Mutton .. ..lbs.	6,317,785	440,317
Pork (in brine) .. ..lbs.	51,826,804	4,250,673
Other meat products lbs.	13,028,060	1,567,251
Cattle .. ..head	45,086	640,514
Horses .. ..head	57,565	2,920,117
Sheep .. ..head	359,447	1,151,022
Swine.. .. ..lbs.	184,779	12,696
Barley .. ..bush.	280,314	174,504
Beans .. ..bush.	307,211	490,343
Buckwheat .. .. ..bush.	6,311	6,177
Oats .. ..bush	1,168,226	603,264
Pease .. ..bush.	51,241	120,840
Rye .. ..bush.	145,920	112,950
Wheat .. ..bush,	373,979	317,748
Hay .. ..tons	49,374	853,059
Flax seed .. ..bush	4,702,090	5,747,612
Apples .. ..barrels	239,647	975,870
Vegetables (except potatoes).....		4,755,908
		$33,356,102

These items do not include wheat flour, oat meal and corn meal nor do they include tropical fruits. The figures indicate very clearly to my mind that, in spite of the light manner in which the Prime Minister treated this matter, the competition of these several countries which will have the right to send their produce into Canada should give the farmers of this country serious concern. It has been stated by defenders of this agreement that the farmers of this country will be getting one more market, will be getting the right to sell their products in the markets of the United States. Let us see where our stuff goes to at the present time. Eighty per cent of what is produced on the farms of Canada is consumed by the people of Canada in Canada. The best market that the Canadian farmer has is his home market, and I believe he fully realizes that. Of the twenty per cent which we have to export, nearly all at present goes either to Great Britain or to the United States. Let us see which of these markets is the more valuable to us. The figures I will give now are for the year 1910, and are taken from the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

—	Canada sold to Great Britain.	Canada sold to United States.	United States sold to Canada.
	$	$	$
Animals.....	10,080,449	2,307,125	2,416,207
Breadstuffs..	71,843,958	4,661,666	18,469,528
Hay.....	922,718	675,843	138,423
Fruits.....	4,508,532	519,623	6,458,101
Provisions...	30,071,269	361,957	3,928,697
Vegetables ..	56,703	683,908	1,004,426
	117,483,629	9,210,122	32,415,382

There does not seem to be any lack of breadstuffs on the other side of the line. Their surplus of breadstuffs is much larger than our surplus, as indicated by what they export and what we export. At the present time they are sending us of breadstuffs about four times as much as we are sending them. These figures surely indicate that the United States is not and will not be a good market for our surplus breadstuffs. I may say that the figures I am quoting are taken from the report of the Department of Commerce and Labour of the United States government. Yet, Sir, notwithstanding these undeniable facts, there are actually men going through this country and telling the people that the prices of provisions are higher on the other side of the line than they are on this side, notwithstanding the fact that the enormous surplus they have on the other side indicates that such a contention is entirely unreasonable.

Exports of Domestic Merchandise from United States for 1910, as taken from Report of Department of Commerce and Labour at Washington:

Animals..	$ 15,292,411
Breadstuffs..	109,096,306
Hay..	1,092,328
Fruits..	22,460 210
Provisions..	130,851,077
Vegetables..	4,679,828
	$283,472,160

Now I have given you figures in regard to animals, breadstuffs, hay, fruits, provisions and vegetables, which I think will cover pretty thoroughly what the farmer produces and has to sell. The totals for the last year indicate that Canada sold $117,483,629 to Great Britain, and to the United States, $9,210,122. The United States sold to Canada, $32,415,382, and sold altogether of these articles $283,472,160. In view of these facts, which are taken from the reports in our own blue-books and from the authorized reports of the United States government, it does seem to me that in nearly everything which we have to sell the United States has a larger surplus than we have. Well, you may say that I have only made a statement covering one year. One hon. gentleman in this House said that in the United States they were rapidly reaching the time when they could not produce enough for their own home consumption. I wish to prove by figures that that statement is entirely incorrect. I am going to take the figures for the last six years. I will give the imports into Canada for home consumption from the United States for the years 1905 to 1910 inclusive, and I am going to divide those six years into three-year periods, in 1905-6-7 as one period, and 1908-09-10 as the second period, and we will compare what was imported into Canada during the last three years with what was imported for home consumption from the United States during the preceding three years. This will give us a reasonably correct indication of whether there is a falling off in surplus production on the other side of the line.

	Years 1905-6-7.	Years 1908-9-10.
Butter.. .. ..Lbs.	369,343	829,533
Cheese.. .. ..Lbs.	490,976	818,105
Eggs.. .. ..Doz.	1,305,720	2,939,575
Poultry..	$81,258	$140,599
Potatoes.. .. .. ..Bush.	830,096	584,502
Apples.. .. ..Brls.	86,312	152,721
Hay.. .. ..Tons.	22,095	27,279
Vegetables, except potatoes..	$1,388,970	$2,125,577
Meats.. .. ..Lbs.	51,963,884	57,878,318
Barley.. .. ..Bush.	5,443	270,774
Beans.. .. ..Bush.	58,676	61,252
Oats.. .. ..Bush.	557,724	120,220
Pease.. .. ..Bush.	13,333	26,620
Rye.. .. ..Bush.	60,346	85,574
Wheat.. .. ..Bush.	182,038	191,548

Now, if you compare the totals for the last three years with the totals for the three years immediately preceding, you will notice that, with the exception of potatoes and oats, the United States sent far larger quantities into Canada during the last three-year period than during the preceding period. When you examine the imports in the different years you will observe a tendency on the part of the Americans to crowd more and more of their farm produce into Canada, and thereby lower the price of Canadian farm produce in our home market. I would like some hon. gentleman to give an answer to this question. The figures which I have taken from authorized reports indicate clearly that instead of any falling off of surplus production in the United States there is an increase in production, and that instead of the United States sending less to Canada they are sending more and more. I would like some hon. gentleman who is advocating the ratification of this agreement to tell me, if the prices are higher in the United States than they are in Canada—and that is the burden of their song—why it is that they are sending more and more of their stuff to Canada and accepting less money for it.

That is something which I submit for the consideration of these gentlemen, and I am sure that every person will agree with me that if the duties are removed and they have a surplus production there the amount which they will send into our market will be greater than it is at the present time, and they will displace the Canadian's home market, the best market that he has, the market in which he should sell for home consumption.

Let me refer in detail to one or two items in which the people of my county are especially interested. The township of Wolfe Island, in the county of Frontenac produces more hay than any other township in Ontario. It is but natural, therefore, that this agreement should appeal to them, and I may say frankly that it does appeal to them in the matter of giving them sale for their hay. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to that. I do not wish to be at all discourteous, but I was somewhat amused by the statement made by the hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Robb) with regard to hay. That hon. gentleman stated that hay uniformly brought $7 or $8 a ton more in Boston and New York than on this side of the line. I thought his statement was somewhat extravagant. The duty is $4 for the long ton, it is $3.57 for the ton as we have it in this country, and I cannot understand our selling any hay in this country at all. If it is worth $7 or $8 more in New York and Boston than it is here they could easily pay the full amount of duty and have a large margin after selling it in New York and Boston. I think that the hon. gentleman, when he comes to consider the matter, will agree with me that his argument would have been much stronger if he had not made the difference in price quite so large. As I have already said the ton of hay in the United States is always spoken of as the long ton. I have here the report of the United States Department of Agriculture which gives the prices of hay on the other side of the line for thirty or forty years back, and I propose to give the average price of hay for a few years in the United States. The figures are as follow:

Year.	Average price in United States
1904	$ 7.78
1905	7.60
1906	9.25
1907	10.42
1908	8.01
1910	10.93

That is for the short ton, and the figures I am giving are taken from a report of the Department of Agriculture for the United States, the book which I hold in my hand. The figures for New York state for these years are as follow:

Mr. EDWARDS.

Year.	Average price in New York State.
1904	$ 9.32
1905	9.26
1906	10.80
1907	13.82
1908	10.93
1910	12.23

There is a considerable difference between the prices of hay in various states on the other side of the line. I notice that in one year there was as much as $3.55 of a difference in the price between the states of Ohio and the state of New York.

An hon. MEMBER. Which was the higher?

Mr. EDWARDS. The price in New York state was $3.55 higher than in the state of Ohio in that year. With regard to prices, last year the American commissioners who were appointed by resolution of the United States Congress stated in their report that:

> It should be noted that owing to crop shortage the price of hay was unusually high in the United States in 1910.

I want to apply this more particularly to the township that I have called attention to. I have said that the township of Wolfe Island raises a large amount of hay. It is but a short distance from the south shore of Wolfe Island to the American side. It costs 18 cents a hundred to ship hay from Cape Vincent to New York city. That is $3.60 for a ton like ours. It costs $2.20 a ton, or 11 cents a hundred, to ship hay from Kingston, or from Wolfe Island, to Toronto or Montreal. There is a difference in railway rates as between Kingston and Montreal, and Kingston and Toronto, and Cape Vincent and New York of $1.40 a ton. That is by rail. Hay, however, can be shipped from Wolfe Island, or from northern New York by water to either Toronto or Montreal. It cannot be shipped by water to New York city. Of course, it could be shipped by going a roundabout way, but it would go by rail from Cape Vincent or northern New York to New York city. It can be shipped by water from northern New York, or from Wolfe Island to either Toronto or Montreal at about half the railway rate, or $1.25 a ton. Let us take into consideration things as they do sometimes occur. For instance, in 1910, we had in my particular part of Ontario a very good crop of hay, a better crop of hay than they had in New York state. Taking one year with another New York state produces about the same amount of hay as Ontario, namely, about 6,500,000 tons. We will suppose that there was a good crop of hay in New York state, and an indifferent or comparatively poor

crop in Frontenac county. In such a year as that those people in Wolfe Island who produce large quantities of hay would be getting from the consumers in Canada a large price for their hay. But we will take an American buyer in northern New York state. He buys a quantity of hay in northern New York, and looks around to see where he can ship it to. There is a shortage in Ontario, and the price of hay has gone up in Toronto and Montreal. He considers the price in Toronto, he takes into consideration the price in Montreal, and he looks at the price in New York and Boston.

He says: Now if I ship hay to New York it will cost me $2.35 a ton more than it will to send it to Toronto or Montreal, and, in the case of an especially poor crop of hay on our side of the line and an especially good crop on the other side, a case where the people on that particular island would stand to gain, I think, when the duty is off, they will be up against serious competition from hay being brought into Canada from the American side. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to direct the attention of the committee to the matter of horses. We have in Canada 2,213,199 horses and they have in the United States 21,040,000 horses in addition to over 4,000,000 mules. Of the horses in Canada 1,586,000 are in Ontario, Quebec, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba. There are more horses in the state of Iowa alone than there are in these six provinces put together. There are 1,600,000 horses in the state of Iowa alone, or more than you will find in all Canada from the western boundary of Manitoba to the Atlantic ocean. Some people have said that in the event of ratification of this agreement we will get a better market for our horses than we have now, but I am convinced that if this agreement is ratified the horse breeders in Ontario and Quebec stand to lose from $25 to $50 on every horse, and later on I will give the reasons why. The official figures indicate a larger and larger importation of horses year after year into Canada from the United States. In the year 1908 the United States exported altogether 18,516 horses of which they sent 14,019 to Canada; in 1909 the United States exported 23,428 horses altogether, of which they sent 18,616 to Canada; in the year 1910 the United States exported 29,359 horses, of which they sent to Canada 25,604. In these three years the United States exported altogether 71,303 horses, of which they sent 58,239 to Canada. You will notice from these figures that last year the United States sent 7,000 more horses to Canada than they did in 1909, and in 1909 they sent about 4,000 horses more than in 1908, which does not indicate any falling off in the horse business on the other sde of the line.

The report of the Tariff Commissioners appointed by the United States Congress says that the average price of horses in the United States is $25 lower than in the Dominion of Canada, and if you apply that to the number of horses which were sold out of my own county of Frontenac last year, that difference in price would mean a loss to the farmers of my county of $32,750. Last year the province of Ontario sold to the Northwest 20,000 horses, and our Ontario farmers obtained good figures for these animals. The Ontario farmers have been encouraged of late years to go into the horse business, and they are giving it a great deal of attention, and are producing a class of horse which is very acceptable in the Northwest. If you take the average price obtained by the Ontario farmers for these 20,000 at $200 each, that would mean $4,000,000 that came into the pockets of the Ontario farmers last year from the horse trade with the west, or at an average price of $175 each it would mean $3,500,000 to the Ontario farmers. I have said, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion the ratification of this agreement means a loss of from $25 to $50 per horse to the farmers of Ontario and Quebec, and I will give you my reason for that statement. The farmers of Ontario and Quebec cannot raise horses as cheaply as they can in the United States, because in some of the states south of the line the horses can run out all the year round, and in these states they produce two or three crops of alfalfa in the year, and when they wish to put the horse in good condition they can feed a little corn of which the United States raises more than all the rest of the world put together. On the other hand, the Ontario and Quebec farmers have to stable their horses for four, five, or six months in the year, and in view of this conditon is any argument necessary to prove that they cannot compete, in the matter of raising horses, against the climatic and other conditions which prevail south of the line. Remove the duty on horses as this agreement proposes, and the horses which are now supplied by Ontario and Quebec to Saskatchewan and the west at good prices will be supplied from the western states where they can produce horses at a much lower figure than we can. The average price of horses in New York state, as given by the statistical year-book published by the Department of Agriculture of the United States is $114, the average price in Ohio $113, and the average price in Pennsylvania $116. Let me say that these three states, which lie just across the border from Ontario, have more horses than there are in all Canada. The state of Iowa has 1,600,000, and the average price as given by this book published by the United States government is $111; the state of Illinois has 1,623,000 and the average price of horses is

$109; the state of Nebraska has 1,035,000 horses, and the average price is $91; the state of Kansas has 1,152,000, and the average price is $89. Here are four states which lie hundreds of miles nearer to the Northwest than do Ontario and Quebec. These four states have 5,410,000 horses, the average price of which is $100, and they have more than double the number of horses there are in all Canada. Let any person look at the map of North America and see the location of these four states; let him take into consideration the climatic conditions there and here, and I am sure that any man who gives the matter consideration will agree with me that the ratification of this agreement will mean the loss of the western Canadian horse market to Ontario and Quebec, which to our farmers in these two representative provinces is a serious loss indeed. I want now to refer to our cattle trade, which is a matter of very great interest to all our agriculturalists. There are in Canada 2,849,306 dairy cows, and in the United States 21,801,000 dairy cows. The average price for all Canada of dairy cows is $43 per head; the average price for the United States is $35.79. The average price of dairy cows in New Hampshire is $36.20; in Vermont, $34.20; in New York state, $39.50, and in Ontario, $48.

Canada has of other cattle 4,384,779 head. The United States has 47,279,000 head. The average price of these other cattle in the United States is $19.41 and in Canada $31. The average price in New Hampshire is $20.30 in Vermont $14.40, New York state $18.20, and in Ontario $34. I have already stated what Canada exported in cattle. Our exportation of cattle to the United States is decreasing year by year while the number they are sending here is on the increase.

What I have said in regard to horses applies also to cattle; any farmer knows that it costs more to feed cattle in cold weather than in warm weather. Where you have to keep your cattle in the stable the expense is greater than where the stock can run out doors. I have no doubt that in the event of the ratification of this agreement American buyers will come over here to buy our unfinished cattle, but it is unreasonable for us to suppose that the American buyer will give us what is now the average price here of these cattle; the price which he will give us will be rather the average price of such cattle in the United States. Will any man argue that as soon as the duty is removed the price of these cattle will be fixed by the smaller number in Canada as against the larger number in the United States? That seems to me to be absolutely unreasonable. They have about twelve cattle to our one. Will any man argue that the one cow in Canada will control and fix the price rather than the twelve on the other side of the line? I cannot see it in that way nor do I believe that any farmer will. If when they buy our cattle the Americans have not enough hay and coarse feed of their own they will come over here and take away our hay. Do we stand to gain by such an arrangement? If they take our unfinished cattle over there and feed their rough stuff to them they will have the benefit of these cattle in keeping up the fertility of their soil, and they will obtain for the finished cattle finished prices. In that way the American farmer will also obtain a better price for his rough grains.

The price of bran and shorts is an important element in considering this question of cattle raising. At present if you compare the price of bran and shorts in Buffalo and Toronto, Windsor and Detroit, Winnipeg and Minneapolis, it will be seen that the average price per ton in Canada is from 50 cents to $4.50 lower in Canada than in the United States. The American farmer lacks one thing to make him king in the production of cattle and hogs. That one thing is the by-products of wheat. If our wheat goes from here to the other side of the line to be ground, as it is only natural to suppose it will if this agreement is ratified, the by-products will go with it. With cheaper bran and shorts to supplement the immense quantities of corn which they produce and which we cannot, they will have the advantage over the Canadian at every stage of the game in feeding cattle or hogs.

I find that the average prices of live cattle for a number of years back in Toronto and Chicago have been per cwt.:

Year.	Price in Toronto.	Price in Chicago.
1901, May..	$4.25	$3.95
1902, May..	5.25	5.00
1903, May..	4.90	4.06
1904, May..	5.20	4.90
1905, May..	5.70	5.50
1906, May..	5.10	4.00
1907, May..	5.12½	4.00
1908, May..	5.50	5.00
1909, May..	5.75	5.10
1910, May..	7.00	6.25

Of sheep Canada has 2,705,390 and the United States has 57,216,000. The state of Ohio alone has half as many sheep as there are in all Canada. The average price of sheep as given in this report, which is neither a Grit nor a Tory document, but the report of the Tariff Commissioners appointed by the United States Congress, is in the United States $4.08 and in Canada $6. The price in New Hampshire is $3.70, in Vermont $4, in New York $5 and in Ontario $7. In connection with sheep raising we must consider the admission to our markets of New Zealand, Australia, and the Argentine mutton as a factor in regulating prices here. The imports of mutton

from Australia alone to Canada since 1905 have been as follows:

Australia in 1905 sent us 60,136 pounds of mutton; 1906, 354,575 lbs.; 1907, 990,556 lbs.; 1908, 1,162,837 lbs.; 1909, 1,113,411 lbs.; 1910, 1,377,270 lbs.

I would ask you to note the gradual increase year by year in our imports of Australian mutton. They have grown from 60,000 pounds in 1905 to 1,377,000 in 1910.

I noticed the following item in the Toronto 'World' the other day, dated April 11:

One hundred and thirty-nine clipped lambs were brought from Buffalo yesterday, and sold on the Toronto market at $7 per cwt. This is only one incident, as similar sales have been made for several weeks past.

When the Americans can afford to bring their lambs from the other side of the line, pay the duty and sell on the Toronto market in competition with our own farmers to-day, what will happen when the duty is removed and these lambs and sheep can come in from the other side of the line without paying any duty whatever?

Another matter in which the farmers of this country are very keenly interested is hogs. We have in Canada 2,753,964 hogs and the United States has 54,147,000. The State of Iowa alone has 7,908,000, or nearly three times as many as we have in all Canada. The average price per head in the United States was, in 1909, $6.55, and in Canada $11.30. In 1910, the average price was $9.14 in the United States and $11.30 in Canada. Let me now give the average price for the last four years in the markets of Chicago, Montreal, Buffalo, Toronto, Peterborough and Hull. I select Chicago because it is the centre of the meat trade in the United States and Montreal, because it is the acknowledged centre of that trade in Canada. I select Buffalo and Toronto because they are lying comparatively near the one to the other; and I take Peterborough and Hull because both those places have packing establishments. The prices per cwt. for live hogs in these different places were as follow:

AVERAGE PRICES FOR LAST FOUR YEARS, PER CWT.

Year.	Chicago.	Montreal.	Buffalo.	Toronto.	Peterborough.	Hull.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1907	6 10	7 43	6 67	6 94	7 01	7 02
1908	5 70	7 10	6 22	6 57	6 71	6 79
1909	7 35	8 64	7 92	8 06	8 25	8 55
1910	8 90	9 60	9 58	9 13	9 26	9 30
Average ..	7 01	8 19	7 59	7 67	7 80	7 92

In October, 1907, the price of hogs dropped in Chicago to $3.80 per cwt. while at the same time the price in Montreal was $6.65 per cwt. Remove the duty and what will occur? If a large number is shipped to Chicago and the price falls there $2 or $3 per cwt. live weight less than in Montreal, a few carloads will be shipped from the west to Montreal and down will go the price in that city.

If you take the difference between the average prices in Chicago and Montreal during the last four years, that difference would represent to the farmers of the county of Frontenac a loss on the number and quantity killed in that county last year of $26,239, and a loss on the number sold or killed in Ontario of $2,176,397, and the loss to the farmers in the province of Quebec would be very little less. In view of these facts, it would be well for us to pause and consider what this proposed agreement will result in before ratifying it.

Probably there is no matter which appeals more keenly to the farmers of eastern Ontario and western Quebec than the production of cheese. I want to point out in this connection that should we ratify this agreement, our farmers in Ontario or Quebec would stand to make a slight gain, but that gain would not be anything like the difference which has existed between the prices of cheese on this and the other side of the line during the last two or three years. During those years, there has been a considerable difference in the prices on both sides of the line. But in my opinion the reason is this. The duty of 6 cents per pound imposed by the United States on cheese has absolutely excluded the imports of that article from all other countries and thereby enabled the American speculator to control prices in the American market. This he does by simply buying up a few thousand and placing them in a warehouse and only taking them out when the market suits. As a proof that this is done, I find in the report of the United States Department of Commerce and Labour that on the 1st of January, 1911, there were 375 tons of cheese still in warehouses in the United States and on the 1st of January, 1910, nearly 500 tons. What would happen if we had free trade in cheese? Canada exported last year more than three times as much cheese as the rest of the world put together. Our market for that is England. The price of cheese in Liverpool will regulate the price in Canada, whether we have free trade with the United States or not. At present the representatives of the various Montreal houses attend our cheese boards throughout Ontario and Quebec and bid against one another. Every day before the board opens, they are instructed

by the firms they represent how high they can bid, and every day these firms receive their cable despatches from Liverpool giving the prices in that centre. What would occur if an American buyer attended the cheese board? It is absurd to contend that if a Montreal firm bids 10 cents for cheese, the American will jump in with a bid of 12 cents. Is that the way the Yankee is built? If it is, I must confess that I have misunderstood him all my life. One sixteenth of a cent advance bid will clear the board any day and give to the buyer his choice of as many cheese as he wants. It is therefore nonsense for any one to say that a buyer who can get what he wants by an advance of one sixteenth of a cent will bid an advance of two or three cents. In the event of free trade you will simply have a levelling of prices, and the prices in Liverpool will continue to rule.

There is another thing which our dairymen ought to consider. Some years ago they were much concerned over the fact that certain Canadian buyers were bringing American cheese to Canada and shipping it by way of Montreal to England as Canadian cheese. Our Canadian cheese, because of that, was suffering in reputation. It is well known that the American cheese is much softer than ours and is considered by the British palate as inferior to ours. But how are you going to prevent this mixing of Canadian and American cheese in the event of a free interchange of natural products between the two countries. You may say that if American cheese were being shipped through Canada by way of Montreal to the old country we could stop that. That is all very well, but how could you prevent an American buyer from taking a thousand boxes of Canadian cheese across to the other side of the line and mixing it with a thousand boxes of American cheese, and marking it all 'made in Canada.'

And your reputation in the English market will be thereby jeopardized. That is a very serious matter and one which should be given very careful attention. Now, it is true that we have been shipping to the other side of the line during the last year considerable quantities of cream, because of the reduction in the duty to five cents per gallon. I put a question on the Order Paper a little time ago asking for the quantity and value of milk and cream sent from Canada into the United States during the past year. There is one very notable feature about the return, and that is that during the last three months, January, February and March, there has been a decided falling off in the quantity of cream sent from Canada to the south side of the line. In this connection, allow me to place on 'Hansard' a letter received a few days ago by a gentleman living in the county of Leeds:

Montreal, April 12, 1911

W. R. Kaiser, Esq.,
Mitchelville, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Replying to yours of the 11th instant.

The Canadian cheese market is rather quiet, particularly for white, as there is no export yet; the few coloured that are coming in are being sold for home trade; besides, the price of fodder in the States is so cheap that it will affect our market. We bought both white and coloured there this week at 10 cents.

If you wish to ship yours in we will guarantee you 11 cents, and if they are worth more we will pay it. See that they are well cured. Or, if you are not satisfied with these prices, call Mr. McVeigh up at Brockville and he will do the best possible for you, should there be any change.

Yours truly,
JAS. ALEXANDER LIMITED
Per J. A.

This letter is from one of the best known cheese buying firms on the continent of America. It is dated only about a week ago and it clearly indicates that the price of cheese on this side of the line at present is better than on the other side. The reduction in the exportation of cream goes to show that the price of that commodity has fallen on the other side of the line. Let me give another instance, and this I quote from a well-known Liberal journal, the 'British Whig,' published in the city of Kingston. The item is headed 'Cheese will be made as the price of cream has taken a drop.' It is dated Newboro, April 15, and appears in the 'Whig' of April 17. The item is as follows:

J. H. Singleton, Smith's Falls, owner of the cheese factories in this locality, spent a few days last week in town. Both factories will make cheese this season, as the price of the cream in the American markets is very low.

Last year, Mr. Singleton put in the necessary machinery for the making of casein, and shipped both cream and casein from his factories to the United States. This year, the price has dropped, he leaves the machinery unused and is going back to the making of cheese. These things indicate the uncertainty of the American market for our Canadian farmers in the matter of cheese. There is another feature of this cheese business, which, I think, is worthy of serious attention, especially of the people of eastern Ontario and western Quebec. I find that in the State of Illinois, they have 1,229,000 milch cows in Wisconsin, 1,462,000 in Minnesota, 1,092,000 in Iowa, 1,586,000, a total of 5,369,000 cows in these four States, or twice as many dairy cattle in these four States as we have in all Canada. And a glance at the map of North America will show where these states are located. They are located

hundreds of miles nearer our Northwest than are the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. One of the arguments being advanced by men from these states in favour of the ratification of this agreement is that, in the event of this agreement going into force, these states will supply Manitoba and Saskatchewan with cheese, butter and other dairy products which are now being supplied by Ontario and Quebec. I stated a little while ago that Canada exported last year 180,000,000 pounds of cheese. But four or five years ago, Canada exported something over 225,000,000 pounds of cheese. We are not producing, I take it, less cheese than we did four or five years ago. Where, then, does the cheese go to? The falling off in the export simply means that a larger quantity of cheese is being consumed at home. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan, which in my humble judgment will never be cheese producing provinces, we have an ever-growing market for our surplus production of cheese and butter from Ontario and Quebec. And I say that it is worthy of the attention of our farmers in Ontario and Quebec the possibility, indeed I may say the probability, that in the event of the ratification of this agreement, they will stand to lose that very important market.

Advocates of this agreement say that in the event of ratification our farmers in Canada will obtain entrance to the American market which will give them higher prices for everything they have to sell than they obtain at present in Canada. It is a very remarkable thing to me that, if that statement is correct, hundreds of farmers are leaving their farms in Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio—deliberately leaving their farms where, according to the advocates of this agreement, the prices of every thing are higher than in Canada—and coming to Canada where they will get less. Last year the United States took their decennial census. It is the custom there to hand out to the press statistics as fast as they get them—that is, before they have all their census statistics compiled and ready to put in book-form, they hand out the figures of the several states as they get them ready.

I have in my hand the advance press sheets of three states on the other side of the line. These advance press sheets give statistics for the states of Vermont, New Hampshire and Massachusetts, and were sent to me by Mr. Durand, the chief director of the Census Statistical Bureau at Washington. I notice that in the state of Vermont, in the last ten years, there is a decrease in the total number of farms of 506, and a decrease in the total acreage of farms of 71,000. In improved acreage, there is a decrease of 495,000, or 23 per cent of the total acreage. Of mortgaged farms, there are 13,117, 47 per cent of the whole. In the state of New Hampshire, in the ten years, there has been a decrease of 2,077, or 8 per cent in the total number of farms, and a decrease of 368,000 acres, or 10 per cent of the total acreage. In improved acreage, there was a decrease of 150,000 acres, or 14 per cent. Of mortgaged farms, there were 6,210, or 25 per cent. In the state of Massachusetts the number of farms decreased in the ten years, 1,203, the total acreage, 277,000, in improved acreage, the decrease was 130,000. The number of mortgaged farms was 11,941, or 38 per cent of the total in 1900; and 12,973, or 45 per cent of the total, in 1910. Yet the states of Vermont, New Hampshire and Massachusetts are right at hand to this great Boston market which hon. gentlemen say will make Canadian farmers rich if they can get into it. In those three states there are nearly 4,000 abandoned farms in ten years. Now, if conditions are so much better on the other side of the line in those states which are convenient to the great markets of Boston, New York, Brooklyn and Pittsburg, and where they have free trade, why is it, if prices of everything the farmer produces there are so much higher than prices here, that the number of mortgaged farms has increased so rapidly? Why are the farmers leaving their farms and coming into Canada, where hon. gentlemen tell us that the price of everything is lower than it is on the other side of the line? I do not think their argument is reasonable. As a matter of fact, the prices of nearly every thing the farmer has to sell in Canada are higher than on the other side. Our market is better. Take the article of eggs: We exported altogether last year 160,000 dozen, while from the United States in the month of February alone, we imported 719,000 dozen, and paid the duty. Now as a matter of fact we are not producing enough eggs in Canada for our home consumption, and on the other hand, the United States are producing a surplus which they are selling to other countries. If there is anything at all in the old theory of supply and demand, it is unreasonable to say that the price of eggs will be higher in the United States where they have a surplus, more than they require for their own needs, than it is in Canada where we do not produce enough for our own needs. The same with regard to meat, the same with regard to butter, to horses, cattle, sheep and hogs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister in speaking on this subject stated as reported in 'Hansard' page 4859:

> The manufacturer is the best friend of the farmer.

That is hardly in accordance with the kind of talk that is dealt out in certain

places in this country. There has been, in my estimation, a very determined effort to try and divide this country into two classes, to place the farmer in opposition to the manufacturer, and the manufacturer in opposition to the farmer. I agree with the Prime Minister when he says that the manufacturer is the best friend of the farmer, and the farmer is the best friend of the manufacturer. I do not think that the manufacturer should have it all his own way, and I do think that in many things the manufacturer has had too high a protection. But the manufacturer is a friend of the farmer, and I will tell you why. Suppose that A has a farm five miles from the city of Toronto, a farm of 100 acres, and C has a farm of 100 acres ten miles from the city of Toronto, both farms having the same kind of soil and the same value in buildings. Now which of those two farms will be worth the more money? Undoubtedly the farm which is nearer the city. Why? Because of its proximity to a good market. So by building up cities and towns we are providing for the farmer a market which, I believe, the farmer values above any other market. But I do think that we have not been following a proper policy, we have not been giving to the farmer his fair share of protection. It was stated years ago when the National Policy was introduced, that while the farmer, because of protection accorded to the manufacturers, had to pay a little more for his machinery, the policy of protection would build up in Canada towns and cities, and thereby provide the farmer with a home market which, to a certain extent, would reimburse him for the extra amount he was obliged to pay for his machinery. Now that is all right. The National Policy did work out in that way, and cities and towns have been built up, and the farmer has reaped certain advantages therefrom. But I submit that the farmer has not been used squarely, because, while he has been obliged to pay more for his machinery on account of protection accorded to the manufacturer, he has not had the protection which he should have been given to enable him to supply this home market which he helped to build up. I contend that instead of taking the duties off his articles and obliging the Canadian farmer to compete with practically the whole agricultural world, what we should do is to take into consideration the cost of production in those other countries, and give to the farmer a sufficient amount of protection to allow him to supply the home market which he has helped to build up. For instance, it strikes me as entirely unreasonable, and I made this statement before in the House, that we should permit the United States to send into Canada, as they did last year, over $3,500,000 worth of pork by paying a duty of two cents a pound when they exclude our pork from going into their country by a duty of five cents a pound. That is absolutely unjust and unreasonable. They have certain advantages over there in the production of pork which should be considered.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has outlined a proper policy for this country, and that is that we should have a permanent tariff commission appointed along the line of the railway commission to inquire into prices and the cost of production, not only of manufactured articles but of farm products as well, and not only in Canada but in the United States, Denmark, Argentina, and all those other countries that the Canadian farmers have to compete with, taking into consideration the cost of production in those countries and in Canada and giving the Canadian farmer just such an amount of protection as will enable him to compete on fair terms with the people of those countries. Is it reasonable or fair to expect the Canadian farmer to compete with the Argentine farmer in the production of wheat where they pay 64 cents a day for wages while we pay two or three times that amount in Canada? If we wish the farmers in Canada to maintain their standard of living, and their standard of living is certainly higher than the standard of living adopted by the people in Argentine, if we desire to see their children educated and their homes comfortable, and if the cost of producing their stuff is greater here than it is there, then I am a protectionist to this extent that I would place upon these products such an amount of duty as will enable our Canadian farmers to compete with the cheap labour of these other countries on fair terms, taking into consideration rates of wages, climatic conditions, the cost of transportation, &c.

Now, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have told us that when they were at Washington they positively refused to consider reciprocal trade in manufactures. It is true that this government, in 1907, reduced the duty on agricultural implements from 20 to 17½ per cent. That was a short time before the last general election, and I remember distinctly that throughout the country appeals were made to the farmers by Liberal orators that the Liberal party had started in to put the manufacturer in his proper place, that they were starting in to redeem the pledge which they had made in their convention of 1893, that they were going at last to cut off the head of protection and later to trample on its body. I think those were the words of the right hon. Prime Minister. Well, they started in by taking 2½ per cent off agricultural implements, and they went to the farmer and said: See what we have done for you; we have reduced the duty on

agricultural implements. They turned around to the manufacturer in 1907 and told him just what they are telling him to-day on the floor of this House: Do not be one bit alarmed; we are not going to hurt you. They went to their customs officers and instructed them to raise the valuation for duty of binders from $80 to $100 so that, whereas, under the Conservative duty of 20 per cent, they collected on a binder but $16, with the rate of duty reduced to 17½ per cent, they collect $17.50. This is what was in the mind of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), who is a farmer himself, when the Minister of Finance presented this pact to the House and when he stated that it was proposed to reduce the duty on agricultural implements from 17½ per cent to 15 per cent. My hon. friend from Dundas asked this question of the Minister of Finance:

Mr. BRODER. Is there any change to be made in the valuation for duty?

Mr. FIELDING. Our negotiations have not touched the question of valuation; that must be left to the operation of the customs authorities of the two countries.

Well, that is what they did in 1907, and that is what they propose to do now, so that if this agreement goes into operation and the duty is reduced to 15 per cent, I presume they will instruct their customs officials to raise the valuation of a binder for duty purposes from $100 to probably $150 or $120, and thereby collect more duty than they would at the 17½ per cent rate.

But, Mr. Chairman, this same party had for 18 years stated that if they once got into power they would take the duties off, they would do away with these duties, with this protection that was accorded to the manufacturers. If they were sincere in that, if they really wish to grant relief to the farmers, the relief that the farmers have been asking for many years in the form of a reduction in the duties on agricultural implements, there is a standing offer by the United States to make agricultural implements free as soon as this government see fit to do this also. If this government wish to make agricultural implements free there is the opportunity. The fact that they have not availed themselves of the offer of the United States shows conclusively that they have no intention of making any considerable reduction in the duty on agricultural implements. For my part, I take this view in regard to agricultural implements; I want to see these implements manufactured in Canada, I prefer to see them made here than to see them made in an outside country, but I do think that when the Massey-Harris Company can go to France, Austria, New Zealand, Australia and other countries and successfully meet the competition of the McCormicks and the Deerings, the amount of protection that they have at the present time is more than is necessary to enable them to go on and do business. Last year we had pretty strong evidence in this country that there was a combine or merger with regard to cement; at all events the price of cement jumped about forty or fifty cents a barrel. There was an opportunity for these gentlemen who went to Washington to do something in the interest of the farmer, because cement is something that almost every farmer uses more or less of. But, as a matter of fact, the only reduction they made in the duty on cement was a reduction of 1½ cents per 100 lbs.

Mr. MILLER. Would the hon. gentleman advise a further reduction in the duty?

Mr. EDWARDS. Undoubtedly I would. That answer, I presume, is emphatic and to the point. I do not see any reason why the duty should not have been reduced as much by this government on cement coming into Canada as it was reduced by the American government on cement going into the United States. On other things they made the rates the same but there is a difference of three cents per hundred pounds on cement. The rate is 3 cents per hundred pounds higher on cement coming into Canada than the rate on cement going into the United States. One of the arguments advanced by advocates of this agreement is that it is not a treaty for a fixed term of years, and that if it does not work out satisfactorily it can be done away with. As to that, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have declared that they would not have been justified in going to all this trouble if this agreement were not intended to remain in effect for a considerable period. But suppose we found this arrangement working unsatisfactorily and that we wished to repeal it in a year or two, the United States government would doubtless say that the agreement was intended to remain in force for a considerable period and that to repeal it would be a breach of faith, which of course would lead to international irritation. Then, suppose this agreement worked satisfactorily to one section of Canada and that another section of our people met with competition from outside countries that was ruinous to them, one section of the community would be anxious for its repeal, while another section would advocate its retention and this would lead to endless confusion and turmoil. If this agreement should have the effect which its advocates on both sides of the line, regardless of politics say it will have, of changing our trade from east to west to north and south, it seems to me that much of the effort the Canadian people have been

making for years past will be lost. We Canadians for a great many years have been struggling to perfect our canal system and to build transcontinental lines of railway; we have been trying to bind the various provinces together into a united country and while we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars towards that end we have scarcely received even a pleasant look from the people of the United States. But now that we have passed through our period of struggle, now that we have demonstrated our ability to make of these scattered provinces a great united nation, the Americans come and say: Let us in on the ground floor to share in your prosperity. Well, Sir, I do not think we are under any obligation to the people of the United States to do that for them. There is one other point to which I wish to refer and that is the question of annexation. I may say that I have every faith in the people of Canada, I do not believe that they can be influenced by dollars to sever their connection with the British Empire, but while that is true of the people of the older provinces would it not be unreasonable to expect from the tens of thousands of Americans and foreigners in our northwest the same regard for British institutions that we have. I have every confidence in the people of the older provinces in that regard, but I do think it would be unreasonable to expect that these strangers to our country would have the same respect for British institutions that we have, and I feel that we are neglecting our duty if we fail to examine the question from that aspect as well as from its economic side. We must, therefore, consider this question in the light of its effect on our relations to the British Empire as well as on our relations with the United States. But, Mr. Chairman, whatever may be our opinions in regard to annexation in this country—and I agree with those on both sides of the House who have preceded me in the view that there is no annexation feeling in this country worth mentioning—yet, the same cannot be said of the feeling entertained by prominent men in the United States. Their expressions indicate at least that in their opinion there is more in this compact than a mere trade agreement. One of the Senators from Wisconsin, speaking in the United States Congress said:

> There is not a citizen of the United States who would raise his voice against the admission of Canada to the Union, thus bringing about almost the identical conditions to be achieved by this treaty.

Mr. Young, one of the Senators from New York, said:

> It seems as though in the course of time that the American continent will be one people living under one flag, and by her influence bringing about amity throughout the world, which is the desire of all thinking, God-fearing men.

Now, whatever may be said of Mr. Champ Clark, he certainly occupies a position in the United States which ranks him as a prominent citizen; he is a leader of the Democratic party and a possible presidential candidate, and this is what Mr. Clark says:

> I look forward to the time when the American flag will fly over every square foot of British North America up to the north pole. The people of Canada are of our blood and our language. If the treaty of 1854 never had been abrogated, our countries would be much further advanced than now towards this end.
>
> Mr. Martin of South Dakota interrupted and said:
>
> Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and make free trade on all products?
>
> Mr. Clark—By taking Canada in to become a part of the United States—Yes.
>
> Then Mr. Norris of Nebraska asked: As I understand it, the gentleman favours the Bill for at least one reason, that it will have a tendency in the end to bring Canada into the union?
>
> Mr. Clark replied—Yes, I have no doubt about that.

This is the same Mr. Clark who used the words which created a certain sensation in this country at the time: We are preparing to annex Canada. The expression of these prominent men in the United States and the articles published in the newspapers and magazines of that country indicate that there is a feeling there that if this agreement is ratified it will be the entering of the thin end of the wedge; that, to use the words of President Taft, 'we are at the parting of the ways,' and that the time has come when the United States should make a move which may lead to the political union of the two countries. While one takes into consideration these statements one cannot get away from the fact that prominent men in this country have given expression at different times to sentiments which would or should cause the people of Canada to pause before they ratify this agreement. I call to mind statements made use of by no less a person than the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who said:

> I am a subject of the British Crown, but whenever it comes to pass that as a Canadian I have to choose between the interests of England and the interests of Canada, my whole heart is with my native land. It is manifest to me that the interests of my country are identical with the interests of the United States, and it is upon the broad basis of continental freedom of trade that I

place the question before the people of this nation.

We cannot exclude from our minds in considering this question the utterances of the right hon. the Prime Minister in times past; we cannot forget, in considering this, not from the economic standpoint, but from the national standpoint, the occasion when the Prime Minister said that the independence of Canada was the goal of his ambition. I cannot forget that, in speaking in Boston, and in other places on the other side of the line, he indicated rather a feeling of hostility towards the mother land and made use of expressions which I thought did not come with good grace from one occupying his prominent position.

It has been said by advocates of this agreement that it is in the interests of the farmer. It is said that the manufacturing centres are opposed to this agreement, and advocates of it attempt to make much of that. The reason why the cities, the manufacturing centres, have shown opposition to this pact is not very hard to get at. If this agreement is ratified the manufacturers see that it must and will logically be followed by a further demand for the removal of duties on manufactured articles as well, there is no getting around that. If this agreement is ratified it will place the farmer in this position that in every thing he produces and has to sell he has to compete without any protection against practically the whole agricultural world. The farmer of Canada is certainly going to follow this up by a demand that the manufacturer shall be treated as he is treated, and I would like to know what party or what government can resist such a reasonable demand. for I maintain that if this agreement is ratified, and the farmers appeal to parliament, or to any party in this country that inasmuch as they have no protection, therefore, no other class in the community should have protection, their demand would be absolutely reasonable and just so the manufacturer realizes that this is but the beginning, that it will be logically followed by a demand for the removal of all duties. That brings us back to the matter as it was fought out in 1891, when the policy of the Liberal party as laid down by the same right hon. gentleman was commercial union, a policy which meant, in the opinion of Hon. Edward Blake, the ultimate political union of the two countries, so that while in 1891 the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury Benches, were candid enough to come out and say that their object was to have freedom of trade throughout the whole of North America, it seems to me they are adopting a slightly different course now, but a course which ultimately leads to the same result. If you carry that to its logical conclusion it means not only a removal of all duties on manufactured articles as well as on farm products, but it means direct taxation, because if you remove your duties on everything you must collect your revenue by direct taxation, and when revenue is collected in that way there is one class of people in this community who will be taxed to the last cent, and that is the farmers. The farmer cannot hide his farm, or his horses, or his cattle; the man living in the city, the wealthy man, the merchant, or the manufacturer, may put some of his wealth in stocks and bonds, and so evade the assessor, but the farmer is the one man who in case of direct taxation will pay to the last copper on everything he has. That is one thing the farmers have to face if you carry this agreement to its logical conclusion. The farmers of Canada are considering this matter, and the farmers of the county of Frontenac are turning their backs on it every day, and every moment of the day. I beg to prophesy that inside of two months you will see the farmers of Canada from east to west almost solidly opposed to this agreement which carries with it absolutely nothing for them but the competition of the whole world in everything they have to produce, and obliges them to pay a higher price for everything they have to buy, and which is necessary for them in carrying on their farming operations.

On motion of Mr. Beauparlant, committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.08 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FRIDAY, April 21, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

WAYS AND MEANS—EXPORT OF CATTLE TO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BLAIN. In the returns of the Department of Customs, under the general statement of exports, I notice these figures: Cattle, 1 year old or less, exported to the United States, $23,679; cattle over 1 year, $618,995. These are the total exports of cattle to the United States according to the last fiscal returns. I would like to know whether included in the cattle cov-

ered by these figures are those purchased by United States buyers and sent to the United States in bond, their destination being Great Britain.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the point, and see that an answer is given to my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) at an early day.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought that would be a simple question.

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Customs is not here, and in his absence the information is not available.

DISEASED HORSES.

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the serious danger which is threatening the health of horses in the vicinity of the United States, particularly in the counties of Dorchester, Beauce and Compton.

I have it on the best authority that an outbreak of glanders has occurred among horses in the northern districts of Maine, and I wish to corroborate that statement by reading a letter I have just received from my colleague, Mr. Godbout, who represents the county of Beauce in the Quebec legislature. It reads as follows:

Dr. H. S. Béland, M.P.,
Ottawa.

My dear doctor,—I wish to inform you that within the last month a hundred horses affected with glanders have been slaughtered at Jackman, Maine. This is the season when our shantymen come back home from Maine where they have spent the winter season with their teams.

We are evidently threatened with an outbreak of glanders, and it would be necessary for an officer to be permanently stationed here.

As you are aware that disease is a menace to the public health and several people out here are rather afraid of the spread of the disease.

I wish to keep you informed about the state of affairs, but I do not want to insist, as I did formerly. I only wish to relieve myself of any responsibility.

Yours truly,
ARTHUR E. GODBOUT.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Godbout and I have urged the department to appoint a permanent veterinary inspector in the vicinity of the American boundary at that particular place.

Up to now I do not think the authorities have acceded to our request. The matter is one of some importance, as it appears that an epidemic of glanders and farcy among horses is liable to give rise to certain morbid manifestations among men. Therefore, I hope the hon. minister will give the matter his immediate attention.

Mr BLAIN.

Mr. FISHER. I shall be very happy to have an examination made into the facts concerning this epidemic in the state of Maine. We have an arrangement with the government of the United States by which their veterinary authorities notify us in case of any such epidemic. I do not think that any such notification has been received, but I will certainly have the veterinary department examine into the condition of affairs, and take the necessary precautions to prevent the spread of the disease into Canada.

JUDICIAL VACANCY IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether any appointment has been made to fill the vacancy on the judicial bench of Prince Edward Island, to which reference was made not long ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has not been made yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I would like again to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to the very great importance of filling this vacancy. The circumstances are well known to the right hon. gentleman, (Sir Wilrfid Laurier) and they are also well known to the people of Prince Edward Island who have been suffering greatly from the neglect of the government in this regard. We have been informed in this House that there are cases on the docket of the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island which have been waiting to be heard by the Court of Appeals since 1908. Now, for part of that delay, the government obviously are not responsible, for it was due in the first place to the illness of Mr. Justice Hodgson. But Mr. Justice Hodgson resigned in October last, as I am informed—indeed the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., (Mr. Fraser) has stated the fact in this House. I believe that on this point there is absolutely no dispute. Six months have elapsed since that time, and the vacancy has not yet been filled. There is no reason, so far as we can judge, or so far as we have heard from the government, why that vacancy should not have been filled within three or four weeks at the outside. The matter was brought to the attention of the government by the hon. member for Kings, P. E.I., on the 20th January last. The answer of the Prime Minister at that time was that he had been very busy. In his subsequent reference to the same subject, he admitted that that was either a poor excuse, or no excuse at all. The Prime Minister, on the 20th of January, practically stated that the appointment would be made in a very short time. More than three months have elapsed since then, yet

no appointment has been made. In speaking upon this question on the 7th of this month, I stated that 'this delay in filling judicial offices for reasons of political expediency amounted to no more nor less than a trafficking in the appointments to the judicial bench of this country; it is absolutely nothing short of that.' And I desire to repeat to-day what I then said. If the government have any just reason or excuse, or any shadow or reason or excuse for not making this appointment, it ought to be stated to the House and the country. Up to this time, it has not been stated. Matters have gone so far that the legislature of Prince Edward Island. in which the supporters of this government constitute a majority, have found it necessary to pass a resolution, and make an address to His Excellency the Governor General upon this subject. That address is in these words:

To His Excellency,
The Governor General of Canada in Council.

May it please Your Excellency:

We, His Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Prince Edward Island in session assembled, humbly represent:

That it is expedient that an appointment should be made with all convenient despatch to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of the Honourable Edward Jarvis Hodgson, master of the Rolls for the province, and assistant judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature of this province.

Wherefore the said Legislative Assembly humbly pray that a fit and proper person may be appointed to fill the vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court and Court of Chancery of this province accordingly.

And, as in duty bound, we will ever pray,

(Certified) JOHN AGNEW, Speaker.

Legislative Assembly, March 30, 1911.

That address passed to His Excellency the Governor General in pursuance of a resolution passed unanimously by the Legislative Assembly of the province of Prince Edward Island on the 22nd of March, 1911, nearly five weeks ago. The resolution is couched in exceedingly moderate terms, I think it might well have been couched in much stronger terms. The matter which ought to engage the attention of this parliament, which ought to be dealt with by this government without one hour's unnecessary delay, is the importance of filling that appointment which has been vacant for more than six months; and I repeat that for the delay in making that appointment there has been absolutely no reason given by this government when the subject has been repeatedly drawn to their attention. I think it deserves an immediate answer, and immediate attention ; and I want to tell my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and the members of this government, that if that appointment is not made without delay, I shall take the earliest opportunity of making a motion in this House condemning the government for their inaction in this matter, and condemning them for making this appointment to the judicial bench a party football. It is well known and recognized in the province of Prince Edward Island that the delay is not occasioned by any reason which can be advanced in the public interest, there are no such reasons. At all events, the belief prevails in the province of Prince Edward Island and I think it is well founded, that the appointment is being delayed because it is not convenient from a party standpoint to appoint the gentleman who is in the minds of the government at this moment. If that is not the reason, the Prime Minister is at perfect liberty to state the true reason. But as a matter of fact, with cases upon the docket of the Court of Appeal standing for years, in October last, the government have delayed up to the present time, for a peroid of six months in making that appointment, although there are many men at the bar of Prince Edward Island, in both parties, even within the ranks of the political party of which the hon. gentleman is the leader, who are well qualified to fill the vacancy. Under these conditions I submit that this is a matter of urgent public importance, and demands an immediate and unequivocal statement from the government as to why this appointment has been delayed, and a further statement as to the date when it will be made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is true that six months have elapsed since there has been a vacancy on the bench of Prince Edward Island. If I may judge by the records of the past, going back to the early days of confederation, I think this is not an unusual delay. I think I could verify my statement by copious examples, in which, however, I do not care to take refuge in order to shield ourselves in the present instance. The last time this matter came up for discussion I stated that the government would be prepared to make an appointment after the Easter recess. We have been very busy, and the recess gave us more leisure to think it over. I have only to say that I have not forgotten it, and I am prepared to make an announcement of this appointment at an early day. If the day on which we make the announcement is not sufficiently early in the judgment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, he will be quite within his right in bringing before the House a motion, as he says, censuring the government. To this I have no objection to take, it is within his right to take any action in this respect his sense of public duty may point out to him. But in my view of our duty, this government has not up to the present time been liable to any censure. My hon.

friend has alluded to the fact that there has been a resolution passed by the legislature of Prince Edward Island on this subject. He surprised me when he stated that this resolution had been passed on the 22nd of March. It has not come to my knowledge, except within a very few days. I do not know whether the transmission was delayed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The resolution was passed on the 22nd of March, but the address consequent on that resolution was not adopted until the 30th of March.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At all events, it has only come to my knowledge within the last few days. I have only to say to my hon. friend, as I have already remarked, that the last time the matter was up we promised we would consider it during the recess, and would be prepared to make an announcement at an early day, sufficiently early to meet the criticisms of my hon. friend. If it is not, then he will be able to make his motion of censure with which he has threatened us. But I repeat that I do not think we have been unduly negligent. My hon. friend has just given a reason why we have had to take some time to make the appointment. He has told us that there are many men at the bar of Prince Edward Island, not only within the two parties, but even in the ranks of the Liberal party, to which he alluded especially, who are capable of filling this appointment. It was a case of an embarras de richesse, it was difficult to make a selection from among so many good men. If this had not been the case, perhaps it would have been more easy to reach a conclusion. But where there are so many men well qualified to choose from, my hon. friend must not be surprised if we have taken some time in making a selection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then if there was no good man at all the appointment could be made at once?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If there was no man we could not make the appointment at all.

Mr. LENNOX. I have paid some attention to cases of this kind, and I may be permitted to say a word in support of the leader of the opposition. The Prime Minister says that, judging by cases which have occurred in the past, the government has not been guilty of any undue delay. If in any case delay is necessary in order to serve the public, then the delay is justifiable, but in this case the administration has been unable to show any justification whatever for the delay. A delay of a year may be justifiable in the public interest, but a delay of a week or a day is not justifiable when it is sought to serve only party purposes, as we know it is in this case. This is not the first occasion of the kind. This government has been notorious for delaying appointments such as this, where nothing can be shown in justification except party interest. The abundance of material the right hon. gentleman refers to is the abundance of claimants upon the government, and he knows very well that the delay in this case is due entirely to a desire to reconcile party exigencies and personal ambitions. I hope the leader of the opposition will promptly condemn the administration for their delay in this matter, and I am quite prepared, from the utter want of reason given by the government, to condemn them now. I do not think there is any doubt about their having failed utterly to discharge their public duties. Nothing is more deserving of condemnation than the effort of a government to administer this branch of the public service for party purposes. I am glad to reflect that among the many proud boasts to the credit of the administration which preceded this one was the fact that in the administration of justice, in appointments to the bench, the first minister and the Minister of Justice were guided solely by the public interest and that appointments were made without any reference to party ends or party interests. I could forgive this government for very many things——

An hon. MEMBER. They need it.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. I am of a forgiving disposition in that respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. I could forgive them for a great many of the sins they have committed, and there are mountains of them as the Prime Minister would say, if they would redeem themselves upon this one point, if, in future, appointments would be made with regard to the public interest and to the maintenance of the high traditions of the judiciary of this country which obtained before the right hon. Prime Minister and his friends achieved power. I do not think that any further delay is justifiable, and it will be a very great satisfaction to me indeed if my hon. friend the leader of the opposition very promptly brings this matter forward for an express and clear condemnation of the administration of the government in this regard.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF MINISTERS AND OFFICIALS.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, on the 14th December I moved a motion in this House asking for a return and the House granted an order which reads :

Return to an order of the House of Commons, dated the 14th December, 1910, showing

what amount has been paid by the government during the last fiscal year for travelling expenses with the names and the expenditure in each case, under the following heads' viz.:

Railway steamship, and other lines of transportation; private cars; pullman cars; tips to waiters; meals and hotel expenses for the following persons: ministers of the Crown civil servants of all grades; immigration agents; and other persons employed by the government on any special or other work.

It is signed by Charles Murphy, Secretary of State, but he adds to the return this statement:

The within return contains answers from every department of the government with the exception of that of Public Works which will not be ready for some considerable time yet.

I am surprised at this statement. The government, a few years ago, paid Americans thousands of dollars at the rate of $75 a day to come over here to show them the proper system of book-keeping, to start their books right, and I am surprised under those circumstances that the Department of Public Works would come down with a statement of that kind. Would any business man in this House tolerate such a condition as this for one moment? The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) is looking at me ; if he went into his office and said to his book-keeper : How much were the travelling expenses in connection with this firm during the last year?—and if the book-keeper could not turn up the account and tell him in ten minutes, he would tell him to go. If he asked him to give a detailed statement, and have it ready on the following morning, and he was unable to do so, he would tell him to walk. That is what any business government would do, and this government pretends that it is a business government. There is the order of the House, and if I had a clerk in my employ who would bring down a return similar to some portions of this return, I would ask him to hand in his resignation immediately. The order of the House asks for certain details, but if it were not for the fact that a minister's name appears opposite the expenditure of some of these amounts I would not know from which department some of these returns came. That is the style of book-keeping that is done. The first return is from the Department of Militia and Defence. It is headed right and made out in fairly good form. The first item charged in this return is:

Sir Frederick Borden, minister, including expenses of sub-conference on imperial defence.

No details?

. . . $3,300.

It is an even $3,300. Then it goes on to give the travelling expenses of other officers, and among the items is one for tips to waiters amounting to $225.28. The Prime Minister and his associates are the trustees of the people's money, and I would like to know what business they have to allow their officers to put their hands in the public chest and give away $200 or $300 in connection with this one department. I will show, before I get through, where $800 has been paid in tips by officers of other departments.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the names of the persons tipped given?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No. The next is the Department of the Secretary of State. He was very modest; he only charged up expenses—no details given—to the amount of $554.75.

Mr. FOSTER. He is young yet.

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing for tips?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Yes, there is something for tips. Then, there is the office of the Governor General; I shall say nothing about that further than that one of the officials—Mr. Sladen—paid $53.05 for tips. Next is the Civil Service Commission. This is a commission that has been organized lately, but they have been able to spend some money, and out of a total of $721 they gave away $35.50 in tips. Next is the Minister of Finance. He is not as expensive as the Minister of Militia although he is down for $2,722. I see there is one gentleman in his employ who spent $105 on transportation and railway fares, $25.90 for pullmans, $53 for tips, and $139.50 for hotel expenses. That is Mr. Viets. Then, there is another return—I presume it is from his department, because it is made out in the same form and in the same typewriting—of travelling expenses paid out of the management vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that is still the Minister of Finance.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I presume it is in the minister's department. There is $22 given by Mr. Hyndman for tips. Here is an amount which I presume comes from the Department of Trade and Commerce. It is headed 'travelling expenses,' and the first item is:

Sir R. J. Cartwright, $300.

That is all the detail that is given. The expenditure on account of travel for himself and officials amounts in all to $18,303.55, but the return does not state anything further than that this is merely for travelling expenses.

Mr. LALOR. What period does that expenditure cover?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). This is for one year—1910. Then we come to the Department of Labour. The return is made out

in detail and it shows a total expenditure on account of travel of $3,029.58. The minister paid out $340 himself, for which no details are given; the balance is for travelling expenses of officials, and they gave away $35.20 of the people's money for tips. Next is the North West Mounted Police, the Privy Council and the Under Secretary of State. Then there is the Auditor General's office in connection with which the expenses for travel were not very much. But there is an expenditure of $53.55 in tips. The next return that we have is from the Department of Railways and Canals. I do not find any item of expenditure by the minister. It is not given in the account, but there are some amounts here that I want to refer to. There is the Railway Commission. This is a little institution composed of three or four gentlemen, but they have quite a staff of officials, and they spent last year altogether $16,389.31 in transportation. They had a private car of their own, and it cost to furnish that car with supplies $7,719.

Mr. FOSTER. How much?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The official car 'Acadia,' cost for running expenses and meals on board, $7,719. Besides that they spent $1,602 for pullman fares for themselves and their officials, mostly their officials. They gave away $606 of the people's money for tips.

Mr. FOSTER. No names given?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No names. These gentlemen have their hands in the public chest and they pay out as they like and there appears to be no control over them. Then we come to the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway. These are pets of the Prime Minister. A year or two before he appointed the chairman of that body I told him he was going to appoint his pet, Mr. Parent, and he can find that prophecy of mine in 'Hansard.'

Mr. LENNOX. That is because he built the bridge.

Mr. SPROULE. A strong evidence of his qualification.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). These gentlemen spent in travel, $7,760.

Mr. FOSTER. What?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). $7,760.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did they go to?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). They had a private car; they furnished that car and this is how they did it. When they wanted to go out on one trip, for example, they sent to Mr. Lapointe for supplies costing $24.54, from another man they bought $10.33 worth, from the fruit man they bought some fruit and then they sent to Bate & Co. to get their liquor supplies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not Mr. Parent.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The liquor was supplied to the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners and I challenge the Prime Minister to bring down the accounts and if he does I will vouch for the fact that nine-tenths of the expense is for champagnes and liquors for that car and to buy it from Bate & Company.

Mr. SPROULE. They are not much of a temperance crowd.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No, on one of these trips they got $132 worth of lush to supply the car. The next trip they went on they bought from Mr. Reid, $19.05 worth, from Lapointe, $3.30 worth, and from Bate & Company, $84.85 worth for champagne and so forth. The next time they went for a short trip Bate & Company got $72.17. The next was a little trip and Mr. Moreland, the fruit man, got $5, and Lapointe got $6.60, and Bate & Company $64.41. On the next little trip Mr. Young got $14.94, Lapointe got $4.75, and Bate & Company $94.85. The next trip was a long one. It must have been down to Quebec, and they must have taken a good sized party because they purchased from Lapointe $46 worth of supplies, from George Matthews & Company, $11 worth, from Moreland, for fruit, $21 and they sent down to Bate & Company for liquor and bought $242.05 worth for that trip. For the next trip Bate & Company got $126, the next trip Bate & Company got $108, the next trip Bate & Company got $147, the next trip $99.12, the next trip $102, the next trip $120.16 and for the last trip Bate & Company got $124.45. Mr. Lapointe came in for his $18, and Moreland $18, making a total expense for supplying that private car for the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, $2,082.80 and out of that there was $572 for provisions and $1,509.93 for Bate & Company for liquor supplies.

Mr. LANCASTER. They must have been going fishing.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I wonder how the Prime Minister will justify that before the farmers of the country and particularly the farmers of the northwest. He took $1,500 of their money and paid it out for champagne and other stuff to feed the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the account show it was for liquor?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The Prime Minister is the trustee of the money of the people of this country, and will he tell me

that any trustee to an estate would handle the funds of that estate as he is handling the funds of the people of Canada? Is there an honest man in this House who would justify that condition of affairs. They did not comply with the order and bring down the total amount in this return so that I cannot give the total figures because it would take me a week to add them up. Here is another paper of this return and I do not know what department it is from except that I can distinguish some of the names.

Mr. FOSTER. What department?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I do not know what department it is, except that I find the Hon. L. P. Brodeur down here for travelling expenses, $4,828.28.

Mr. LANCASTER. For himself?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He outshines and double discounts any other minister.

Mr. SPROULE. He always was an expensive luxury.

Mr. LALOR. He is going on the bench.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I do not know whether he is or not. I do not know whether he took this Mr. Demers with him or not, but Demers paid for transportation, $385, for cabs $218, for hotel $676, for pullmans $94, and tips to waiters $100—just an even $100. Now, I would ask the Prime Minister can he justify that charge of Mr. Demers in giving away $100 of the money of the people for tips? There is a Mr. Morrisette here who, I presume, travelled with the minister and I am told he is his private secretary. Mr. Morrisettes' travelling expenses amounted to $277, his cabs to $235, his hotel bill to $1,075, his pullman $32.60, and tips to waiters $131.90.

Mr. FOSTER. He beats Demers.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Yes, he beats Demers by $31.90. He did not make it even; he put in the odd cents. The total expenses for travel for the minister and his officials amounts to what do you think?

Mr. LENNOX. $5,000, I suppose.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Why the minister, himself, drew $4,828. He paid for transportation, $7,710; he paid for cab hire, $1,402.82; he paid for his hotel bills, $7,240; he paid for pullmans, $1,372 and he paid for tips, $800.09, making a total of $23,354.92 for travelling expenses of the Department of Marine for the minister and a few officials. Here is $23,000 of the money of the people of this country practically thrown away. I am satisfied that the Prime Minister is ashamed of it, judging by the way he looks and the way he shakes his head.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What did you say the total was?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). $23,000. The Prime Minister says it is too much; will he have it returned to the treasury where it properly belongs?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Please show me that paper.

Mr. LALOR. It's an eye-opener.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It's time he got his eyes opened. Then we have another little department here, the Department of Mines, and they gave away in tips $55.75. and the Geological Survey gave away in tips $37.90; I have not totalled up the travelling expenses; I have more important matters to deal with. The Minister of Justice was not nearly as expensive as the Minister of Marine. Although he did a big work, he charges only $2,245.63—no details—and the Solicitor General $150 for travelling expenses. For the Department of Justice I have not the total expenditure, but the tips to waiters amount to $296.80. The Department of Customs comes next. This is the most economical department of the lot. The minister is down for only $40 for travelling expenses, no cab hire, and very little for tips to waiters. The Department of Printing and Stationery is also very economical, although there is something paid for tips to waiters. The Department of Inland Revenue comes next. The minister just charges $500 even for his travelling expenses, and there is no change left to return to the treasury. But there are some charges here that require some explanation. There is a gentleman of the name of X. Saucier—he paid for transportation—by railway, $505.40; by other lines of transportation, $135.50; for meals and hotel expenses, $519.15; for Pullman cars, $107.75. He drew from this country $1,367.80 for travelling expenses, besides his salary.

Mr. LALOR. Does he give any tips?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). There are no tips charged; they are put in as hotel expenses. Here is the Minister of Agriculture, who is the temperance man of the party——

Mr. CURRIE. There is no champagne there.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). There isn't, eh? I asked for a return showing the amounts paid to railways, steamships, other lines of transportation, for pullmans, tips to waiters and hotel expenses. These are all set out in detail, but there is a column

added—incidentals. Now, anybody knows what incidentals mean. The Minister of Agriculture himself drew $587.70 for expenses—no details. But Mr. Goddard, who travels with him, got $41 for railway fares, $34.15 for other transportation, $37.50 for pullmans, $16.25 for tips to waiters, $205.10 for meals and hotel expenses, and $172.35 for incidentals. Everybody knows that that is the account at the bar.

Mr. EMMERSON. Are there any names given?

Mr TAYLOR (Leeds). No names are given.

Mr. FOSTER. We want the details of that.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). There is a Mr. A. W. Tolmie who got $69.20 for railway transportation, $56.25 for other transportation, $39.50 for pullmans, $1,295 for meals and hotel expenses, and $207.73 for incidentals. Mr. Wm. Hutchison's name appears twice in this account. In one place he is down for $66.02 for railway fare, $130 for steamships, $213.80 for other transportation, $18.10 for pullmans, $3.50 for tips to waiters, $1,728 for meals and hotel expenses and $37.61 for incidentals. He is also down for $69.20 for railway fare, $42.25 for other transportation, $20 for pullmans, and $4,280 for meals and hotel expenses, and $2.50 for incidentals. There is altogether about $8,000 for travelling expenses and total expenses for Mr. Hutchison. Besides this, Mr. Hutchison is paid a large salary and $20 a day for expenses. The Minister of Agriculture must surely explain what these incidentals mean, and this large amount paid to Mr. Hutchison. The Postmaster General puts in a bill for $2,836.70—no details; but he has a lot of officials travelling with him, and they disbursed altogether $365.94 in tips. I have not made up the total expenditure for expenses, but a gentleman named George Ross figures for transportation, $56.20; for pullman cars, $209.45; for tips, $41.55, nearly as much as for railway fare; meals, &c., $607.55; for cabs, street cars and other items, $247.52; total, $1,162.27. The Postmaster General can, perhaps, explain who that gentleman is. I hope the Prime Minister will draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this matter. I am surprised that this government, which pretends to be a business government transacting the business of the country fairly and honestly, will attempt to justify the charges that I have read here to-day. I want the Secretary of State to return these documents to the bookkeeper who made them out and say: If that is the best you can do, hand in your resignation. Take the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to him and say: There is the order of the House, there is what you have sent us, not in accordance with the order at all, and no style or form of bookkeeping about it. The Minister of Public Works was apparently ashamed to have his account discussed here and after four months it was not brought down

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a bit, my hon. friend will find it on three pages of the Auditor General's Report, V—16, 17 and 18.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That does not give it all. Let the return be a true transcript from his book if he keeps a book. I think I have given the ministers enough to think over during the holidays, Saturday and Sunday, and perhaps the Minister of Public Works will have his report ready for me on Monday, and we will discuss it. These are the facts, and I would ask the Prime Minister to-morrow to call the Council together, to read 'Hansard' and ask these gentlemen to stand up one after the other and explain how they can account to the people for thus having squandered public money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not aware that my colleague the Secretary of State was presenting this return without getting the particulars from the Department of Public Works. If my attention had been called to the matter I should have asked him to delay the return a short time until the officials of my department could make out their portion of it. I can assure my hon. friend there is no intention of withholding any information which may be required. My hon. friend will find the full amount of the travelling expenses of myself, of the deputy minister, and of other officials of the department upon pages V—16, 17 and 18 of the Auditor General's Report. If he requires anything further I shall be very glad at the earliest possible moment to produce it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The travelling expenses are not given in detail.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total amount is given, and the amounts paid by each official, 50 in all.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The House has ordered it made in this way.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister has simply to conform to the order of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no objection to that.

Mr. FOSTER. He cannot get out of it by throwing a portion of the Auditor General's Report on the table. He will save himself a great deal of trouble if he will do what the Minister of Agriculture does

not appear to have done, give all the details of these expenditures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no intention of disobeying the order of the House; the matter had not been brought to my attention. In the ordinary course the order goes to the proper official of the department, and I presume the Secretary of State thought there was some undue delay, and he has presented the return without waiting for the portion from my department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The long list of officials who have been travelling and charging their transportation, pullman cars, &c., to my department in 1910. is made up of inspectors, assistant inspectors, and clerks in the inspectors' office, who by the nature of their work are obliged to travel from one end of the country to the other to inspect post offices.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I admit that, but they have no right to put their hands in the public treasury and take out money and give it away in tips.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I do not know whether the hon. member was in earnest when he said that each member of the government should rise and give some information in regard to these figures. Personally I feel somewhat sensitive on this subject, and I have no backwardness about expressing my feelings. I had been for some 15 years or more before entering this House in the habit of travelling almost every week of the year at the expense of other people, and the only method of keeping track of the expenses incurred upon such journeys which I was ever able to adopt was to make a note when I was leaving my office of the amount of cash I had in my pocket, and similarly when I returned to take a note of how much remained, and in that way to know what I had expended on the journey. In any travelling I have done since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, and in the government, I have pursued no other method. I think that any other is unendurable. With reference to the amount of expenses which were incurred by me, as shown in the return referred to, I ask you to bear in mind that it is for the period of the summer before last. During that summer I was in London for some 150 or 160 days. I was living at a hotel. Upon my return I knew, in the way I have described, what exactly I had expended. The amount, after deducting the cost of the ocean passage, and of the railway fare to and from my destination, was a few cents over $10 per day. It has been, I think, a standing rule for a great many years in the practical administration of the departments of this government that when any official of the government, such as a deputy minister, is required to travel upon public business his expenditure is passed by the Auditor General at the uniform figure of $10 a day in addition to his disbursements for actual moving or transportation expenses. I thought that if I was within a few cents of that limit I was not at any rate expending an excessive figure while I was abroad.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I did not say so, I said I thought you were liberal.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I certainly lived no differently when I was abroad on government business than when I was abroad for my own pleasure.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I do not think any objection could be taken to legitimate expenses in connection with public business of the country; I do not think that any individual will take exception to liberal expenditure, but when we see items of hundreds of dollars paid out for liquor, the people of this country will seriously object to these expenses. The Auditor General's Report has been handed to me and under 'Transcontinental Railway, legal services other than for right of way', we have $45 for liquor cases. That seems to be an extraordinary amount. That is at page W—238, 1910. Such items are very suspicious. It seems to me that the Minister of Interior must have chartered a special train and steamboat service to take his whole staff around the globe. The total travelling expenses in connection with the department is two hundred and twelve thousand——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Does he not know that the payment for liquor cases is a payment to Messrs. Stevens & Lawson for legal services in connection with the prosecution of offenders against the liquor law?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I read the item as it appears. If the minister can explain it, he can do more than I can. Here it is: 'Dominion Express Company, $45, liquor cases.'

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The minister struck the wrong item.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). As I was saying the Minister of the Interior must have chartered special conveyances and taken his whole staff around the globe, because the travelling expenses for his department are two hundred and twelve thousand——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon gentleman allow me——

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am quoting the item, and the minister can explain it later.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct an error into which he has fallen?

Mr TAYLOR (Leeds). When he (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario) gets through.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am willing that the minister should——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman says he finds an item, 'Dominion Express Company, $45, liquor cases' If he will look at it again, he will see that the amount paid the Dominion Express Company is $45, and the next item is 'liquor cases, $14.95.'

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Well, can the minister explain that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman probably knows that there is a zone along the Transcontinental railway in which the sale of liquor is prohibited, and prosecutions take place from time to time for the punishment of offenders against the Act.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What has the Dominion Express Company to do with that?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I do not pretend to understand the details of these payments. The Auditor General's Report was handed to me a moment ago, and this item was pointed out to me. If the minister (Mr. Pugsley) is familiar with the details, he is that much better informed than I am, and it is for him to explain the matter to the House. But I was pointing out this item of travelling expenses of the Interior Department. In many cases the payment for pullman cars is greater than for railway transportation. There are several individuals who have very large travelling expenses. The Rev. J. Macdougall, who was special commissioner to investigate the St. Peter's reserve, charges for railway and steamship transportation $173.45; for pullman cars, $53.25; for meals and hotel expenses, $308.05; for cabs, $419.94; total, $954.69. The Minister of the Interior does not give the details of his expenditure, but he charges $2,986.67 for travelling expenses. Mr R. G. Evans also has a large bill: transportation, $790.30; pullmans, $223.50; meals and hotel expenses, $529.35; cabs, $217.20; total, $1,760.35. Mr. R. E. A. Leech, who is a very prominent civil servant of 'red-line' notoriety in Manitoba, had transportation expenses $1,350.70; pullman cars, $379; meals, $1,073.15; cabs and livery expenses, $1,300.98; total, $4,103.83. Mr. R H. Campbell, an official of the department, shows more for pullman car expenses than for travelling expenses. His travelling expenses were $38.55, and pullman cars $40.50; hotel expenses, $163.95, and cabs $51.53, a total of $294.53. Mr. Knechtel, another official, has an account in the same position—travelling expenses, $94 and pullman $119.45. Here also is Mr. P. H. Harvey with pullman expenses of $14, against travelling expenses of $3.10. I think it is up to the Minister of the Interior to have these officials explain the disproportionate payment for transportation and pullmans. Mr. Geo. Summer had travelling expenses of $2 and pullmans $13.50. I hear it whispered behind me that perhaps these gentleman engaged in a little friendly game of poker in the pullman, but I would not suggest that. Mr. F. X. Gosselin had travelling expenses $83.75, pullmans $183 His meals and hotel expenses were $203.75. Mr. J. Seale had travelling expenses of $12.80, and pullmans $18. Mr. W. D. Scott charged $33.50 for transportation, and $76.75 for pullmans, with $158.90 for hotel expenses, $48 for cabs and $14.50 for tips. Mr. Webster had $360.95 for travelling expenses, $93.89 for pullmans, $382 for meals and hotel expenses, and $38.64 for tips. Mr. W. J White had $985.41 for travelling expenses, $502.50 for pullmans, $1,171.30 for meals and hotel expenses, and $24 for tips. And so the list goes on indefinitely, amounting to the enormous total of $212,835. It seems to me that while the minister or the deputy minister may be given a liberal travelling allowance—I do not think $10 a day excessive—yet when it comes to the officials in receipt of smaller salaries, I think they should confine themselves to a reasonable limit and not disport themselves like young millionaires or government contractors. I think the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is to be commended for drawing the attention of the House to this matter. It seems to me that an investigation in the Public Accounts Committee would probably disclose some interesting facts for the electorate, and I trust that the matter will be prosecuted further in that committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I owe it to one of my colleagues who has not a seat in this House to give at once explanation of the false impression conveyed by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in dealing with the Department of Trade and Commerce. As that hon. gentleman dealt with the figures, he conveyed the impression to my mind, and, I think, to the minds of hon. members generally, that the $18,000 for travelling expenses for the Trade and Commerce Department last year had been spent as travelling expenses by the head office here in Ottawa.

Mr TAYLOR (Leeds). The office and its officials—I stated that plainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The impression created in my mind was that all these expenses had been incurred by the officers connected with the head office. It is true

that the Department of Trade and Commerce expended last year for travelling expenses under the authority of the minister $18,000. But the department has many large branches.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will refer to two accounts marked there, which I intended to give but forgot, he will find that Mr. Jackson figured for about $2,000, and Mr. Preston for about $4,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend had dealt with matters which are debatable he would have made a better impression. He says that the Department of Trade and Commerce have expended the sum of $18,303.55 for travelling, as I understood it, under the responsible minister, by officers connected with the head office. Nothing of the kind. All that has been expended by Sir Richard Cartwright and the officers of the staff immediately under him is—how much? $18,000? $323.45, that is all that is chargeable to Sir Richard Cartwright and his staff of officers here at Ottawa. Here is the detailed account:

Sir Richard Cartwright, $300; Mr. O'Hara Deputy Minister, $9.55; Mr. Wright, $13.15; H. Robertson, 75 cents; total, $323.45.

That is the total amount expended by the Department of Trade and Commerce here at the city of Ottawa for the management of the department. Now it must be remembered that Sir Richard Cartwright has to deal with the inspection of staples and that for that purpose he has over twenty officials at Kingston, Montreal, Peterborough, Quebec, Toronto, Winnipeg and so on. I think all these officers have to travel, and they have expended $4,222. Now the trade commissioner charges for his expenses $12,800. Mr. Jackson, who is at Shanghai, charges $1,411. But Mr. Jackson was stationed in England, and he charged his travelling expenses in going to China, $1,224. I do not know whether the charge is correct or not, but so far as I know it is not an overcharge. Then his travelling expenses in China are $187. Mr. Jackson, therefore, charges $1,411 travelling to China and travelling in China, and that does not seem to be an over-charge. Mr. Preston charges $2,104 for travelling expenses, this includes transportation from Japan to Holland. I do not know whether it is an over-charge or not, but it does not seem to me to be so. Then there are charges in connection with the bounties on iron and steel, $73.45; administration of annuities, for which Mr. S. T. Bastedo charges $129. That is not extravagant. I am afraid my hon. friend has found a mare's nest on this occasion.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The chief complaint I found against that account was that it is not made out in detail.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a very interesting question, and what I find hard to understand is how they managed to consume so much bread with so little liquid nourishment, $14 for bread and meat and $130 for liquid refreshment. The medical profession forbids giving to children solid food with a nursing bottle, and while they were well looked after with a nursing bottle, I cannot understand why they should require $14 worth of bread and meat. My surprise increases when I learn that this expenditure is made by men who have been so prominent as temperance reformers, and who wished to be considered all over the country as eminent examples of temperance. There was one thing that did not surprise me in hearing the details of this expenditure, and that was the expenditure of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He has a history in the past with regard to expenditures, which we know. I have one of his old accounts here, and it is somewhat amusing; therefore, I was not surprised in hearing his expenditure read to-day. It is quite in keeping with his record. Had he not made it as much as he did, I should say that he was failing in some way, or was wanting in moral courage. I take his record when he was Speaker. I have here the records of various Speakers. I do not know what will be the record of our hon. friend who is occupying that position to-day; we will know in the future. Now I would like to show the House some examples of the economy that was practised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he was Speaker. Let me at the same time give the expenditures of some of the other Speakers in that high office so that we may compare them in furnishing the two or three rooms which they occupy, and which are pretty lavishly furnished from year to year. Whenever a new Speaker comes in there are some new repairs to be made, and that might be expected. I take the record of a few, by way of comparison to show how economical the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was when he was Speaker, and, therefore, we might expect that he would keep up his record in his present department. The Hon. Mr. Ouimet, in nine months, expended $1,175, a little over $1,000 a year. The Hon. Mr. White occupied the office five years, and he spent $5,000, that is $1,000 a year for furnishing those rooms. Sir James Edgar, in three years and eleven months, spent $4,000. That appeared to satisfy his ambition for economy. Mr. Bain, who was there one year six months and five days spent $229. But then, he was a close fisted Scotchman that kept his 'sawbaths,' and every thing

else he could get his hands on. But he did not come up to the average, $229 for one year six months and five days, while the others spent usually about $1,000 a year. Then we come to the Hon. Mr. Brodeur. He was there three years, one month and five days, and he spent $9,899, nearly $3,000 a year to furnish the few rooms down here. Of course, that was the splendid economy this government was to exercise to carry out the demand of the patrons, they are carrying out the exact platform of the patrons in public affairs—$3,000 a year to furnish these two or three rooms. Then I take Mr. Belcourt. He was here nine months, and he spent $703. Had he been here the whole year, I suppose he would have spent $1,000. Then take Mr. Sutherland, he was there one year five months and twenty days, and he spent $383, as against the $3,000 a year for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Then when we come to look over the items, it is amusing and interesting to see how they expended that money. Of course his political friends would not get much of it, you would not expect that, because he was never distinguished for using his patronage except in the most exemplary way; he is expending the money where he can get the best returns for it.

I find another, John L. Cassidy & Co, $204; and I find here the C. Ross Co., $77. This during part of his term. Then I find James Wilson & Co., $210.50; J. L. Orme Co., $73; H. & H. E. Hamilton—I do not know the firm—$888; the C. Ross Co. again, $1,462; A. J. Lawrence, $270; A. Brillon, $321; the Hamilton firm again, $933; Joseph Archambault, $36; The C. Ross Co. again, one year, $2,395, to help furnish a couple or three rooms down here in the basement of this building. Then, in the next year, I see the C. Ross Co. again down for $2,395 to furnish rooms that year and the following year, almost at the beginning of the account, is $1,074 to furnish the same rooms again. This is a splendid example of the stringent economy carried out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He has a record, this is a notable example of it, and the country ought to know it, because in knowing it they will know the kind of men to whom they have entrusted the expenditure of the public money. I would like the farmers of this country to know it, and if you put that alongside of the record that he has made for himself of late, it will be seen that his right hand has not lost its cunning, neither is he wanting in moral courage. I would like to know how they made away with so much bread and meat and with so little liquid refreshment.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss this question at present. I imagine that this is only the introduction to the discussion which must take place later after all the returns are down, and we have had time to thoroughly sift the different accounts. But I wish just at this time to enter my protest against the principle which appears to have been laid down by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) as to the expenditures of public money by public officials. The principle that he laid down was that when he left on his journey he had a certain amount of money in his pocket, that when he came back he found a certain amount of change left, and he charged the rest up against the person who was paying these expenses. That is an intimation to every civil servant, every official and every minister, coming from the Minister of Justice of all members of the administration, that they need not ask for any vouchers, that they need not keep any accounts, that all each one has to do is to get a certain amount of money by requisition, put it in his pocket, note in his book when he goes out in the morning that he has so much, spend what he likes and then, when he comes back in the evening, count the change in his pocket, enter that in his note book and find when his trip is over that he has 55 cents left or whatever it may be. That is the kind of accounting that the Minister of Justice recommends to the public officers, and that is the way that he suggests they shall perform their duties to the country which pays these moneys, and whose moneys they are. I did not notice that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made an allusion at all to that doctrine. Does he believe in it? Is that the principle upon which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has gone? Does any man mean to tell me that the minister honestly spent that amount of money in the interests of the people of this country during his incumbency of that office? Does any man mean to tell me that he had any warrant for spending the people's money to that amount on the fripperies of the office which he held? What has become of the purchases? Where are they to-day? Will the Prime Minister pretend that within the last six years he has ever been open to the appointing of a commission to make an examination into that particular expenditure, a thing which he was invited to do? So it goes on. I notice that the Prime Minister was very quick to take advantage of Sir Richard Cartwright's bill of expenditures. I particularly listened to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and what my hon. friend said was that these were the expenses incurred by Sir Richard Cartwright and his officers for travel. He did not criticise that department as I think he might well do. I would just ask the right hon. Prime Minister to let his

memory travel over those seventeen years when he and his friends were on the opposition benches, and call to mind the closeness and, I may say, the smallness of the criticisms which were made by the then opposition upon such expenditures as these. They went even to the table of the Governor General and counted the spoons and knives and forks. They traversed the lowest basement and measured the carpets and the drugget. They went through every by-way, hall and corner, toted up what was bought, what was returned, what was spent again, and they rang the changes on this year in and year out.

Now, I call my right hon. friend's attention to the course which has been pursued by the opposition since he has been in power, and I challenge him to say if, in the matter of expenditure such as we are to-day discussing, the opposition has not been generous and free with the government? What close and keen analysis of proper expenditures has been made by the opposition? They have freely granted that the necessary services of the country must be carried on and should be carried on without meanness, but they have also tried to maintain that they should be carried on without waste and without criminal expenditure. Now, I challenge the contrast between the two parties in that respect. We do not say that when an officer of the government has duties to perform he shall be kept at home and not perform them because the country will not give him his expenses. Neither do we say that as an officer of the government he shall travel meanly. He shall be careful of his position as an officer of this Dominion government, and he shall travel as befits such an officer, but there is an awful wide chasm between that and this actual criminal throwing away of money which is being done by some officers of to-day; not by all the officers in every department, not by all ministers and not by every minister in all phases of his department, but there are some who are especial sinners. Will the Prime Minister, for a single moment, stand in his place here and defend that overplus of liquid refreshment which seems to have been poured down the gullets of certain favourites of the government and their favourites without any regard to the taxpayers of this country, without any regard to rhyme, reason or judgment? The Prime Minister will not defend it for a single moment. Go into the Department of Marine and Fisheries and analyse that account. Let him go into the department of his Minister of the Interior and analyse that account, and there will be others that we will bring up, and I pin my faith to it that when we come to the discussion and the examination of that he will not stand up for everything that is going on. But specially I warn him, and I think he cannot do any better than to get on his legs just now and tell us whether or not he stands by his Minister of Justice in this new code as to the expenditure of public moneys of this country by the officials when they are travelling what has just been announced by all the authority and all the dignity which ought to belong to the Minister of Justice of this country. If there is one man who ought to hold himself absolutely aloof from all things of that kind, it is the Minister of Justice, and I can conceive of no better warrant given for foolish and extravagant expenditure and waste by the officials of the government than the utterance which has been made to-day by that same minister.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. A. M. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I crave on my behalf the attention of the House for a few moments while I submit a few remarks in connection with the reciprocity proposals.

I represent a constituency whose population ten years ago—it is larger to-day—aggregated 21,543, of which 10,381 was urban or industrial and 11,162 agricultural. These are the two great classes of people the country over, and I would be remiss to my duty were I to approve proposals which I did not deem acceptable to these two main groups which make up practically in equal proportions the whole population of the county of St. Hyacinthe. As I am satisfied that these proposals are not only acceptable to, but in the interest of, these two main groups of my fellow-citizens, it is natural that I should support them by my vote. Should the Dominion parliament, in order to secure to our farmers the benefit of the United States markets, have to sacrifice our manufacturers it would be, as all will readily perceive, in an embarrassing position. The farming industry of Canada was credited in the last census with $1,787,102,630 of invested capital, and is of direct interest to 66 per 100 of the population. On the other hand, $846,585,023 are invested in the Canadian manufacturing industries out of which the remainder of the people, directly or indirectly, get a living. These two main groups of our population are entitled to the protection of the government, each in accordance with its requirements.

Now, that is exactly what is implied—and until a quite recent date was not expected to be implied—in these reciprocity

proposals which do away with the duties on our agricultural products entering the United Staets, while maintaining them on the manufactured articles entering Canada from the United States, which open up to our farmers the great markets of the United States, while maintaining them on competition in connection with Canadian manufactures. Nothing more satisfactory could be expected or asked for.

Take the case of the leather industry. At that time it represented $28,667,125, and since 1896, the protective duties on that article have been reduced from 20 to 17½ and ultimately to 15 per 100. The government would only be doing the right thing towards compensating these manufacturers for the loss inflicted through the cutting down of protection in their behalf, if they were to reduce at the same time the rates on the machinery required in connection with these manufactures and which has to be imported from abroad, and such a step is desirable the more so that such machinery is not manufactured in Canada and therefore the customs duties in reference to them can in no way be said to protect a national industry. Besides, these reductions on leather have been decided on previously to these proposals being made and are not in any way affected by the latter.

It will thus be seen that these proposals imply that freedom of trade in agricultural products which the farming community were so anxious to obtain, while on the other hand they do not interfere with protection to our manufacturers; in that way they combined advantages of benefit to the various classes of people, an ideal system in the minds of Canadian statesmen of all parties who have been competing for the confidence of the population. The Canadian manufacturer stills retains an advantage over his American competitor of 12½ to 32½ per cent, depending on the industry, and the Canadian farmer will be highly pleased with a treaty which puts him on the same footing as the Yankee farmer. Now, the great majority of Canadian manufacturers is too fair-minded to object to these proposals, and, besides, they have an actual interest in supporting them, were it only for the sake of ensuring the welfare of the farming class who make up the local market.

The interest which a town has in the well-being of the surrounding country will be readily understood. It is an easy matter to realize what would become of the trade and of the value of property in a town surrounded by a wide belt of thinly settled farming country, impoverished through the want of a local market for agricultural products. The Canadian farmer has an interest in, and, in principle, a right to, the American market as his natural market. There is ample proof of the truth of these contentions. We ship to the United States horses under a duty of 25 per cent; hay, under a duty of $4 a ton; barley, 30c. a bushel; butter and cheese, 6c. a pound; cream, 5c. a gallon; eggs, 5c. a dozen. Now, there is no amount of sophistry on the part of our opponents, no amount of gullibility on the part of people, no amount of partisanship which could make us believe that such shipments will not be increased, and the producer benefited accordingly, once these duties are done away in accordance with the offer made by our neighbours in these reciprocity proposals.

In spite of these unfavourable conditions and although just out of a period of depression, in 1909 we shipped to the United States horses to the value of $295,230; hay to the value of $32,000 only, the average of preceding years being $300,000; of barley, $144,660; of butter, $18,246; of cheese, $19,428; of cream and milk, $8,256; of eggs, $13,050. Figuring on these amounts and on the rates indicated above, it is an easy matter to find out how much duty we paid to the United States and what quantities of agricultural products we have thus been prevented from shipping over there. Referring to this matter, Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1883, expressed himself as follows in the House of Commons:

> Take the following case: In the eastern townships and along the imaginary line which divides our country from the United States, a man owns 100 acres of land on the Canadian side, and 100 acres on the American side. He grows 100 bushels of barley on each of these 100 acres. He takes to the American market the 100 bushels grown in the United States, and sells them there at the rate of one dollar a bushel. Then he takes to the American market the 100 bushels grown on Canadian soil and he realizes only 85 cts. a bushel, having had to pay 15 cts. per bushel for the privilege of crossing the boundary.

The same may be said of all kinds of crops. Sir John Macdonald could not have better expressed the interest which the Canadian farmer has in being let free to ship his products across the line. Hon. gentlemen opposite are welcome to repudiating their old-time leader for the sake of some tactical move which they deem fruitful, but in this they will not have the support of all their friends. That view of Sir John Macdonald, a theoretical view of the question, is corroborated by that of a business man, a practical man, whose ability is evidenced by a long and successful career. I mean Mr. Alphonse Poirier, a large dealer in hay and grain, of St. Madeline, in the county of St. Hyacinthe, and his good faith is shown by the offer contained in his letter, which reads as follows:

My dear Sir,—Allow me to draw your attention to certain facts in connection with the Bill which is just now being considered by the House and against the passing of which the Opposition are putting forth such strenous efforts. It is preposterous to contend that our farming class would not thereby be greatly benefited in the sale of their products, of hay, for instance, which under the present conditions is rated at $4 per ton. Should that article be put on the free list, the returns from sales of hay would increase to say the least $2 per ton, and, in years of shortage, even $4 per ton, and I shall explain the reason. The great eastern markets of the United States are regulated as to prices by quotations in the western states. We are bound to sell our hay for what the western dealers get, and nothing more. Thus, we pay the duty exacted on crossing the line, and farmers sell their hay from $2 to $4 below the price they would get were the reciprocity proposals to carry. The same rule applies to all other natural products.

Our government promised to protect the farming class, which constitutes the majority of our population, and to open up for them, as soon as possible the markets of the United States which all farmers who knows wherein their interest lies have been clamoring for so long. I trust that at last they have succeeded.

For over thirty years, I have been in continous intercourse with the farmers, and they are all anxious to see the day when our products will be admitted free across the line. However, you know that, as a rule, farmers are not troublesome people. Notwithstanding which, I am confident they will more than offset whatever protests are forthcoming against the reciprocity proposals. I am satisfied that 90 per cent of the farmers would sign in favour of reciprocity.

I may say further that, once the treaty is in force, I would be willing to contract with from fifty to one hundred reliable farmers on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, for No. 1 hay, at $11 a ton, and, for good No. 2, at $10 a ton, said contract to cover a period of ten years, and that is a price much in advance of those received heretofore.

Yours very truly,
ALP. POIRIER.

Mr. Poirier makes that offer on his own financial responsibility, and that is the best of security. We do not expect our opponents to go to that length. On their part it would be recklessness, and at any rate they would not like to run any chances. No one is expected to do so.

The Liberal to-day sends out a challenge to some classes of people who are inimical to farming interests, and in so doing it is in danger of developing enmity within its own rank and file. The liberal party is making a supreme effort in behalf of the farmers, without in any way interfering with the rights of manufacturers, for whose benefit, on the contrary, it is preparing a more satisfactory local market, through the increase of opportunities ensured to the farming community. In view of what it is doing to-day for the benefit of the farmers, the Liberal party is entitled to their support, and expects it will not be wanting. The spirit of partisanship is not strong enough to induce Tory farmers to continue following Tory leadership, for they realize what is the trend of events and what it means to them.

Considered in its true light, in its essence, the customs duty is a tax which politicians for election purposes, have dubbed with the better-sounding and more popular name of protection. As a matter of fact, from the viewpoint of the producer which this arrangement frees of his competitors, it means protection; however, from the standpoint of the consumer, who subsequently has to make good that amount of duty, or its equivalent, to secure the goods, it means taxation.

On the other hand, considering that the producer, who goes under the name of manufacturer, employs other people, gives work to a good many and in that way has a certain public usefulness, such protection is in a large measure deemed warranted. Protection may also be considered as a necessary means of collecting revenue, provided the duties are levied entirely on articles of luxury; it is obnoxious whenever it bears on the necessaries of life. Every man has a right to live and make live his family, and we know how numerous are the working men and labourers whose salary is barely sufficient, under ordinary circumstances to keep them and their families alive. Of course the cost of production and the cost of transportation of the goods must be paid for, but the government cannot in fairness exact, in addition, the payment of customs duties on goods coming from abroad, or allow that, on goods manufactured at home, the selling price of the goods to be enhanced in proportion.

I realize that these are questions which have been long controverted. If it were in the power of the administration to collect the necessary revenue for running the machinery of the government to gather the required statistical data, without having recourse to customs officials, part of the $2,268,233.86 which are expended yearly towards running the Customs Department might be saved, and people travelling from one side of the line to the other, that is to say practically all of us would be rid of a great deal of bother. In the meantime, we have in Canada 2,204 customs officers. People are under the impression that the political and legislative machinery is a costly affair to keep up, and they are right as to that. However, members of parliament, senators and ministers cost yearly to the country $775,564.55, while $1,921,306 is what we pay every year in the shape of salaries only to customs officers in Canada. In other words, it has cost the people more

money to collect taxation of an indirect concealed character than it has cost them to carry on in the open light the business of law-making through their duly chosen representatives. Such a condition of things might be improved upon. For the time being we are indebted to the liberal party for a reduction of about 3 per cent, in the general rate of taxation.

As regards the benefits which may be expected from the reciprocity proposals, I may add that our experience under a similar treaty which has been in force from March 16, 1855, to March 17, 1866, suggests arguments which our opponents have not heretofore been able to controvert. Previous to the enactment of the treaty, in 1853, the united provinces of Upper and Lower Canada sold to the United States for $4,246,288 worth of animals and their products and of farm products. Under the treaty, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1866, these two same provinces sold to the Americans for $24,482,749 worth of these same products, which represents an increase of about 500 per cent. Some may contend that it was the result of the country's natural development; but the figures for 1867, the year following the termination of the treaty, point strongly in the opposite direction. These two same provinces, in 1867, sold for only $14,871,418 worth of these same products to the United States, a falling off of $9,611,331.

The member for East-Grey (Mr. Sproule) contended that the increase of our trade with the United States at that time was the result of the war which was being waged at the time between the North and South. Well, war was declared on December 20th, 1860, South Carolina and seven other states having then made known their intention to secede ; and two years previous, in 1858, Sir John A. Macdonald, of whom the member for East-Grey (Mr. Sproule) has been a constant admirer, expressed himself as follows : 'If there is one measure of which the country has benefited more than of any other, it is the reciprocity treaty negotiated by the Hincks government. If you recall that wheat was taxed 30 cents per bushel on entering the United States while now it is admitted free, you will realize that every Canadian farmer is 30c. a bushel wealthier on account of this measure. Instead of being shut out from the United States and obliged to go to Montreal to sell his products, he has now the alternative between two markets, he has two strings to his bow.

Last evening the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) stated within my hearing that if Sir John A. Macdonald were here leading the government, he would certainly be opposed to that reciprocity treaty. It is always an easy matter to put statements in the mouths of dead persons, or to attribute views to them. There is one sure advantage in so doing, contradiction is not to be feared. Whether the hon. member be right or wrong in assuming that Sir John Macdonald would be opposed to this treaty, I may say that, if he took such a stand, it would be in direct opposition to statements which he is known by the extracts of his speech given above. Now, the war practically ended on April 9, 1865, through the surrender of General Lee, of the Confederate forces, to General Grant, commander of the northern army, while the treaty was abrogated on March 17, 1866. And the figures quoted above show that our trade continued to be flourishing after the war, and that there was no falling off until after its termination. So that, contrary to the contention of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the expansion and buoyancy of our trade with the United States were the result of the treaty of reciprocity and not of the civil war.

I shall briefly quote some views expressed by various leading statesmen in support of our views concerning this treaty. As early as 1874, Mr. Mackenzie sent Mr. George Brown to Washington to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity. In his budget speech for 1888 in this House, Sir Charles Tupper stated within the hearing of his colleagues, of Sir John, of Mr. Chapleau, of all the Conservative leaders, without being contradicted by any of them: 'Needless to recall to the House that both parties, whether in or out of power, had always been very anxious to obtain a renewal of the treaty of 1854, or the conclusion of reciprocity arrangements similar to those enjoyed by Canada and the United States under that treaty.' Now, it is known that this treaty of 1854 comprised the products of the fisheries, the farms, the forests and the mines; in a word, all natural products in the same way as the proposals we are now considering.

In his manifesto sent out to the Canadian electors on February 7, 1891, Sir John Macdonald said: 'We stated to the Americans, we are willing to carry on trade with you on an equal footing; we are anxious to secure a fair treaty of reciprocity.' In his campaign speech of February 10 of the same year, Mr. Chapleau expressed himself as follows: 'We have always shown a disposition to negotiate with them' (the Americans). Lastly, the member for North Toronto himself (Mr. Foster) submitted, on March 15, 1888, a resolution for the purpose of extending our trade intercourse with the United States.

As for the Liberal party and its leaders, they have made too openly a fight for reciprocity in 1891; they have too generously staked their political existence on that measure and make it necessary for me to state what was their position in

the matter. During that famous election of 1891, both parties advocated restricted reciprocity on natural products with the United States. However, the Liberal party was more anxious for it than the Conservative. So desirous were the Liberals of obtaining it that the majority of them were ready to advocate unrestricted reciprocity, both in regard to agricultural products and in regard to manufactured products, considering that the United States government was not disposed to grant it under other conditions, in accordance with the despatch of Secretary Blaine to Congressman Baker, and with Carlisle motion and the Butterworth Bill. Even now, American statesmen, such as Senator Prouty, of Iowa, are anxious that reciprocity be granted to several manufactured articles. While in 1891 the Conservative party was anxious to secure reciprocity, its leaders refrained from requesting from their supporters who were manufacturers the smallest sacrifice towards obtaining it. However, I repeat it, in respect to restricted reciprocity in natural products, there was not a discordant note, all were unanimous. Possibly it is the only question of policy, financial or otherwise, which has rallied all sections of public opinion in Canada since confederation. If there is any weight to be attached to a general concourse of opinion within a nation, it must be admitted that reciprocity limited to natural products is a desirable thing for Canada. Well, that reciprocity restricted to natural products, without materially interfering with protection to manufactures, properly speaking, is exactly what the United States are offering to Canada to-day.

Now, for nearly three months past we have witnessed the hostility shown by members of this parliament to the acceptance of these proposals. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot but admire the pluck of members of this House, especially of those representing agricultural constituencies, who, in some shape or other, openly or under cover, by dilatory proposals, appeals to plebiscite or attempts at delaying the matter, have endeavoured, or are endeavouring, to stave off, on the eve of obtaining it, the conclusion looked to and wished for by both political parties in Canada for the last fifty years.

Particularly in the province of Quebec our opponents have freely and generously, in the course of last year, thrown on our shoulders a responsibility which was not ours in respect to the naval question. We have begun freeing ourselves of these responsibilities; we shall continue to do so, one by one from the first to the last, and when we have settled our bills with the public, when we have told them all we are bound to tell them, all we wish and are anxious to tell them, our opponents will deem it fair that we should invoke the law of compensation, and let us have our turn; our opponents will admit that in all fairness we should then be permitted to call on them to make good the statements they have been making in the course of last year on that naval question, and to adjust these if possible with actual enactments and facts.

It has been stated by friend and foe that the Laurier government, with their usual expertness, would manage to have the Naval Bill accepted by tacking it on to the reciprocity proposal, a rather striking admission that the reciprocity proposals are popular, in the same way that the naval Bill is said to be unpopular. It has been stated, moreover, that the naval question was a dead issue, and that no more was being said about it. We Liberals are anxious that more should be said about it. We are unwilling that it should be left in the light under which it has been represented in the course of last year, and should our opponents fail to bring it up, we shall see to it that it is not overlooked. We insist on dealing with both questions before the people, for in respect to both the government's policy is worthy of approval and will be approved. When the naval question will have been discussed and threshed out to a finish, we shall take up the question of reciprocity, and in this connection, as well, over the bargain, we shall load our opponents with the responsibilities actually coming to them on account of their interference and attempts at obstruction in regard to a treaty of commerce of which without exaggeration it may be said that its effect would likely be to increase in a large measure Canada's trade, Canada's business and Canada's revenue.

Even admitting that we should be held responsible for all that our opponents charge us with in connection with the navy, such responsibility would be very slight when compared with what they have actually assumed themselves in voting as they have done on the reciprocity issue. I am not a voter in the constituencies of those who proposed or seconded the dilatory motion of February 9, or the plebiscite of March 8. I am not, therefore, called upon to pass judgment in their case and shall abstain from guessing aloud at what their electors will think of their policy of interference and obstruction as regards this treaty. But in the course of last year they and their organs have shown themselves so lavish of their condemnations and electoral forebodings of a disquieting character for ourselves, that I should be allowed to offer on this same subject my clean-cut opinion, which is that the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr.

Monk), the actual Conservative leader as regards Dominion matters in the province of Quebec, has not shown towards his followers in that province the consideration which they had the right to expect when he induced them to vote as they have done on the reciprocity question.

The member for Jacques Cartier is not in the same position as the majority of other hon. member in this House. He represents a constituency situated on the outskirts of the great city of Montreal, where farmers have a highly paying specialty and exceptional opportunities for the sale of their products. Having at hand the markets of the metropolis as an outlet, they do not feel the necessity of catering to the United Staets market. Under these circumstances, the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) will possibly be in a position to square himself up with his constituents.

However, such is not the position of many other hon. gentlemen in this House who represent constituencies farther removed form Montreal or other cities where the production and sale of farm commodities is carried on under the ordinary conditions, and wherein farmers cannot do without the American market, a market which they are threatened to be deprived of on account of the stand taken by their representatives. I believe, therefore, that I am showing greater consideration for these hon. gentlemen than they have shown themselves for us last year if I stop at saying that the voters in some constituencies will show signs of uneasiness and bad temper when they come to pass judgment on the policy followed by their representatives in respect to this reciprocity issue which is of great interest to the farming community. Since our opponents have shown such anxiety in our behalf, in the course of last year, they will not object to our reciprocating their feelings in this connection, unless they are bound to keep aloof from all manner of reciprocity.

The stand taken on this question by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has been the occasion of applause and enthusiasm on the surface at any rate. There is reason to believe that when the vote is taken there will be occasion for hon. gentlemen on this side to show their appreciation of support coming to us from the other side of the House, but these latter changes will be inspired by motives of general interest of a higher order than those which apparently brought about the turn-over of the hon. member for Brandon. This gentlemen has always had a reputation for consistency, and he has just proved once more that he shines in this respect. As long as his financial condition was that of the great majority of his fellow citizens, he stood out against that form of taxation which bears more particularly on the great bulk of his fellow-citizens, but now that deals which have turned out successfully have made him one of the privileged few, whether in this country or elsewhere, he turns out in a mood more favourable to high duties, and advocates economic and fiscal theories in sympathy with the small group of capitalists to which he belongs. His situation is no longer the same and his views have changed accordingly; he remains consistent. He continues to show the same shrewdness, the same keenness in looking after his own interests, a shrewdness and a keenness which do not concern themselves with the general interests of his fellow-citizens, which have nothing of the lofty character apparent in the views of those who devote themselves to forward the public weal, the only goal worthy of men in whom the people are fond of putting and putting permanently their reliance.

Accordingly, his defection will soon be forgotten as others of greater import have been forgotten, with no other aftermath but the protests of his own constituents. And that policy in closer touch with Liberal traditions which heretofore had been his guiding star, that policy more conformable to the general interest, still advocated by his ex-colleague the Minister of Agriculture, by all his former colleagues and by the majority of the members of this parliament that policy more humane, more generous which maintains protection for the benefit of manufacturers, while at the same time mindful of the requirements of the farmer (the founder and foster father of Canada), that policy I say, will meet with the approval of the Canadian people, in the same way that, in spite of failings and defections, the Liberal teaching has prevailed for the last fifteen years throughout the Dominion.

Every policy is sure to have its opponents as well as its promoters. Interests as well as opinions, though not to any greater extent, have their strenuous, uncompromising, devoted advocates. It would be a matter for surprise were proposals of such moment as those relative to the navy and reciprocity issues not to meet with determined opposition in certain quarters. In countries covering a limited area and having a homogeneous population, public opinion is divided and passion runs high on almost all important issues. It stands to reason that in a country such as Canada, with a variegated population and covering nine extensive provinces, there should be a wide field for diversity.

Natural products may require legislation of a different character from that required for manufactured articles. Fisheries, coal mines, steel works, farming in the mari-

time provinces; dairying, butter or cheese making, grain-growing and mining in Quebec or in Ontario ; wheat-growing on a large scale in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta; forestry, fruit-growing, mining and the fisheries in British Columbia may each require a different treatment from that suitable for the manufacturing centres such as Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal or Quebec. The interest of the western man may be different from the interest of the eastern man; the heart swayed by French or Irish traditions may under certain circumstances be more resonant than the thoroughly British mind. But above the conflicting voices emanating from the throng of these various people, interests and feelings, the Canadian nation, made up of the best material on earth, should have enough humanitarian and public spirit to be able to perceive and give emphasis to the most desirable tones, those best in accord with the needs, the rights and the general interests of the people throughout the Dominion.

As for me, while refraining from overconfidence in the future, I hopefully look to these reciprocity proposals as to a further element of wealth and welfare for our country, at the same time accepting my reasonable share of responsibility and claiming my reasonable share of credit in connection with the settlement of the navy question. Owing to the settlement of that question, we have a fleet of our own, distinct, separate, independent, lending itself at the same time, in accordance with our collective or individual needs, subject to our requirements and our decisions, to concerted action with the most powerful fleet in the world. That should enable us to do away the bane of war for an indefinite length of time. In this connection, despite the taunts and obloquy of a hostile press, I believe I have done good work towards ensuring the security, peace and prosperity of a country in which all of us are interested, the manufacturer and the farmer, the man in the west and the man in the east, the citizen of the Dominion whatever his origin, the grown-ups and the children, It means the security, the peace and the prosperity of our common fatherland, Canada.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). Mr. Chairman, the question before the Chair being in my judgment one of the most important questions if not the most important question that has been before this house during the six or seven years that I have been a member, I feel that I am justified in taking up the time of the House sufficiently to put myself on record with regard to it. Before proceeding to deal with the question itself, I wish to enter my protest against the action of the government in springing on the members of this House and the people of the country such a very important question—a question requiring a great deal of time and a great deal of serious consideration—and endeavouring to force the people's representatives here to come to a decision upon it without giving them sufficient opportunity to ascertain the views of the electors generally. Moreover, I think the electorate ought to have been given an opportunity of studying this question from every point of view, and of arriving at some conclusion as to what its probable effects would be, and where it is leading to. I also want to voice my objection to the failure of the government to lay before the members of this House the information that is absolutely indispensable if we are to come to a conclusion that will be really valuable. I want to make a comparison between the action of our negotiators and the action of the negotiators on the other side of the line. When they made up their minds to go into this question, they took a year to do it; they appointed a tariff board and went into the question thoroughly; they had statistics which were more valuable and were put into more concrete form than anything we had in the blue-books issued by the various departments of our governernment. But they did not consider that these were sufficient for their purpose, and through the Tariff Board they appointed agents who went direct to the farmers, and visited every state of the United States, and every province in Canada to ascertain at first-hand the actual conditions, the prices of various articles, and other information which they thought necessary in connection with the matter. It would not appear that any such action was thought advisable by our negotiators, as they took no such precautions. Now, in view of the fact that we in Canada are affected to a much greater extent than are the people of the United States, it would seem to me that our negotiators, and our government behind them, should have taken even greater precautions and have gone into this matter more thoroughly than the United States did, for this reason, that while the United States were interested only in the effect that this arrangement might have in the United States, and the effect it might have in Canada—because as far as they are concerned, the agreement goes no further than these two countries—yet as far as Canada is concerned, we are vitally interested, not only in conditions as they exist in all parts of the United States but in every part of the British Empire, and also in the whole of the thirteen other countries that are producing the commodities that we produce, and that will be the competitors of our farmers as soon as this agreement is completed, if it ever is

completed. That being the case, I think we ought to have had some information with regard to all these countries—as to the cost of production, the means of production, the climatic conditions, wages, and various other matters that will bear upon the agreement, and upon the condition in which our farmers will find themselves if it should go through.

Dealing more particularly with the matter itself, I think that the time for going into the agreement was singularly inopportune. The United States had enacted a hostile tariff, in many respects directed at Canada; they had treated us very harshly in trade matters for 45 years; they had raised a tariff of 45 per cent against us; during those 45 years they have exercised every ingenuity to cripple our trade, and make us dependent upon them; and then, when they had reached a state of almost insurrection against their very high duties, not only the farming community, but the great consuming masses of the towns and cities protesting most vigorously, it seemed that the United States must in the very near future be forced by their own people to lower very considerably their tariff. That being the case, and realizing that the Republican party had been the high tariff party, mainly if not altogether responsible for the trade barrier that had been erected against Canada exporting anything to the United States, the President of the United States tried to find a way of escape from these conditions, and no doubt he was also looking for a second term. So he looked abroad to see where he could get some advantage that would satisfy his own people for the time being, and he said: I will try and make a little deal with Canada, and that will divert the attention of the great farming community, and the consuming masses of the United States; I will make the farmers believe that it is going to help them, and I will make the consumers believe that they will get cheaper products from Canada. He proceeded along these lines to work out his plan. He first got Congress to enact a law that would enable him to put a 25 per cent increase of duty against any country that gave better treatment to any other country than it did the United States. After securing the passage of this Act, which we some times term the club, he took advantage of a very foolish treaty that our government had made with France, and made it a pretext for swinging this club against Canada; and he sent word to our government that he wanted to talk over this matter, and they went down and had a conference. Our government, I suppose, maintained that they had a right to make any deal they liked with another country without it affecting the United States—in fact, the Minister of Finance boldly stated so on the floor of this House in dealing with the French Treaty; yet the President sent for our bold Finance Minister, and the result was that when the interview was over, he came back to this House and reported that we would have to do some little thing to help the President of the United States out of the awkward situation in which he found himself. Some have stated that he went a little further, and that there was a little private understanding not communicated to this House at the time, that they would proceed later on to do something in the nature of the arrangement now proposed But whether that is true or not, the minister came back and tried to do something in the way of lowering a lot of duties that prevailed against the importation of United States products into this country, in order to bring about peace. They reported that when they had visited President Taft he had been very pleasant to them, and had been very sorry, indeed, that the wicked Congress had passed that Act, and compelled him to take some action. They told us about how pleasant he was, and how he smiled when he swung the club. Well, considering the whole matter, and the condition of affairs prevailing in the United States, I do not wonder that he smiled. I only wonder that he did not laugh right out loud. The result was that the Act passed, and the United States was relieved of a considerable amount of duties on goods exported to this country. The result of the arrangements at that time, I suppose, brought about the condition of affairs that we find now.

The Prime Minister, in speaking of that, tried to lead the House and the country to believe that we had always been in favour of a treaty of reciprocity with the United States in agricultural products such as is proposed to-day. I purpose reading a few words spoken by the Prime Minister in 1899, in this regard. He said:

> If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with the honourable gentleman himself (referring to Sir Charles Tupper), would have given many things to obtain the American market; there was a time, not long ago, when the market of the great cities of the union was the only market we had for any of our products. But, thank Heaven, those days are past and over now. We are not dependent on the American market as we were at one time.

Again he said:

> Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself, would have given may things to obtain the American market, but, thank Heaven, these days are past and over.

On another occasion he said:

There was a time when we were wanting reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negatived. We have said good-bye to that trade and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

It has also been represented to us that Sir John Macdonald had always been in favour of a reciprocity treaty. Let me say that I believe Sir John Macdonald was in favour of a reciprocity treaty if it met with the conditions he thought would be favourable to Canada, but when Sir John Macdonald introduced the National Policy in 1878, he distinctly laid down the principle that any bargain we made with the United States would have to be a fair bargain, a bargain that would give Canada an opportunity to sell as much to the United States as we buy from the United States. In the working out of that, he was able to approximate the business transactions between the two countries; but under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite they have allowed the balance to drift altogether in favour of the United States who are now sending us $107,000,000 per annum more goods than they are buying from us. That is a condition that would never have met with the consent of Sir John Macdonald and it would be idle for any member of this House to try to convince the House or country that Sir John Macdonald would ever have accepted any such proposal. The National Policy itself was entered into chiefly with the view, as I said before, of equalizing conditions between Canada and the United States. It has been claimed that under the reciprocity treaty of 50 years or more ago, Canada derived a great deal of advantage. I wish to show that conditions then were altogether different from the conditions that prevail to-day in the two countries. Prior to 1846, the Canada of to-day was a few scattered British possessions, without cohesion, each working independently of the other, with the exception of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, which had just joined forces. Prior to 1846 we enjoyed a measure of preference in the British market. The British people then had a protective tariff and gave an advantage to the colonies which they denied to foreign countries. When they adopted their present trade policy in 1846, and put it upon the statute-book the colonies lost the advantage they had enjoyed up to that time and this put them in a very awkward position. Except those portions of the country which were on the ocean where vessels could land, practically the whole country was shut out from the civilized world, with no opportunity of shipping its surplus unless it was sent through the United States. Under such conditions it was of the very greatest advantage to our people that we should, if possible, have a trade arrangement with the United States. In consequence of this an arrangement was entered into in 1854, covering certain commodities, not exactly on the lines now proposed but resembling this treaty a good deal, binding us for a certain length of time and our trade developed along those lines. Our people found it necessary, in order to keep up any balance of trade with the United States, to put on a tariff against American manufactured goods coming into this country. They needed the money very badly to open up the country, to build roads, railroads, canals, and means of transportation and to help out with all the various things that were necessary for the development of a new country. This treaty worked along all right for a while until the Americans found they were not getting altogether the best of the deal. As soon as they found themselves in that position, they commenced to make serious objections. The matter was discussed in Congress and I shall read from a record compiled by the United States government giving extracts from the Congressional debates on the reciprocity treaty of 1854. I do this to show the objections that arose in the minds of the people of the United States which I believe will apply with equal force to any bargain we may make with them under the present pact. I find the following statement at page 16:

The tariff of 1859 was avowedly based upon an isolating and exclusive policy. It was supported on this ground alike by ministerial organs of the press, by petitions in its favour, and by members of the colonial parliament. After securing our free market for all Canadian productions, its advocates argued that it was the interest of Canadians to become independent of all other countries and to employ their own ships and their own people; thus 'keeping in the country all that is now paid to the United States.'

They can find no justification for the annual increase in their rates of tariff in the assertion that the present rates do not exceed, or own when the treaty was ratified our tariff exceeded theirs and the consideration given to them was not an equality of tariffs, but an interchange of the produce of both countries and certain privileges in navigation, while a liberal policy toward our manufactures was promised and had been adopted; thus placing the commerce and navigation of the two countries upon 'terms reciprocally beneficial and satisfactory,' although we have made large reductions in our tariff since the treaty. Canada had determined to free herself from the difficulties of her geographical position, and the British government was compelled to secure our free markets to prevent rebellion. This was secured through menaces and promises of liberality to manufactured goods. Justice to our people for the privileges granted

by the treaty demands that future Canadian legislation should conform to the letter and spirit of the treaty, and that Canadian enactments should be in the direction of a more free intercourse between the two countries.

If it be true that the Canadian government has a right to increase its taxes upon our industry, as it has done, almost to the exclusion of our manufactures, because no stipulation against this course was inserted in the treaty, then it has a right to put an embargo (for a prohibitory duty amounts to an embargo) upon all articles not enumerated in the treaty, and there could be no check to its aggressions.

They take there the ground that we must not do anything with regard to items not enumerated in the treaty—

Mr. LENNOX. They are going to make our tariff.

Mr. WRIGHT. —and, as intimated by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) our tariff would have to be made altogether in the United States before it would be satisfactory to the people there. Again, at page 17:

'The public debt of Canada has increased from year to year to about fifty millions of dollars, twenty-five millions of which have been created since 1853, principally in the construction of railways yielding no income.'

Countless trains of cars are now daily dashing along these railroads from the seaboard toward the Rocky Mountains, competing, without regard to remuneration, for the commerce of the great valleys of the Lakes and the Mississippi.

The railroads and canals of Canada were alike constructed for the express purpose of extending political and commercial power, by the diversion of the trade of the great interior of our country through the valley of the St. Lawrence and the Canadian routes of transportation, thereby advancing the prosperity of the colony and increasing British power. They were undertaken by the government and were mainly dependent upon subsidies and municipal bonds; and the object of their managers has hitherto been to secure the largest amount of traffic to the roads, instead of the largest dividends to the stockholders.

This extensive system of internal improvements was brought into active life by the ratification of the reciprocity treaty, through which Canada was enabled to open a grain trade between the great west and the Eastern States. To control it, she plunged into extraordinary expenses for an extended railroad and carrying system. Increased taxation was the consequence, and additional duties were imposed upon all manufactured articles, and upon many others not enumerated in the free list of the treaty.

You will observe that the gravamen of that allegation is that this would divert trade and would prevent it going out through American channels and would send it by Canadian channels, that is, down the St. Lawrence, to the ocean. And I hold that the present proposition is intended to change the condition that has been brought about in Canada and again to divert trade through American channels; and if it does not have that effect our American friends will soon bring pressure to bear upon our government for other greater concessions on our part, or they will do away with all the rights they have given us under the bargain. At page 18, we find the following:

To make up the deficiency caused by these speculative expenses, Canada now seeks to make our merchants and manufacturers, who have been most damaged by the diversion of western trade to Canadian cities and transportation routes, pay for her non-remunerative carrying system. This whole modern movement of Canadian or British policy in transportation is artificial, unnatural, and against the laws of trade, climate, and geography—in violation of the spirit of international intercourse as mutually recognized and sanctioned by the reciprocity treaty. It cannot last, even if Congress should refuse to protect our commerce on the inland seas. The transit lines of freight and passengers across this continent to the ocean may be deflected for a time by disturbing causes, but cannot be permanently changed. They are governed by laws as imperative as the natural laws which govern the flow of our rivers in their course to the ocean.

So, you will see, they still stick to the contention that Canada's business should go out through American channels. I quote again from page 19:

The retrograde policy developed by the Canadian tariffs since the ratification of the treaty is not confined in its action to American manufactures. With duties practically differential, through a change in the valuation, she has endeavoured to lessen the business of our shippers, forwarders, and merchants, by diverting trade in tea, coffee, sugar, wine, and all other articles of foreign production, but especially those of tropical origin, from New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other Atlantic cities of the north, to Montreal, choosing a long and circuitous route to the richest and most progressive portions of her territory, endeavouring thus to draw her commerce from all parts of the world along the vast line of her frontier, instead of taking the shortest course from the Atlantic across the United States.

And at page 20:

All the consequences of the high tariffs of Canada cannot yet be thoroughly shown by the governmental statistics of either country. The minute ebb and flow of commerce from one year to another year cannot show the full effect of these exclusive laws. Manufactures are chiefly represented as products of the United States, paying duty in Canada, in the table already given, and exhibiting in this class a decrease from nearly 8,000,000 in 1856 to 4,500,000 in 1858. Manufacturing establishments, however, cannot be brought into full operation in 6 or 12 months, although the progress made by Canadians, under the influence of these tariffs, toward supplying their own wants and excluding us for ever, has been so great that from a locomotive down to a shoe peg almost every branch of the manufactures of this country

is already successfully commenced. Montreal, under the forcing process of protection and discriminating tariffs, is now rivalling Lowell and Lynn in almost every article of their manufacture and approaching our Atlantic cities in the magnitude of her commerce.

For similar reasons the effect of the tariff of 1859 on our exportations of foreign merchandise to Canada cannot be shown in the form of statistics. Less than a fiscal year, under the regulations of either country had elapsed since it received the requisite legal assent.

On page 22 we find the following:

The statesmanlike ideas prevalent at the time when the treaty became law, anticipating the removal of all unnecessary restrictions between two neighbouring states, are in strong contrast with the realities of today. The British provinces are admitted to a special participation in the benefits arising from the American system by an exemption in their favour, while we continue to levy duty on the articles named in the treaty when imported from other countries, but in Canada all these articles, with a few nominal exceptions, are admitted free of duty from every country in the world, and the products of the United States enjoy no more advantage in Canada than they would do if the treaty had never been made or were now abrogated. Thus also, for the articles enumerated in the treaty and produced in Canada, the market of the United States is thrown open to all the world via Canada and the provinces, for no system of inspection can be devised sufficiently exact to determine in what country these common products of temperate zone may have had their origin.

I read that to show that the same objection will immediately follow on this treaty going into effect. Our duty being lower than the duty of the United States, exactly the same condition will prevail again which prevailed in 1854-65, until the treaty was abrogated. If it had that effect then of creating dissatisfaction in the United States, will it not have the same effect if we bring this pact into force now? I want to point out that during the time this treaty was in force, during 1854-5-6-7-8, the imports into Canada and the exports to the United States were as follows:

In 1854 we bought from the United States $15,533,097, and we sold them, $8,649,002. In 1855, we bought from the United States, $20,828,676; and we sold them $16,737,277. In 1856 we bought $22,704,509, and we sold $17,979,753. In 1857, we bought $20,224,650, and we sold $13,206,436. In 1858, the last year for which I have figures, we bought from the United States $15,635,565, and we sold them $11,930,094.

You will perceive, Mr. Chairman, that in all these years we bought from them a great deal more than we sold them, and yet the treaty was so unsatisfactory to the United States that they abrogated it in 1865.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 152) respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. — Mr. Fowke.

CANADIAN BAPTIST FOREIGN MISSION BOARD.

House in committee on Bill (No. 161) to incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.—Mr. Fowke.

On section 7: limit of time of holding property,

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. member (Mr. Fowke), who is in charge of this Bill, should give us some explanation of that clause more especially as to the limit of the time during which property can be held by this association.

Mr. FOWKE. I think the limit is stated at ten years. There is no desire to carry property for speculative purposes, and they propose to divest themselves of all surplus proprietary rights within a period of years.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that that is a longer period than we usually grant for such a purpose. We had a rule years and years ago fixing the limit at seven years. We thought that was a sufficient length of time for property to be held under these conditions. I assume the private Bills committees have well considered this, although I do not see the chairman of that committee here to-night to say whether the matter was discussed or considered at all.

Mr. FOWKE. For the information of the hon. gentleman I may say that I was present at the meeting at which the Bill was considered, it was considered very carefully and passed the committee unanimously in its present form.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was the question of time raised in the committee?

Mr. FOWKE. Well, the clause was read.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was there any discussion as to the time?

Mr. FOWKE. I cannot say that there was.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think this is a very important question for the House to consider.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Apparently every member of the committee was in favour of it as it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was the Minister of Public Works present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say 'apparently.'

Mr. HENDERSON. But we cannot pass legislation on appearances.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not usually have a discussion unless there is some difference of opinion.

Mr. BARKER. I have no objection to the thing itself, but we have every day in our committees the point raised that a certain thing has been done once before. It having been considered that seven years as a maximum was a good rule, I think the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill ought himself to consider whether it is right to extend that period. I have no objection, I have not thought of it, and did not hear of it until to-day, but every day in the committees the statement is made that this has been done before. Somebody gets in seven years, another person gets in ten, and the next one fifteen. We had to-day, in a very important committee, that argument used and unless there is some reason for increasing the time limit from seven to ten years, I think the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill owes it to the House to say why there should be nearly fifty per cent added to the time limit.

Mr. FOWKE. I had not known until now that the rule heretofore obtaining was that a limitation of seven years should be placed on the holding of property in cases of this kind. However, I do not suppose it would do any great harm if we should comply with the desires of those who are seeking this incorporation by extending the period to ten years. The hon. gentleman who has raised the objection, of course, is aware of the fact that the Bill would have to be returned to the Senate and go through the whole process again. If he has no serious objection to allowing it to pass as it is at present. I trust he will reconsider the point which he has raised.

Mr. HENDERSON. My recollection is that ten or fifteen years ago seven years in a case of this kind was considered ample. I remember that on one occasion the Crown actually took possession of property in which I was myself interested after a lapse of seven years because we had not disposed of it. That was a matter of property held under a charter granted by the Ontario government. I have always understood that seven years was a sort of recognized limit. Unless there are good and substantial reasons why we should go beyond that I do not think it is wise. I have not the Bill before me, but I understand that this board asks for the privilege of holding property for ten years for speculative purposes. If the property were for their own use as a board I would not care if they held it for fifty years, but to say that they may hold property for speculative purposes for this length of time is getting too far away from what I have been led to understand was a well established policy. Of course I do not at all wish to impede the progress of the Bill, but what I fear is that the next body of the kind applying for incorporation may ask for twelve or fifteen years or longer, and thus we will be getting further away from what in the past was considered sound policy I believe we should be conservative in these things, and that the well considered policy of former days should not be departed from without substantial reason. More particularly as the Bill relates to a religious organization I would be sorry to see its passage delayed in any way, but I think they should recognize the principles of legislation which have been in vogue in the country for many a long year and should not ask for such a radical departure from the rule.

Mr. PUGSLEY. After all, what is the objection to allowing a religious corporation such as this to hold real estate for ten years? Section 7 limits the value of the real estate held in any province of Canada except Ontario to $50,000 per year, and in Ontario to $150,000, and under section 3 the association is obliged within ten years to sell any property it may have acquired during that period and which is not required for actual use and occupation. Suppose some one should convey a piece of prairie property in the Northwest to this association for religious and charitable purposes, where would be the serious objection to the association holding that property for the comparatively short period of ten years so as to get the advantage of the increase in value for use in religious and charitable purposes? I know of no rule limiting this to ten years, and if there is any such I cannot understand why it has been established in Canada. We have nothing to fear from ordinary religious associations such as this holding property for the short period of ten years. The Senate having passed the Bill, and the committee of this House having passed it, it would in my opinion be relying too much upon a technicality to send it back to the Senate amended.

Mr. BARKER. The Minister of Public Works wants to know why there should be a limitation of ten years or why there should be any limitation at all. Well, it has been considered, having regard to the history of the past, that it is not desirable to put real estate in mortmain. The experience of ages teaches that it is unwise to place real estate in dead hands. If the members of the government present want to lay down the principle that there is nothing in the old objection to mortmain, well and good, but, it has been recognized

wherever the English language is spoken, that the limitation to mortmain should be very strict. The argument of the Minister of Public Works is that church corporations and religious bodies of this kind should hold lands to eternity, but suppose a church should acquire land in this growing country of ours in the middle of what is now a village, but which may grow into a large city, would the minister think that they should reap all the advantage of increased value which the people owning the surrounding property had placed upon it? There is a principle in the thing. There is not a gentleman in this House who would object to the ten years in this particular case except on a matter of pure principle, but if you give ten years here why may not the next religious corporation that comes to us ask for fifteen or twenty years? Before we jump from one stage to another in such a matter we should know why. I take for granted that those who in the past, ruling this country and other countries, thought there was a reason for limiting the holding of such land in dead hands, had sound and good reasons. If so, we ought not to depart from that without some better argument than has been given to us by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the statute of mortmain has not been very effective in this country.

Mr. BARKER. It ought perhaps to be made more effective.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Churches do own a great deal of property, and I have never had very much faith in the statute. I would tax, in the way ordinary property is taxed, the property of religious corporations which is not actually used for church purposes. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowke), says that is the case in the province of Ontario. Any property of religious corporations that is used for business purposes might fairly pay a tax. Whether there should be any limit or not need not now be discussed. The question is between 7 years and 10 years, and I see no more objection to making the limit 10 years than 7 years. But there is another point which my hon. friend is not considering, that is, that this is not a church corporation in the ordinary sense of the word. It is simply a foreign mission board, formed for the purpose of establishing missions and teaching the doctrines of christianity in heathen countries. Can there be any reasonable objection to allowing a society of that kind to receive property, as it would naturally receive it, by way of gift, for the short period of 10 years, so that there might be a reasonable time for it to advance in value, and so that when it was sold the proceeds might be so much the greater to enable the corporation to advance the missionary work for which it has been formed? It does seem to me that in the case of a corporation like this, there is no reasonable objection to allowing a period of 10 years.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister has produced perhaps the best argument that has been offered in favour of limiting the period to the shorter term. I have not read the Bill, but I understand from the hon. member who is promoting it that this is a case in which the property is being held for speculative purposes.

Mr. FOWKE. I did not say that; I said the reverse of that.

Mr. HENDERSON. For what purpose is the land being held?

Mr. FOWKE. For the purposes of the association—for religious purposes.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister has told us that in all probability it is held for increase in value. I would like to know what that is if it is not for a speculative purpose. Suppose they acquire a section of land, 640 acres, in the northwest, and suppose this section is surrounded by men who have gone in to settle on the land and improve it. The section might be in the midst of a school section, and they would probably claim exemption from taxation—I do not know what the law in that respect is out there. At all events, it is not being improved, while the people living adjacent to it are improving their lands and building roads and bridges, and this property is getting all the benefit of their industry and is increasing in value, not by reason of any action on the part of its owners, but by reason of the activity of others. The fact that the land is held in this way is rather a hindrance than a help to the district, and I think that is one of the strongest reasons why they should not be allowed to hold it for any great length of time, but should be required to put it on the market and let it be sold to persons who would cultivate and improve it so that the neighbourhood would get some taxes out of it. It seems to me that the minister has solved the whole problem and has given a conclusive reason why we should adhere to the practice of by-gone years and limit the statute of mortmain to 7 years. If the government proposes to take a departure and adopt a new line of policy, and extend the term to 10 years, then the minister ought to bring in general legislation to give the same right to all other corporations or individuals. I enter my protest against this extension. I am not going to take the responsibility of saying to the hon.

gentleman that he must get the Senate to undo what they have done; but I do contend that we should carefully watch these matters and not make radical changes.

Mr. FIELDING. Is this a radical change? I confess that I am not as well informed as others seem to be with regard to the practice of other bodies. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), would lead us to believe that it is the custom not to allow other religious bodies to hold land more than 7 years. Is that the fact?

Mr. BARKER. I gather from the hon. member for Halton that that is the rule, and it is not denied by the Minister of Public Works. If it is, we ought to adhere to it until we enlarge it for everybody.

Mr. FIELDING. Great as is my respect for the Minister of Public Works, I am not prepared to admit that his failure to deny a thing proves the thing to be correct. Some of us who have had the opportunity of looking into the question—and I confess I am not one—ought to be able to speak more definitely. If this corporation is asking for some privilege which is at variance with what is granted to others of like character, I do not want them to have any exceptional privilege; but I have not seen any evidence yet that that is the rule or the practice.

Mr. BARKER. I understand the rule of parliament to be that the government is responsible for all legislation whether it is government legislation or any other. The Minister of Finance will not dispute that the government while controlling this House is responsible as a government for every Bill that passes here. If the hon. gentleman says he does not know whether it ought or ought not to be granted he should not allow the Bill to pass until he does know.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think that is quite the point. I did not waive any question as to the rights, powers, privileges and duties of the government, and the government does not pretend to control the House, it is the House that controls the government. I dissent entirely from the view of the hon. gentleman, but that is a detail. The hon. gentleman has said this is the rule. If he were able to give us evidence of that I would pay great respect to it, but if he makes that statement as his passing impression I do not think we should regard it as conclusive.

Mr. BARKER. I stated distinctly that I could not assert that a limit of seven years was the absolute rule. That has been stated by a member of this House. The minister, as leader of the House to-night, is responsible that no legislation is introduced contrary to the general principles of parliament in passing such legislation.

Mr. FIELDING. We need not quarrel over that; I prefer to keep our attention on the Bill. No evidence has been given on this matter. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has made a statement which I have no doubt he believes to be correct, but at the same time if I were to ask him to give authority for it, probably he would have as much difficulty as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). If these two hon. gentlemen make the statement the obligation is on them to show that it is correct. I am not contradicting it nor have I had an opportunity to look into it. I know the rule is not general; banks in certain cases are allowed to hold real estate for 12 years.

Mr. BARKER. That is under peculiar circumstances.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so. This Bill has been considered by a committee. If it can be shown that the privilege granted to this association is at variance with what we grant to others, I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite and do not want the Bill to pass in that form but I have not seen any evidence that it is.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman is correct in his argument he would pass this Bill if there was no limitation whatever because we had no evidence before us. What is the duty of the government in regard to legislation? Has the government no obligation to the people of Canada with regard to all legislation proposed here, while they are in power? The hon. gentleman does not go so far as that. Are we as individual members under any personal obligation to look into the question as to what is the policy of this country as a whole on this subject? Surely the hon. gentleman to-night as leader of the government is in that position, not the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) or I.

Mr. FIELDING. I repeat that I do not think this has anything to do with the discussion. If my hon. friend insists on a statement of opinion on that, I would say that the hon. member and every other hon. member in this House is bound to look into every measure which comes before this House and if he takes the responsibility of making a statement about it he ought to have the responsibility of supporting and proving that statement. The hon. member for Halton rested his argument entirely on the assumption that this property would be exempt from taxation.

Mr. HENDERSON. I said it might be.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a question for the provincial authority and as respects this corporation or any other corporation

or any private individual property that is held under conditions which do not make for the general advancement or improvement of the community, the provincial authorities must deal with that by the law of the province and we are not concerned to deal with it here. Whether this corporation would come within the class of corporations whose property is exempt I would not say but I think the hon. member for Halton will agree that this is a matter for the provincial legislature rather than for this parliament. As to the Bill generally there is a practice in this House which I frankly confess I am usually willing to follow. None of us have an opportunity to deal with all the details of Bills particularly of private Bills. For that reason committees have been appointed and if a committee representing the House generally has investigated a Bill and recommended it to this House my general feeling is to support it unless it is clear that the committee has made a mistake. Under that rule I am prepared to support this measure until I see it is a departure from other Bills.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will follow section 7 of the Bill while I read, he will see that this section is identical with section 7 of a statute passed in this House in 1909 to incorporate the Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada. That section reads:

> The society may receive, take and hold real estate by purchase, gift or devise, and determine by by-law the manner in which such property shall be held and conveyed, subject always to the laws of the province in which such real estate is situated; and in regard to any real property which, by reason of its situation or otherwise, is subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, a license in mortmain shall not be necessary for the exercise of the powers granted by this Act.
>
> 2. The annual value of the real estate held by, or in trust for, the society in any province of Canada, shall not exceed fifty thousand dollars, except in the province of Ontario where it shall not exceed one hundred and fifty thousand dollars.
>
> 3. The society shall, within ten years after its acquisition of any real estate, sell or otherwise dispose of and alienate so much of such real estate as is not required for the use and occupation of the board, but nothing herein contained shall be deemed in any wise to vary or otherwise affect any trust relating to such.

Mr. BARKER. The Minister of Public Works has been successful on two occasions in convincing me of the opposite of what he is contending for. I stated at first that I did not know and I do not know what the limitation has been with regard to the holding of property in mortmain for such purposes as this. The hon. gentleman said that his knowledge and recollection was that seven years was the maximum. Nobody has disputed that. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) contends that whether it was the maximum or not, there is no reason why we should not give in this particular Bill 10 years. My statement is that the holding of public lands by mortmain, by dead hand corporations, has been for centuries a serious question in legislation. It has been the subject of the most careful watchfulness. Whether it should be 7 years or 10 or 20 years is not the question to-night. The question is whether we should allow any private Bill to be brought in here and fix a number of years, according to the views of the particular corporation, that it may hold lands especially in such a country as this where properties may increase in 10 or 20 years tenfold or one hundredfold, whether they should be allowed to acquire property, hold it dead in the midst of a progressive people, representing the profit not of their own expenditure but of the work, the energy and the expenditure of the people about them.

And they, instead of assisting, are absolutely holding back the efforts of their neighbours, and yet they reap the full reward. I say, as the hon. member for Halton said, we have no objection to this particular corporation. But we hear every day—we heard it to-day in one of the committees of this House—that this must be all right because it was done before. Unfortunately, it is considered by many members as sufficient answer to any objection in a committee that another committee on another occasion had done the same thing. It is simply raised here as a question, assuming that the hon. member has said is correct, that seven years has been, as a rule, the period allowed to church corporations to hold land for speculative purposes—because that is the truth whether that should be increased to a longer term of years, whether ten or twenty, does not matter. Now, what I contend is that it is the duty of the ministers controling, as they are supposed to do, the legislation of parliament, not to allow any Bills to pass that contravene any general rule of that kind, unless they are prepared to take the responsibility of it. I do not admit for a moment that the government of the country is responsible only for government measures. As I understand the principle on which we work, the government is responsible, while it remains in power, for the legislation of the country generally. If the Minister of Finance, who, I understand, is leading the government here to-night, is prepared to say that ten years is a reasonable limit for these things, let him take the responsibility of it. Then every other person who wants to claim the same privilege will have the right, I presume, to do so. I presume also that the

government will see the propriety, in that case, of passing a general Act with regard to other church corporations that have hitherto been limited to seven years, to provide that they may have ten years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I desire to take a minute to refer to the statutes. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) says there is a seven year rule——

Mr. BARKER. I have not said so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) says so——

Mr. HENDERSON. No, if the minister will excuse me, I will repeat what I said. I gave my authority for putting the period at seven years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was it?

Mr. HENDERSON. A joint stock company, in which I was interested, was formed for the purpose of building houses in the village in which I live. It applied to the authorities of the province of Ontario for a charter of incorporation. The government was that of Oliver Mowat—he was not then Sir Oliver. I have not always adhered to the teaching of Oliver Mowat, but he was a great lawyer, and he understood business well enough. In granting us that charter, he limited us to seven years. That is the reason I gave why I thought a seven year period was the proper period. In the case I speak of the property was not held unused, for buildings were erected on it and the taxes paid on the property were probably ten times more than before these buildings were constructed. After seven years that property was escheated to the Crown. If that was the doctrine of Oliver Mowat, I think it must be sound doctrine, and I think I am treading on safe ground when I accept that, and give it as a reason for the course I have contended for. If I am wrong, Oliver Mowat was wrong. I may say that we acquired the property back from the Crown, but it cost us something. I have given my authority, and I hope the Minister of Finance will be satisfied with it. I do not think he will say that Oliver Mowat was not a good authority, or that he did not know anything of the statute of mortmain.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Except that the instance he quotes has nothing to do with the rule of this House in incorporating these bodies, or with the statute of mortmain, the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Henderson's) instance is very good. The statutes of mortmain are statutes which apply to religious bodies, and a religious body, as the hon. member for Halton says is one which does not do anything to utilize its real estate except as may be required for its religious houses or churches. I have shown that in 1909 a statute was passed incorporating a religious body, and fixing the period at ten years. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) were members of the House at that time. Then, at the last session of parliament, not only one but three different companies of this character were incorporated, the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming, the Congregational Union of Canada, and L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, two being Catholic institutions, and one Protestant, and in all three cases the time named was ten years. So, I have produced four cases, which certainly must be pretty good evidence, unless we have something to the contrary, of what the rule in this House actually is. And in dealing with the incorporation of a religious body, and determining what period it should be allowed to hold real estate, it would be better for us to follow what parliament has done rather than what Oliver Mowat may have done in Ontario in granting a charter to a commercial corporation which would enable it to hold property and carry on its corporate business.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) has given what he imagines is the practice of this House. It may have been the practice in the last few years, but it has not always been the practice, for I know for a fact that corporations which received their corporate powers from this House have been allowed to hold property for seven years only. I have here one of these charters. It is regarding a fraternal society, and I remember distinctly the charters of three or four fraternal societies, all of which got their corporate powers from this House. My impression is that every one of them was allowed to hold property for seven years only.

But the association should sell such real estate property as it acquires by the foreclosure of any mortgage, hypotheque, or lien within seven years after it has been so acquired.

At that time a fight was made to have the period extended to ten years, and it was refused by this House. I think the same thing took place with regard to one of the Orders of Foresters, and one or two other fraternal societies this Act I refer to went through about 1890, and after then the time was seven years. I think I can turn up several of those Acts and verify the statements I have made if necessary, because these were all called in question at the time this charter was passed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It seems to me the onus is rather upon the government to show a reason for changing the rules from seven to ten years. As I have always understood, all the various statutes of mort-

main limit the right of holding property of this kind to seven years. But it seems to me this parliament has no jurisdiction whatever to say what time a religious body or any other body should hold real estate, when the subject of mortmain is a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the local provinces. Under the British North America Act any local province has power to deal with property and civil rights, and I have been unable to come to the conclusion that this parliament has any jurisdiction in that respect. I notice in the statute incorporating the Missionary Society of the Methodist Church, passed in 1872, the limitation there is in these words:

And such conveyance should be subject to the laws relating to the conveyance of real estate to religious corporations which are in force at the time of such conveyance in the Canada in which such real estate is situate.

I notice in the Act incorporating the Missionary Society of the Church of England, this provision:

And any device of real estate should be subject to the laws respecting the devisers of real estate to religious corporations in force at the time of such devise in that part of Canada in which such real estate is situate.

So I say we have no right to interfere to the extent of saying what length of time a religious corporation shall hold property, because we are thereby infringing upon the domain of the provinces. I think if this matter were referred to the Minister of Justice he would support my contention. If we can limit the time at all, we can say fifty years, and if we can say fifty years, we can absolutelv obliterate the provincial statutes in that regard.

WAYS AND MEANS — RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the House resumed in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. WRIGHT. When the House rose at six o'clock I was dealing with the causes that led to the abrogation of the treaty of 1854, and giving the reasons which induced the American people to cancel that agreement which had been in force for the previous ten years. I was attempting to show that their reason was that it was not sufficiently in favour of the United States, although they were profiting very largely, and their exports to Canada were much in excess of our exports to the United States. While they were sending the finished products of their factories into Canada, we were supplying them with raw material and agricultural products. I was attempting to show that if this proposed agreement went into effect, unless it proved to be very much to the advantage of our American neighbours, they would immediately proceed to cancel it, or would put such regulations in force by means of their custom houses as to hamper our trade very much. Now it is a question in my mind whether, if we pass this treaty, it will be observed by them as it ought to be observed. We have to go back in history to see how other treaties and bargains that we have made with the United States have been observed by them. Going back to the treaty of Washington, in 1782, we find that the United States agreed at that time to take whatever steps might be necessary in order that the United Empire Loyalists, those who had property in the United States when they left that country on account of the revolution, would be able to get back the possession of their estates; and the United States government agreed to recommend the state legislatures to pass the necessary legislation. This was considered by our people as an equivalent to an agreement that they would be enabled to recover possession of their property. But this agreement was never carried out, the American people sheltering themselves behind the excuse that the various states had to deal with this matter, and the various states never gave over to the people that were entitled to them the lands and estates that they had held. In the treaty of 1871, there was a provision for free fish. Our American friends soon discovered that while fish might come in free, the cans could not come in free, and they put a duty of 1½ cents on each can. In the same treaty the joint use of our canals was provided for. But the Americans, by some tricky customs regulation, compelled the boats going to American ports from Canadian ports to call at the first port of entry and report themselves; and then Congress suplemented that by an Act that these boats would have to unload at the very first place at which they called. If such a regulation were put in force again, the position would be that if a boat left Port Arthur it would have to register, we will say, at Sault Ste Marie, and there it would have to unload its cargo, supposing it were destined for Buffalo or some other port, and that would practically put our Canadian boats out of business. Now, in the carrying trade of the Great Lakes, we have 84 steel ships and 4 wooden ones, with 2,500 officers and men, and 5,000 freight handlers. If such a regulation were again put into force it would be a very serious matter indeed to our whole marine interests.

Now, let us consider for a little the reasons which may be actuating our American neighbours and impelling them to make this agreement with Canada. Mr. Taft is upon record to the following effect:

If we can enlarge our supply of natural resources and especially of food products and

the necessities of life without substantial injury to any of our producing and manufacturing classes, we should take steps to do so now.

Also:

By giving our people access to Canadian forests we shall reduce the consumption of our own, which, in the hands of comparatively few owners, now have a value that requires the enlargement of our available timber resources.

Mr. Pinchot, in dealing with this question says:

The five indispensably essential materials in our civilization are wood, water, coal, iron and agricultural products.

We have timber for less than thirty years at the present rate of cutting. The figures indicate that our demands upon the forest have increased twice as fast as our population.

We have anthracite coal for but fifty years, and bituminous coal for less than two hundred.

Our supplies of iron ore, mineral oil, and natural gas are being rapidly depleted, and many of the great fields are already exhausted. Mineral resources such as these when once gone are gone for ever.

The diversion of great areas of our public land from the homemaker to the landlords and the speculator; the national neglect of great water-powers, which might well relieve, being perennially renewed, the drain upon our non-renewable coal; the fact that but half the coal has been taken from the mines which have already been abandoned as worked out and by caving-in have made the rest for ever inaccessible; the disuse of the cheaper transportation of our waterways, which involves comparatively slight demand upon our non-renewable supplies of iron ores, and the use of the rail instead—these are other items in the huge bill of particulars of national waste.

Mr. Beveridge says:

There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbour. That policy already has driven American manufactures across the Canadian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workmen to supply trade.

That capital should be kept at home employ American workmen to supply Canadian demand. We should admit Canadian wood pulp and Canadian paper free in return for Canada's admitting our agricultural implements, our engines, pumps and other machinery free. We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada freely admitting other American manufacturing products to Canadian markets.

We find this report from Washington on the 21st February:

Washington, Feb. 21.—Free trade with Canada, based upon identical tariffs of that country and the United States, as applied to all other countries of the world, was discussed by the Ways and Means Committee of the House under a resolution by representative Gaines, of West Virginia.

The resolution contemplates a commercial compact between the two countries, whereby they shall agree to establish identical tariffs against all other countries. All duties between Canada and the United States on the products of either are then to be abolished, and virtual free trade is to reign within the borders of the North American continent north of the Mexican line. The committee took no action, but it is understood will consider the measure further.

The resolution directs the President to undertake negotiations with Canada looking towards a compact to exist twenty years or longer between the two countries, each agreeing to adopt the same tariff wall against the world.

Mr. Hill, speaking at Chicago a short time ago on the subject of this measure, used the following language:

Reciprocity in raw materials, in natural products, and in some of the simpler and more generally used articles of manufacture, as provided for in the pending agreement, is the obvious road to a relation profitable to both countries.

The time, probably the last time, when this can be realized has arrived.

The future union of all parts of the British Empire in a commercial federation is almost certain.

When that shall have been concluded, under a system of preferential advantages securing the English market to the colonial producer of raw materials and food products, and the colonial market to the English manufacturer, it will strike the United States a double blow.

Our best customer, Great Britain, and our third best, Canada, will trade less and less with us and more and more with each other.

And it will then be permanently impossible to repair our error.

Political and economic weather signals indicate that should the present measure fall no other can succeed for many years, if ever.

Governor Foss gave expression to the following sentiments:

There are two essentials to successful industry. First, that you must have your raw materials on as favourable a basis as possible. This includes not only what goes into the industry, but also includes the food and necessities of life to the workingmen.

Second, you must have the broadest possible markets.

These are the two requisites and these are what reciprocity will give to Boston.

You will have better transportation facilities both on land and water, our coastwise shipping will double and every steamship company serving the district to the north and east of us will double its fleet.

Our great water terminal, Boston harbour, will be improved with new docks and piers adequate to this increased business.

Our present railroads will increase their facilities and extend their lines to handle the increased business and the great transcontinental lines of Canada will come to the port of Boston, which is the natural port for eastern Canada as well as New England.

Reciprocity will command a greater Boston, for our increased industrial and commercial

interests will compel it. Real estate values will increase materially owing to this increased business development, and the increased population which will follow.

New factories in all lines will be established here, for with these conditions our capital will no longer seek Canada for the purpose of building up those factories which it is now forced to build in Canada by unnatural tariff conditions.

To every man, woman and child in Massachusetts reciprocity will mean a greater opportunity for a livelihood, and it will mean that our young men and young women will find better opportunities right here at home and will not be compelled to seek their fortunes in other sections of the country.

Reciprocity will give Massachusetts a more equal chance with other sections of the country, and this without doing any injustice to other sections. That is, we shall not enjoy these advantages at the expense of other sections.

Reciprocity will not only build up this section, but the whole country will receive a tremendous impetus for the next 100 years. It will enable the wealth of New England to safely invest its capital in the development of the natural resources of Canada, to the mutual advantage of both peoples.

This commercial union of these two English-speaking neighbours of the same family will make for the peace and good-will of the entire world.

When this question was being discussed in Congress Mr. Clark, the present Speaker of the House of Representatives, spoke as follows:

I look forward to the time when the American flag will fly over every square foot of British North America up to the north pole. The people of Canada are of our blood and our language. If the treaty of 1854 never had been abrogated, our countries would be much further advanced than now towards this end.

Mr. Martin of South Dakota—Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and make free trade on all products?

Mr. Clarke—By taking Canada in, to become a part of the United States—Yes.

Mr. Norris of Nebrasks—As I understand it, the gentleman favours the Bill for at least one reason, that it will have a tendency in the end to bring Canada into the union?

Mr. Clarke—Yes, I have no doubt about that.

Some years ago Senator Sherman discussed this question in the United States Senate using the following language:

The way to union with Canada is not by hostile legislation; not by acts of retaliation, but by friendly overtures. This union is one of the events that must inevitably come in the future; it will come by the logic of the situation, and no politician or combination of politicians can prevent it. The true policy of this government is to tender freedom in trade and intercourse, and to make this tender in such a fraternal way that it shall be an overture to the Canadian people to become a part of this republic . . . The settlement of the Northwest territory, the Louisiana and Florida purchases, the annexation of Texas, and the acquisition from Mexico are examples of the adaptation of our form of government for expansion, to absorb and unite, to enrich and build up, to ingraft in our body politic adjacent countries, and while strengthening the older states, confer prosperity and development on the new states admitted into this brotherhood of Republican States . . . With a firm conviction that this consummation most devoutly to be wished is within the womb of destiny, and believing that it is our duty to hasten its coming, I am not willing, for one, to vote for any measure not demanded by national honour that will tend to postpone the good time coming, when the American flag will be the signal and sign of the union of all the English-speaking peoples of the continent from the Rio Grande to the Arctic Ocean.

A United Stafes authority referring to the old reciprocity treaty says:

It is probable that Canada never was so near forcible annexation by the United States as when the earlier reciprocity treaty was denounced in 1865. The closer the two countries can now come to unrestricted trade the more certain and lasting will be their friendship and independence.

In 1888 the Chicago 'Tribune' dealing with this question wrote:

There are two ways in which Canada can protect herself from all possibility of a quarrel with this country about fish. One of these is by commercial union with the United States. The other is political union. If she is not ready for either, then her saftey lies in not provoking the United States by unfair or unfriendly dealing, for when the provocation comes, Uncle Sam will reach out and take her in, in order to ensure quiet, and neither she nor her venerable old mother can prevent it.

I read the following as indicating the trend of feeling in the United States on this question:

Lansing, Mich., Feb. 23.—Representative Fiske, of the second district of Jockson county, who is a farmer, introduced this annexation-of-Canada resolution yesterday:

Whereas, there has recently been introduced in the Congress of the United States by Representative Bennet, the following resolution:

That the President be requested to commence and continue negotiations with the British government to secure the annexation of the Dominion of Canada to the United States.

And whereas, there seems to be in this state at this time considerable sentiment in favour of a closer relationship with Canada, therefore be it

Resolved, by the House the Senate concurring, that it is the sense of this legislature that annexation is the true and only equitable solution of the problem and that we therefore favour the passage of the so-called Bennet resolution; and be it further

Resolved, that upon passage of this resolution copies be sent to Michigan senators and representatives in Congress.

The motion according to the rules, goes over for one day.

Dismarck, N.D., Feb. 21.—Annexation of Canada came before the legislature to-day, when Rep. Sorlie introduced a resolution declaring that the measure pending before Congress and the Canadian parliament, relating to the free exchange of farm products, shows that the two countries have interests in common.

It is also contended in the resolution that the people of the two nations can be best served under the same government.

Pointing to the fact that western Canada is largely populated by citizens of the United States, the resolution asks 'North Dakota members in Congress to use their influence in bringing about a peaceable annexation treaty.

Washington, Feb. 21.—Ex-Governor N. J. Bachelder, of New Hampshire, master of the National Grange, speaking to-day before the Senate Committee on Finance, suggested that the only fair way for free trade to be established would be to let the Stars and Stripes float over Canada.

The Los Angeles (California) 'Herald,' in an article reproduced in the following typographical form, says:

It was unfortunate just at this juncture, when every vote in the legislative councils at Washington and Ottawa is needed to ensure the ratification of the Canadian reciprocity treaty, that Champ Clark should have made his half jocular break about the annexation of the Dominion. The Canadian reactionaires will make the most of it, though it seems unlikely that they will be able to prevent approval on this side.

But, just the same, though this was the wrong time to say the right thing, many of us may live to see the very result that Champ Clark hopes for, brought about by this reciprocity agreement.

It may be predicted that the razing of the tariff bars will in time show both parties to the bargain that they have everything in common. Their social and trade relations are apt to become so intertwined that the most natural thing will be political union.

The late Goldwin Smith was the leader of a considerable party of annexationists in Canada. They have less strength, relatively, now than formerly, owing to the foolish tariff attitude of this country that has alienated many. But they are a good nucleus for the future annexation party.

These are a few opinions out of very many expressed in the United States. Showing very conclusively what is actuating our American friends in the move they are now making.

Now, Sir, with regard to the treaty itself I want to say that there was a feeling of intense anxiety all over the Dominion when it was learned that our government had sent men to Washington to negotiate an arrangement with the United States. The efforts of the government in the past had been so unfavourable to Canada that great anxiety indeed permeated the whole business portion of the country. We had had experience of different bargains that this government had made. After coming into power in 1896, they took up the tariff and introduced what has been termed the British preference, though it was not intended to be a British preference. In fact, Great Britain was not mentioned in the Act. It was simply an offer to all countries that would in tariff matters bring about a condition of affairs that would be favourable to Canada, to grant to them similar favours by lowering the tariff, I think 10 per cent.

I take exception to the principles on which this government seem to have managed all their affairs since they came into office. I had always understood that it was a good British principle that the people ruled, but ever since they came into power in 1896 they have utterly ignored that principle, which is supposed to permeate all our legislatures and councils all over this country. If any municipal council in the province of Ontario at any rate, were to attempt to mortgage the future beyond their term of office, they would be violating the law of the land. They are empowered to carry on the ordinary affairs of the constituency over which they preside for their term of office; but if they want to do anything beyond that, they have to go to the people to get permission to do so. If they want to build a courthouse or establish a sewerage system, or an electric light plant or waterworks, the consent of the people must always be obtained; and I had understood that even in the Dominion government the same principle was supposed to prevail. But when these hon. gentlemen came into office, they immediately started off by keeping the people in the dark, and they thought that was a great virtue. The Minister of Agriculture, in dealing with the move known as the British preference, in his speech on the 28th of February, used these words:

I fail to remember a single statement on the part of the present leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), or any member of the party placing before the people of Canada the principle and details of the British preference brought down to this House in 1897. Did anybody at that time say that we had no mandate for that policy? I can remember well that when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) announced his British preference in the House, it was like a thunderclap to the House and to the people; nobody expected it; nobody dreamed of it. The secret was well kept, so that, with the exception of the men who sat at the council board of that day there was not a single individual in Canada who knew that we were going to bring down a proposal for a British preference on the lines that were announced.

The same secrecy seems to prevail in the councils of the government with regard to all the great measures that have come to the surface during their term of office. On the Transcontinental railway they kept the

people absolutely in the dark. With regard to the Autonomy Bills for the Northwest, the same secrecy prevailed. The same with regard to the French treaty, and the same with regard to the bargain that is now proposed. In my opinionfi this is entirely opposed to the underlying principle of all British government.

It is well known, I think, to the members of this House that when the British preference was enacted, our government got into trouble with Germany. They found that they would have to give the same advantages to Germany and I think to Belgium that they were expected to give to Great Britain. Consequently they had a lot of trouble with Germany for several years; but finally a few years ago came to some kind of settlement with Germany which was supposed to be very favourable to Canada. The net results of our trade with Germany for the last year reported are as follows. We bought from Germany $7,958,264, and we exported to Germany $2,065,768, showing that we got practically no advantages worth speaking of from our friends in Germany. I think the bargain was an exceptionally bad one for Canada. I will quote the bulk of the exports of farm products that we sent to Germany:

Grain and flour	$1,134,418
Fruits	102,728
Beef, &c	11,652
Clover, flax, &c	123,384
Tobacco	1,201
Total	$1,373,383

In addition, we exported to Germany, agricultural implements to the value of $461,921.

Our government also made a bargain with France, known as the French treaty, which was supposed to be of great value to our people. The net results of that bargain were as follows. In the last financial year we bought from France $10,170,903 worth of goods and sold to them $2,640,648 worth. We exported to France the following farm products:

Grain	$337,629
Fruits	34,902
Hay	5,580
Hides	1
Seeds and grasses	8,904
Vegetables	3
Total	$387,019

We did sell them pretty largely of agricultural implements and lobsters: implements, $787,524; lobsters, 949,793; other fish, $48,960. In regard to opening a market for our farmers, the French treaty was one of the greatest possible failures. In adition to the great disadvantage it has been to Canada, our government has voted and paid $200,000 every year to a steamship line to ply between Canada and France and bring French goods to Canada, for practically that is about all it has to do, and the farmers of Canada have to help to pay that $200,000, for which they get practically little or no advantage. Then the government made a bargain with Italy, to which our total exports of farm products seem to be a small quantity of wheat, $430,919 worth. Our total imports from Italy last year were $945,243, and our exports to Italy $829,508, a balance against us of $115,735.

Under the British preference they allowed quite an amount of agricultural products to come into this country at the preferential rate, so that instead of being an advantage on the whole to the farmers of Canada, all four bargains made by this government have proved of very decided disadvantage. We have sent to England under the head of agricultural products the following:

Animals	$ 10,080,352
Animal products	69,117
Grain	60,498,857
Grain products	10,097,943
Breadstuffs	1,246,258
Fruits	4,508,532
Hay	922,718
Hides and skins	32,138
Hops	25,765
Oil cake	393,523
Provisions and meats	30,071,269
Seeds	3,042,817
Total	$120,989,289

That is the best market that Canada has for these products. I do not think our government can claim credit for opening the British market to the Canadian farmer, as it has been entirely free, with the exception of the embargo on live cattle, during all these years.

It may be interesting to learn that largely as the result of this lowering of duties on goods from Great Britain, Great Britain was able to send to Canada, in competition with our farmers, the following:

Living animals	$ 625,995
Breadstuffs	681,524
Dried fruits	97,894
Green fruits	272,732
Preserved fruits	262,648
Hides and skins	1,848,242
Hops	50,736
Provisions	144,200
Seeds	62,212
Vegetables	113,536
Total	$3,959,719

We imported from Great Britain almost twice the amount of agricultural products that we exported to France, Germany and Italy during the fiscal year.

We hear so much about the advantage to Canada of the 90,000,000 market, that it will be perhaps advisable to quote a few figures dealing with the trade between Canada and

the United States in an effort to ascertain whether the arrangement as a whole will be of any advantage to the people of this country. In volume 2 of the Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the last fiscal year, I find the following statistics of our trade with the United States for 1910:

TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES, 1910.

Agricultural Products.

Imports from.			Exports to.
Living animals	D.	$ 687,507	
"	F.	1,727,700	
Total		$ 2,416,207	$2,307,125
Grain	D.	$12,899,609	
"	F.	4,636,824	
Total		$17,536,433	2,958,470
Breadstuffs	D.	$ 932,949	
"	F.	146	
Total		$ 933,095	1,703,196
Provisions	D.	$ 3,928,697	361,957
Vegetables and potatoes		1,004,426	683,908
Fruits	D.	$ 2,696,914	
"	F.	3,761,187	
Total		$ 6,458,101	519,623
Seeds	D.	$ 1,008,246	
"	F.	30,775	
Total		$ 1,039,021	1,258,012
Hops		$ 147,752	2,133
Flax, hemp and jute	D.	$ 210,158	
" " "	F.	$ 220,851	
Total		$ 431,009	104,566
Hay		$ 138,143	675,843
Oil cake		$ 86,154	40,528
Hides and skins	F.	$ 1,760,420	5,487,775
Oils	D.	$ 2,736,956	
"	F.	2,204,921	
Total		$ 4,941,877	169,622

Before proceeding to quote some further figures, I would say that if the present pact should go into effect it may become a very vital factor in our commercial life and interfere with a very large portion of our total trade, while our exports of agricultural products to the United States amounted to only one-forty-fourth of the total of their agricultural Exports. We only buy one dollar's worth out of every $30 worth they sell of that class of goods; so that if at any time they see fit to abrogate the arrangement it will cut a very small hole in their total trade, while it may be a very serious matter for us. The United States have a very large export of farm products, and I want to quote a few figures to show that there is very little foundation for the statements that are being sent broadcast over this country that they will likely soon be importers of natural products to feed their teeming millions. They sell of agricultural products as follows:

Great Britain	$375,674,868
Germany	171,592,232
France	64,489,091
The Netherlands	44,603,736
Italy	43,603,700
Belgium	30,461,220
Canada	30,375,721

And to all other countries a sufficient amount to make up a total for last year of $903,238,122. It would not look, Mr. Chairman, as if there was a very promising prospect for the Canadian farmer in his attempt to find a market in the United States. I want to deal for a few minutes with some of the commodities which it is stated we will be able to sell very largely to the United States. Let me deal first with the question of apples. We are told that there will be a great market for our apples. I will not go into the figures for each year but I will give the total of five years' export and import of apples. During the last five years for which we have figures, we sold to the United States 229,210 barrels of apples and we got for them $626,129, or we got on an average $2.73 per barrel. During the same five years we bought from the United States 216,203 barrels and paid for them $900,662, or $4.16 per barrel. The reason, of course, is very easy to understand. The Americans, being further south, and their apples coming in earlier, they are able to put them on the market a week and sometimes two weeks before the Canadian apple producer, and in consequence they get the cream of the apple trade. They will get that to a much greater extent if apples can come in here free. It must not be forgotten that if we carry this agreement into effect it will cut a very considerable hole in our customs receipts, and whatever is lacking there will have to be made up by the imposition of further duties upon other goods of which the farmer will have to contribute his share either in increased purchases or increased duty upon the purchases that he is already making.

I will enumerate just a few of the things that we have sold a little of to the United States and will not wait to quote the figures the other way as it would be shown on the whole that they are selling more to Canada of most of these things that we are selling to them while the trade advantage would be the other way with regard to a few of them. In ten years we have sold of butter to the United States, 2,253,795 pounds. We received for that $428,793, or we got for the butter that we

sold to the United States on the whole 19 cents a pound. In ten years we sold 867,342 tons of hay, for which we received $6,404,178, or $7.38 per ton. Yet we hear that there is going to be a great advantage to the producers and sellers of hay in this country. It would not look as if it were to be a wonderful advantage when we are selling hay on the average at $7.38 a ton. In ten years we sold 4,057,491 bushels of oats for which we got $1,692,049, or an average of 41 cents per bushel, which was not so bad. Of wheat we sold them in ten years 11,249,205 bushels.

We got for it $9,367,709, or an average of 83 cents a bushel. We are told that, in this article of wheat at least, the consumption in the United States is fast overtaking production, and that in a very few years they will find it necessary to buy wheat. I have gone over the figures for the forty-five years for which figures are available, and I find that they have had for export, on the average 25 per cent of their total crop of wheat. I have taken the figures for the last ten years—owing to differences in the crop yield in different seasons, it is necessary to take a period of years long enough to give a fair average—and I find that during that period they have had for export, and have exported, 24 per cent of their wheat production. So, it would not look as though they were going to reach a point in the very near future at which they will find it necessary to buy wheat. I have here a table of the wheat production of the United States for some years past which shows that their production is practically keeping pace with their population and consumption:

United States wheat production:

Year	Bushels.
1901	522,229,505
1902	749,460,218
1903	670,063,008
1904	637,821,835
1905	552,399,517
1906	692,979,489
1907	735,260,970
1908	634,087,000
1909	664,602,000
1910	737,199,000

I have other figures showing the average price of wheat for the farmers over the whole of the United States for nine years—the tenth year was not available. The figures are as follows:

Average price of wheat to the farmers in the United States for 9 years:

Year.	Average price.
1900	61.09
1901	62.04
1902	63.00
1903	69.05
1904	92.04
1905	74.08
1906	66.07
1907	87.04
1908	92.08

Average price for nine years.. 74½

Now, leaving wheat for the present, I wish to deal with the question of potatoes, another item on which great expectations have been based. In discussing this question, the Minister of Agriculture stated, as reported at page 4525 of unrevised 'Hansard':

> Now I want to say a word about potatoes and fruit. In twelve years of high duties, the United States accepted from Canada $11,000,000 worth of potatoes more than they sent to Canada.

In my opinion, the minister is entirely astray, and I do not believe he can substantiate his statement by any accurate figures. According to the return brought down to this House lately, our sales of potatoes to the United States from 1901 to 1910 inclusive were as follows:

Quantity and value of potatoes (Canadian produce) exported from Canada to United States.

Years	Bushels.	Value.
1901	231,101	$ 68,151
1902	808,041	327,046
1903	138,855	56,969
1904	1,451,070	742,537
1905	34,870	18,301
1906	473,239	128,363
1907 (9 months)	8,941	4,250
1908	34,392	15,459
1909	574,454	251,907
1910	678,632	345,903
Totals	4,433,495	$1,988,886

Average 64 cents per bushel.

And in the same period, we bought from the United States as follows:

Quantity and value of potatoes imported into Canada from the United States:

Years.	Bushels.	Value.
1901	136,666	$ 88,649
1902	81,771	87,970
1903	407,425	228,609
1901	77,028	78,025
1905	518,875	232,044
1906	227,155	126,163
1907 (9 months)	94,521	71,065
1908	249,907	195,650
1909	127,110	129,725
1910	217,170	181,751
Totals	2,139,968	$1,419,651

Average 66 cents per bushel.

So when we deduct from the money that we received for all our potato sales to the United States for ten years, the amount of money we paid them for potatoes, the credit balance to the people of Canada was actually $539,235. So when the Minister of Agriculture tells us that he can show a balance of $11,000,000, he will have to cut that down by about ten millions and

a half. I will now quote from the 'Weekly Sun,' one of the strongest advocates of this reciprocity pact, on the 1st of March, 1911:

At local points potatoes are selling as follows: St. Thomas, 90c. per bag; Peterborough, 80c. per bag; Chatham, $1; Owen Sound, 70c., and Bellevlle, 75c to 80c.

The trade bulletin says:

An easier feeling is apparent in the Montreal market. A number of carloads of American potatoes arrived during the week, and these, with the liberal supplies of Green Mountains from the lower provinces, caused a break in the prices. Sales are being made at 90 cents to 92½ on track.

In New York, says the 'Weekly Sun,' of the above date, potatoes are $1.37 to $1.62 in bulk for 180 lbs.; Jersey, $1.25 to $1.65 per bag or barrel; State, $1,25 to $1.50 in bulk per 100 lbs., with inferior $1 to $1.10 per bag. Showing that in the city of New York potatoes were much cheaper than they were in Montreal. The Montreal 'Gazette' of to-day speaking of potatoes, says:

In potatoes the feeling is firm under a good demand and small offerings. For car lots sellers are now asking $1.10 to $1.15 per bag, and in a jobbing way sales were made at $1.25.

I quote these figures because I propose later to refer to prices of several commodities in certain portions of the United States. I may say that we sold them of barley, 1,123,225 bushels in ten years, for which we received $578,579, or 51 cents a bushel. Now with regard to the prices of animals in the United States, I will make one or two quotations. From the publications of the International Agricultural Institute, from which the Department of Agriculture obtain their statistics, I find on page 16, on the date February 20, 1911, prices of various farm products. I will give two months in each year. In 1909, on the 1st July, the following prices prevailed over the whole of the United States: Corn, 77 cents; wheat, $120·8; oats, barley, 67; rye, 81·7; buckwheat, 86·9; flaxseed, $1.53·1; potatoes, 91; hay, $10.56; cotton, 10·3; butter, 21·9; eggs, 18·5; chickens, 11·1.

On the 1st December, 1909, the prices were: Corn, 59·6; wheat, 99·8; oats, 40·5; barley, 52·2; rye, 73·9; buckwheat, 69·9; flaxseed, $1.52; potatoes, 54·9; hay, $10·62; cotton, 13·9; butter, 27·4; eggs, 28·4; chickens, 10·8.

In 1910 on the 1st of April the prices were: Corn, 65·5; wheat, $1.04; oats, 45·6; barley, 59·7; rye, 76·6; buckwheat, 73·4; flaxseed. $1.93; potatoes, 47·4; hay, $12.73; cotton, 14·1; butter, 25·8; eggs, 18·6; chickens, 11·9.

On the 1st of October, 1910, the prices were: Corn, 61·1; wheat, 93·7; oats, 36·3; barley, 56·1; rye, 72·8; buckwheat, 71·3; flaxseed, $2.34; potatoes, 67·8; hay, $11.82, cotton, 13·3; butter, 26·2; eggs, 22·4; chickens, 11·6.

I find in this same publication figures regarding live animals. For the ten years from 1900 to 1909 inclusive, the average value of horses in the United States was $71.99; milch cows, $30.12; other cattle, $18.09; sheep, $3.13; swine, $6.46.

I may remark that when I went west some weeks ago, I happened to meet a gentleman who lived within 22 miles of St. Paul, and who formerly lived in Windsor, Ontario, where I met him. His name is William Steacy, and he gave me some of the prevailing prices in his neighbourhood. He reported that good average farm horses could be bought for $125; steers, 3 and 4 years old, from $30 to $35; milk cows in the spring, $40; hogs, 7 and 8 cents per lb., dressed; winter butter 18 to 20 cents; grass butter, 16 cents; wheat, 98 cents; oats, 38 cents. These were the actual farm prices there on the first of March as I received them from the farmer himself. I have occupied so much of the time of the House that I will have to leave out a good deal of what I intended to say, but I want to recount a little trip that the member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) and I made during the Easter recess to the State of New York with a view of ascertaining the actual conditions there at first hand. I will give an account of the conditions just as we found them in one or two places in Canada, and also in several places in the State of New York which we visited.

We went to Brockville the twelfth of April, the day the House adjourned, and went to the market there the next morning. We got farm prices from a number of farmers as follows: Potatoes per bag, $1.10; butter per pound, 25 cents; eggs, per dozen, 20 cents; veal, per pound, 5 to 6 cents; beef by the carcase, per cwt., $10.35; horses, from $150 to $250; beans per bushel, $1.85 to $2; milch cows, $50 upwards; oats, 40 cents; pease, 90 cents; barley, 62 cents; buckwheat, 60 cents; cheese, new, 11¾ cents; chickens, 18 cents per lb.; lamb, live weight, 10 cents per lb. Machinery quoted as follows: Cream separators, 300-lb., $60 ; malotte, 500-lb., $80 ; McCormick binder, without transport or carrier, $115; tongue truck extra, $15; walking plough, $11; wheelbarrow, $3; top buggy, $75 to $80; farm wagons, complete, 2½-in. tire, $78; gear only 2½ tire, $59; double harness, complete, $36. We went to Prescott from there and found on inquiry there was no truth in the report that cream and milk were being exported to the United States from this point; the same being true with regard to Brockville. Cream is sold at higher prices at Brockville and Prescott than in the United States towns of Ogdensburg and Morristown across the river. While it is true that there was considerable

export across to the American centres last fall, it has entirely ceased at the present. Mr. Small, who runs a creamery in Prescott, is buying all the milk or butter fat offering at a price considerably higher than that offered by Mr. Jones of Ogdensburg, in New York state. Mr. Small is paying the farmers twenty-seven cents per pound for butter fat at Prescott, and at Cardinal, a point some eight miles out, twenty-six cents, from which place it is brought in by stage at one cent a pound. In Prescott prices for farm implements as far as we could gather were about the same as in Brockville, with the exception of walking ploughs, which were quoted one dollar higher. We found farm lands very difficult to price as they vary very much in this locality, in quality, but for fair to first-class farms the prices seem to run from $4,500 to $10,000 per hundred acres; a good deal depending on improvements and buildings and conveniences to town and distance back from the St. Lawrence, &c. We went over to Ogdensburg in the evening, and the next morning visited the store of Mr. H. G. Chandler, provision dealer, and were given the following prices by his obliging office man. He is selling from his establishment for the following prices: No. 1 creamery butter, 22 cents per lb.; old cheese, 13 to 14 cents; eggs, farmers' price, 15 cents; salt per bbl. 280 lb., $1.30; potatoes per bag, 68 cents; farmer's butter is selling in Ogdensburg at 18 cents. We visited the International Harvester's large distributing warehouse, where there is stored for distribution their goods for the large tract of country in this part of the United States. They also retail their goods from this establishment. We were given the following prices as sold to the farmers: Binders, 5 or 6 foot, with transport and sheaf carrier, $120; tongue truck extra, $20; 5-foot mower, $45; disc harrow, 12 discs, 16 inches diameter, $25; 12 discs, 18 inches diameter, $28; 8-foot rake, 26 teeth, $22; farm wagon, complete three-inch tire, $75. The above prices were for cash payment October 1st. If the time is extended five dollars per year is added for binders and other goods in proportion, as well as six per cent interest on all notes. The above are the prices at which the agents are also to sell to the farmers. Mr. J. F. Devine, merchant, Ogdensburg, had a card in the window offering maple syrup at $1 per gallon, and eggs at 18 cents per dozen. The usual difficulty was encountered in getting actual value of farms. Mr. Thomas Sinnett was reported to have a first-class farm for sale with good houses and barn and stabling for forty head, farm first-class in every respect and within five miles of the city of Ogdensburg. This farm is composed of one hundred acres for which he is asking $6,000. Ogdensburg has a population of considerably over 20,000 people, and is the largest and most important shipping point on the United States side of the St. Lawrence, and Ontario farms situated about the same distance from an important city and with the same improvements and like quality would be worth at least $1,000 more. Mr. Sinnett has not been able as yet to sell his farm. Out from Ogdensburg on the railway running to Decalb Junction is a small village called Heuvelton, and a farm of one hundred and three acres belonging to the Smither's estate has been sold just lately by public auction. It is only about seven miles from Ogdensburg. The farm is reported without stone or rock, the buildings being nothing extra. This farm was sold for $3,385. Farms generally are quoted from $3,500 to $6,000. A few were quoted at higher prices, where the farmers are not anxious to sell At Rensellar Falls we visited the creamery there, and interviewed farmers who were delivering their milk. Mr. Powell, a farmer, stated that he got from 80 to 90 cents per hundred for his milk for the month of March. Mr. Madill, another farmer, stated that he received for his milk for March 86 cents. Still another farmer, quoted milk for March at 86 cents, but did not think April milk would bring over 60 cents per hundred on account of the low price of butter sold by the creamery. Mr. Todd, another farmer figured out that with butter selling at 21 cents the farmer could not possibly get more than 60 cents per hundred weight for his milk. The milk being sold on the percentage of butter fat, one farmer might get a little more than the other, according to the quality of his milk. With regard to horses the prices seemed to vary very much, and between the average horse and the really fine animal, the discrepancy was greater than in Canada. Mr. Madill, a farmer of Rensellar Falls, stated he had paid for the farm team he was driving $62 each, they were a light team for farming. Speaking generally horses ran from $75 to $175, and some large and fine animals higher. Cows ran from $45 to $50 and some higher There seemed to be no beef or hogs or mutton for sale by the farmers here. The following cash prices were quoted for machinery, &c.: Binders, $110; mowers, $45 to $50; walking plough, $13; tongue truck for binders, extra $15 to $20. Mr. Orr, harness dealer at Rensellar Falls, quoted farmers' double harness, complete (cash), $49. At Decalb Junction Mr. George Taylor expected to net 65 cents per hundred for his April milk. Mr. Brille says the factory he sells to will net for the farmers for April about 60 cents for their milk. Mr. McGruar merchant at Decalb Junction says the farmers are getting about 18c. for butter. He states that milk was worth $1 per hundred to ship to New York

but would not bring more at the creamery than about 60c. He pays five cents per quart for milk for his family. Mr. Thayer a butcher at Decalb Junction is offering for good beef dressed 7½ cents per pound, and for pork dressed 8 to 9 cents. From here we went on to Oswego and drove out from there to a creamery managed by Mr. L. Isbell a very clever and able young man. His creamery was up to date in every respect, making not only first-class butter but also casein, and has nearly all the machinery installed to turn out granulated sugar from whey. Casein is supposed to be worth from 3 to 3½ cents per pound. He expects to extract about 3½ pound of refined sugar from one hundred pounds of whey. The sugar will be in crystals and sent to a refinery to be finished. This factory is supplying the finest trade in New York and getting 22 cents per pound at present for butter. They charge at this factory 4½ cents per pound for manufacturing butter. Mr. Sexsmith states that he does not know of any place in Ontario where more than 3½ cents a pound is charged. We found the prices of horses here about the same as those of other points visited. Cows quoted from $45 upward. Mr. Charles Stoddard, farmer from Oswego, quoted beef on foot at 4c. per pound. Mr. Sylvester Dyke, another farmer of Mexico, New York, reported having sold milk some years as low as 45c. per hundred, on the average for the season. Last year at the bottling plant it got as high as $1.30 per hundred weight to send to New York city. The farmers are buying their machinery a little less here than in Canada except walking ploughs which were about the same. Horses here were bringing on the average from $125 to $175 and extra animals higher. There does not seem to be any meat offered by the farmers. The whole business is transferred to the packing houses which were supplying the trade everywhere we went. Binders retail here at $125; mowers $45; walking plough $13. Cows worth from $50 to $60 at present. An extra nice farm team would be worth $400. Hay per ton $10. Barley 60c. to 65c. per bushel. Mr. Dyke ' quoted above ' also quoted evaporated apples per bushel 20c. and winter apples on the tree at $1.25 per barrel.

From Oswego we went to Watertown and there met Mr. Farmer, a merchant, who came to this place from Havelock, Ontario, eight years ago and has built up a successful business. Mr. Farmer's place of business is at 700 Mill street. He very kindly drove us all over the city. Watertown is a thriving place of over 20,000 population having large paper mills and other large industries. Mr. Farmer states there are a large number of Canadians in Watertown and they are arriving all the time. The present mayor and also an ex-mayor being Canadians. Mr. Sexsmith met several cousins there who gave us a lot of information about the place, also stating that there were a very large number of other Canadians located there. We were very much interested in seeing the place at 126 Court Street where the bogus ballot boxes were manufactured. Mr. Farmer quoted us the following prices: Eggs, 18c. out of the store, buying them at 15c.;farmer's butter, 18c. to 20c; compound lard, 9c; pure lard, 10c; potatoes, per bag 45c.; Quaker oats, 1 pound package, 10c.; good flour, per barrel, $4.70; oleomargarine, retailed at 18c. Mr. Farmer states he is selling 18 pounds of oleomargarine to one pound of butter and has a large sale for oleomargarine. He states it is driving butter out of the market fast. Mr. C. H. Capworth of Syracuse, a produce dealer, handling a number of retail stores in the northern part of New York state, is selling one hundred tubs of oleomargarine per week. This time last year he was selling fifty tubs of butter per week, and is now only selling twelve tubs of butter over the same territory. He finds the people fast transferring their allegiance from butter to oleomargarine, and also finds that a number prefer it, now they are used to it, to ordinary butter at the same prices. Prices in the stores in Watertown for general merchandise seem to be about the same as in any town of a similar size in Ontario. For such articles as boots and shoes, clothing, general merchandise, &c. Morristown, a small town on the south side of the St. Lawrence river, opposite the city of Brockville, Ontario, we found conditions about the same as in other places visited. We went over the new creamery which is not yet running, but will soon be completed. When in working order this will be one of the very finest. Mr. Bett, the manager, is buying milk at 90c. per hundred. There is no milk or cream taken from Canada as the price is too high in Canada. They will make casein here as well as other products. Mr. Delong, farmer, here sold his milk for March at 89c.

I wish to quote here from a special correspondent to the ' Post-Standard ' newspaper, of Syracuse:

Gouverneur, N.Y., April 16.—The Gouverneur Dairy Board met at the St. Lawrence Inn last night for the first time this season. There were seventeen members and sixteen factories represented. Thirteen of them with cheese and two with butter. Only 638 boxes of cheese and 100 tubs of butter were offered. Both butter and cheese have taken a big tumble in prices since last year. Butter has declined 11 cents, and cheese two cents per pound. It was decided not to elect officers for the year until the first Saturday in May. The meeting developed several exciting features which proved that the salesmen of the board would be able to maintain their old stand of naming prices. The buyers evi-

dently decided to curtail this advantage and stood firmly for a price of ten cents for cheese but the salesmen refused the offer. The price committee is composed of W. A. Freeman, John H. Barry, Wm. P. Clark, secretary of the Dairy Board, H. G. Chandler of Ogdensburg, and A. B. Vercler of Carthage. After the meeting of the price committee a wire was received from a firm in Montreal offering ten and one quarter cents for chesee. All the factories with the possible exception of two or three which had disposed of cheese earlier in the evening accepted this offer. Usually the first offerings are the lowest of the year and as the season advances and the cows are turned out to grass higher prices are expected. Last year at the first meeting 756 boxes of cheese were offered at the ruling price of 12½ cents, and butter sold at 31c. Last night's prices were: butter, 20c.; cheese, 10¼c.

After coming back to Canada we learned that in a sale of coloured cheese at Lansdowne, in Leeds county, Ontario, on April 14, the prices realized were 11½ cents against 10¼ cents at Gouverneur, New York. At the Mitchellville factory in the same county, on April 13, white cheese sold at eleven and one-sixteenth cents, nearly a full cent higher than it was worth in the United States.

I want to give one other little quotation with regard to hogs. These figures are a comparison made by the Ingersoll Packing Company between the average price of hogs at Ingersoll, Ontario, and the average price on the Chicago market for the years stated:

Year.	Price at Chicago.	Price at Ingersoll.
1901	$5 71	$6 70
1902	6 76½	6 68
1903	5 88	6 07
1904	5 04	5 32
1905	5 18	6 41
1906	6 23	7 17
1067	6 09½	6 85
1908	5 36⅓	6 87
1909	7 53½	8 04
1910	8 59¾	9 11

The Ingersoll prices averaged 58 cents per hundred weight higher than the Chicago market prices.

Under this agreement the favoured nations will come into competition with the Canadian farmers in the Canadian market. These nations are Argentine, Austria-Hungary, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela, and Bolivia. I wish to repeat to the House some figures given by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), with regard to our importations from these countries for six years, and it must be remembered that they came in under a pretty stiff duty. The figures are as follows:

IMPORTS INTO CANADA FOR HOME CONSUMPTION FROM MOST FAVOURED NATION COUNTRIES DURING SIX YEARS.

Article.	Quantity.	Value.
Butter..lbs.	2,894,416	$ 685,306
Cheese.."	2,901,815	566,786
Eggs..doz.	4,600,534	944,704
Poultry..	..	276,648
Potatoes..bush	1,422,829	926,693
Beef (salted)..lbs.	10,610,533	502,831
Bacon and hams.."	35,140,613	4,312,359
Mutton.."	6,317,785	440,317
Pork (in brine).."	51,826,804	4,250,673
Other meat products .."	13,028,060	1,567,251
Cattle..head	45,086	640,514
Horses.."	57,565	2,920,117
Sheep.."	359,447	1,151,022
Swine..lbs.	184,779	12,696
Barley..bush.	280,314	174,504
Beans.."	307,211	490,343
Buckwheat.."	6,311	6,177
Oats.."	1,168,226	603,264
Pease.."	51,241	120,840
Rye.."	145,920	112,950
Wheat.."	373,979	317,748
Hay..tons	49,974	853,059
Flaxseed..bush.	4,702,090	5,747,612
Apples..brls.	239,647	975,870
Vegetables (except potatoes)	..	4,755,980
		$33,356,102

You can easily imagine what these imports will be when the door is opened and the goods can enter Canada free of duty. There are about 307,000,000 people residing in these favoured countries, and in some of them the population is largely agricultural, producing vast quantities more agricultural products than they need. Let me refer for a moment to one of them, Argentine. This is a comparatively new country in South America, situated about the same distance south of the equator that California is north with climatic conditions just about the same as California. They have vast pampas or plains about the same as our prairie lands of the west, they have no clearing of land to encounter. Argentine is one of the greatest stock producing countries on the face of the globe and a very great grain producing country. The climatic conditions are such that cattle can run for the whole year; people can live in houses of comparatively cheap construction and they do not have to encounter the problem of clothing which the people of this country must face. A gentleman now residing in my riding who lived for five years in Argentine has given me much valuable information in regard to that country. When he first went there he says there was no such thing as shipping meat out of Argentine, and he has seen hundreds of thousands of carcases of the finest beef thrown into the ocean, yet the cattle raisers were mak-

ing a good profit out of the hides and tallow. But they have developed that country wonderfully and now have the finest cold storage, and being able to produce cattle and grain under such favourable conditions, I think it is not too much to say that they will be the very keenest competitors for the Canadian market. They are able to produce these cattle and ship them at one-half the cost the Canadian farmer can. The same thing is largely true with regard to grain. I ask in all seriousness whether this government consider it a fair deal which permits a country like that to pour their produce into Canada while they bar the door against the Canadian producer.

What is true with regard to the Argentine is also true with regard to all the other countries I have named as well as to all parts of the British Empire, outside of the British Isles themselves. What strikes me as peculiar is that this gives us no additional advantage within the British Empire, the only thing we get is a temporary advantage in the United States and I think we have shown fairly effectually that that advantage will be very meagre indeed, that the supposed advantage will prove a very great disadvantage, and instead of helping out our agriculturists will help to swamp the markets of Canada with the cheaper productions of the United States. For it must be admitted that over a large part of the United States their climatic conditions are similar to those of the country I have referred to; their stock can run at large the year round and they can raise large crops of corn and can feed under conditions more favourable than Canada enjoys. Is it too much to expect, then, that they will be able to produce more cheaply than the farmers of Canada can possibly produce? Is it fair to open the door and allow them to flood this country with their cheaper products? It must be remembered that, taking these countries as a whole, it is summer the year round, for it is always summer in one or other of them. The result will be that just at the time when the farmer of Canada might reasonably expect to get good returns for his labour, say after he has fed his stock all winter, the country in which it is summer and in which for that reason production is cheap, will be able to send its products into our market, and so our farmer will be up against it. If we protect the farmers reasonably, as we do other classes of the community, then, a short crop usually has its compensations. If the weather is bad or the conditions unfavourable and the crop therefore short, the prices usually go up. But that will be impossible if world prices are to prevail in Canada, and they will prevail if this arrangement goes into effect, there is not a shadow of doubt about that. Some of the ministers seem inclined to treat this matter lightly, to treat it as if it were a matter of absolutely no importance. We find that even the Prime Minister pooh-poohs the idea of goods coming into this country and attempts to justify this proposed arrangement. To my mind, there is no justification for it from the farmers' standpoint. If the intention is deliberately to force down the market to the agricultural producer, that is another matter, and perhaps the step taken is a wise one from that standpoint; but to pretend that this is going to be of some advantage to the farmer is really, I think, practising deception upon our great agricultural classes, and, such being the case, I cannot give my support to the proposition. If I felt there was any advantage in this arrangement to the farmers of Canada, I would support it, for I have had dealings with the farmers all my life, I was raised on a farm, grew to manhood on a farm and am perfectly familiar with all farming conditions. I know the hardship the farmer has to endure, and I have the keenest sympathy with the great agricultural classes of this country more than I have with any other class of the community. If I were considering some other class perhaps I might say that it would be an advantage to them. But not to any class will it be the great advantage that some claim, for the conditions as to prices and markets that prevail in the United States generally will certainly, under this arrangement, prevail in Canada. And I think we have pretty effectually shown that, at present, and on the average the farmer of the United States is not getting as good a price as is the farmer of Canada. There is a greater discrepancy there between what the producer receives and what the ultimate consumer pays than there is in this country. This is accounted for by the great amount of speculation in the wheat pit and by the great meat trust and other great interests and combinations that are able to control the situation. The meat trust of the United States has driven the ordinary butcher out of the market and is carrying on that whole business and extracting larger sums from the pockets of the producers or of the consumers, or of both, than is the case in this country. And I cannot but express my conviction that there is too great a discrepancy even in Canada between the price paid to the original producer and the price paid by the ultimate consumer. The prices paid to the farmers in this country to-day are not commensurate with the prices that the average consumer has to pay. If the government desires to benefit the farmers, then, instead of making this arrangement, they ought to direct their efforts to the great problems of transportation and exchange with a view to lessening the expense of transferring the goods from

the producer to the consumer. They are certainly not going to do it by putting the people of Canada under the great combines of our neighbours to the south. To my mind it is almost a suicidal proposition, even if we leave out of consideration altogether the ultimate effect of placing ourselves at the mercy of these ninety millions of people. I have read statements, and so have other hon. members, proving what, I think, is common knowledge, the aims and objects of our neighbours to the south in this matter. I think it cannot be gainsaid that they intend that this should be a step towards the ultimate absorption of this Dominion.

Hon. members opposite have taken the ground that if we do not like this arrangement, if in a year or two years, if we find it working to our disadvantage, we can revoke and annul it. But this may not be so easy a matter. What would be the position of the government of this Dominion if the Americans were to say, in the event of such a step being proposed: This agreement was entered into in good faith and was accepted after clear-cut statements made in the Congress of the United States that it was the intention of the promoters from the American standpoint that it should lead toward annexation? When Champ Clark made his famous statement in the House, two of the representatives there were heard to say one to another: If the Canadian parliament endorses this agreement after the words of Champ Clark, the prospective speaker, they endorse it with all that it entails as he has put it from the United States standpoint. I think if we do endorse it, we will be endorsing the whole thing—there is no doubt in my mind about that. And the United States might turn round and say: You should not annul this agreement; it was entered into in good faith and is going to be carried out; and you knew it all the time; and, in contravention of the Rush-Bagot treaty, we have ten vessels on the Great Lakes that can destroy your shipping in a few days. We can easily put enough men on your border to compel you to carry out the promise that you entered into. I do not say that such a course will be followed, but I do say that we are putting ourselves into a position to invite such a course if we endorse this pact. It is at least an unsafe step to take, and I think I have shown conclusively that it will be to our great disadvantage commercially. Why, therefore, should we enter into this arrangement? Why should we endanger the autonomy of this great country? Why should we jeopardize our dearest national interests simply because certain demands are made upon us to take this step by radicals and people of that class, who are enamoured of free trade as they have it in England? I think they will find, if we are led to take this step, that we have made a grievous mistake, and a mistake that we might not be able to remedy. We must not listen to propositions that would drive us to national suicide. I do not believe, as is advocated by some people, that Canada should become a purely agricultural country, raising food for the millions of Europe. I believe that when we have been so well endowed by a wise Providence with the finest minerals, gold, silver, iron, lead, nickel, copper, coal, oil, and a hundred others, with splendid water-powers—surely Providence, in bestowing upon us all these natural riches, intended that we should develop them ourselves. Are we going to put ourselves into the position of being hewers of wood and drawers of water to the commercial Egyptians to the south of us? Are we going to convert ourselves into Israelites to please them? I think not. I think that the good sense of the people of Canada will revolt at this proposition, and on the first opportunity they get to pronounce themselves, they will reject the proposition of the government and stamp it with their strong disapproval.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec county). (Translation). Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) who has just taken his seat on account of his good intentions. He has endeavoured for several hours to show that the Canadian farmer was in a bad plight, and the Canadian fatherland as well. He is intent on saving from utter destruction the Canadian farmer and the country he lives in. Those are excellent intentions, and surely the pains to which the hon. member has gone to bring about such a result is worthy of our encomiums, and the House, as well as the country, should show their appreciation of what he has done. However, I am not satisfied that the farming community or the country are actually in danger. A group of population so important, so industrious, so energetic cannot be done away with in so short fashion, in a country of such development, of such fertility, of such natural wealth as Canada. A modicum of common sense will enable us to understand that the dangers with which the farmer is threatened under the circumstances is rather of an imaginary type and concocted for political purposes. Hon. gentlemen, on the other side believe that the farmer is in a bad plight, and they say so, but it is with an eye to political exigencies.

As for the country, it has been in existence for a few centuries back, and threatened with evils of a much more serious character than this supposed danger. It has

gone through crises of a most trying nature, and instead of being by these cramped in its growth, it has come out of them stronger than ever, with an expanded territory and an increase of industrial and commercial enterprise. Even in the field of politics it has made great strides, since to-day we are a nation, on account of these very dangers which have put the people under the necessity of trying their strength, of developing an aggressive spirit, and enabled them to secure victories both on the fields of battle and against competitors in business warfare. So that in that respect I believe the country has nothing to fear.

Mr. Chairman, I represent here an agricultural constituency, and in advocating to-day this truly national policy which the government have submitted for the approval of the House, I am only fulfilling my bounden duty. In the first days of January last, there was held at Quebec a great seed exhibition under the patronage of the hon. ministers of Agriculture for the Dominion and provincial governments. It was a fine display of the wealth of our country's possibilities; it was the occasion of an impressive concourse of farmers and others from every part of the province, mostly laymen, with a strong admixture of clergymen and monks addicted to agriculture, all congregated to discuss and find out the most effective means towards ensuring increased returns from the tillage of the soil.

I remember that at one of the last meetings which I had the honour to preside over, there was a resolution voted requesting the government to obtain, if possible, the free entry of our Canadian farm products on the United States markets. As negotiations were in course at the time between the representatives of the United States and the Canadian governments, I, of course, expressed the hope that such a result would be obtained, adding, however, that in the past we had not always been very fortunate in our dealing with the neighbouring country. Luckily, a few days afterwards the representatives of both governments came to terms in regard to reciprocity proposals. That was on January 21, and on the 26th of that same month the scope of the arrangement was made known to us by the hon. Minister of Finance, who informed the House and the country of the government's stand on the question of reciprocity and the interchange of natural products between Canada and the United States, while at the same moment the president of the United States was announcing the conclusion of that trade arrangement by means of a message to Congress.

There is one very striking feature of these proposals to which I shall draw the attention of my hon. colleagues. Both governments in acting as they have done were moved by their anxiety to help the farmers in both countries. Such is the motive which induced both governments to make arrangements and adopt a common policy towards promoting the common interests of the farming community on either side of the line. That is a striking fact which goes to show how anxious our government are to help the farming class of Canada. We are now called upon to confirm that customs arrangement. Following on international negotiations and the action of diplomacy, it is up to us to put through the parliamentary enactment which will give effect to this agreement.

When the result of these negotiations was announced, constituents of mine asked me: Will we soon have the benefit of that trade arrangement in the sale of our products? To this query I had only one answer to make: Members of parliament have now your case in hand, it is up to them to decide whether or not you will enjoy the benefits promised. I could not but add that in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite all possible means were being resorted to in the hope of delaying the ratification of this trade arrangement, that even representatives of border counties went to the length of voting in favour of motions destined to interfere with the successful termination of the negotiations which people hoped for so earnestly; that these hon. gentlemen opposite had no end of questions to ask, as if a representative of the people were not supposed to be posted on public questions concerning his country; that, in a word, our friends on the other side were endeavouring by every means in their power to delay the work of parliament so as to postpone indefinitely the ratification of the reciprocity convention. Things have even gone so far that a proposal has been made to us which might be termed shameful, since it amounted for us in stopping short before reaching a vote and marking time until the Congress or Senate of the United States had made known their decision. I say that was a proposal of an obnoxious character. Representatives worthy of the name and of the position they hold should be enlightened enough, energetic enough, and sufficiently well posted as to the merits of the question to be in a position to settle the question without waiting to learn what our neighbours are doing. I say, therefore, that the government have acted wisely in pushing the matter to a conclusion and calling on the House to express at once its opinion in the matter.

To my mind, there is good reason for us to press the matter through. I am aware that the United States government, after the House of Representatives carried the Bill through, did not succeed in getting it through the Senate, and that in the

meantime Congress came to its natural ending under the constitution. But the President of the United States at once summoned another Congress in order to resume the consideration of the proposal.

There are in the United States, as in Canada, persons, representatives of the people, senators, who are not favourable to this reciprocity arrangement. Objections were made over there in the same way as in this country. Objections have cropped up in this Congress in the same way that objections had cropped up in the late Congress. Nevertheless, if I am well informed, the proposals were accepted by the House of Representatives of the United States this very day, the majority in favour of its ratification figuring 175.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the same thing would happen here and the proportion on either side would stand the same were the House called upon to vote right away. If we have to listen to such long speeches by hon. gentlemen opposite condemning this measure, it is not on account of any desire on the part of these gentlemen to convince the House, or any hope on their part to secure a majority, but rather because it enables them to work on the prejudices of the people and to turn public opinion against that policy. As to what is going on here, the sole object is to weary the House in view of certain events about to take place. Obstruction is resorted to for the purpose of having the settlement of this important question deferred until another session. It is child's play. On the other hand, that is a game at which more than one can play, and we may be sure that the opposition will waste at it whatever vigour may be left them, for the government have made up their minds to carry the day. In fact, there is no reason to believe that all these negotiations about a matter which may be termed novel are being carried on for the satisfaction of a mere whim of the government. There is no sense in assuming that the Canadian government would take their lives in their hands for the sake of legislation which would not be to the liking of the Canadian people. That would not be sound policy. The question is of vital interest to the nation; it is bound to have a far-reaching effect on the material progress of our country. Under such conditions, the government which puts its very existence at stake to carry the measure through, is worthy of consideration on the part of the public. It is apparent that, barring a few manufacturing and trade centres, the bulk of the population, the country people, are heart and soul with the government on this question. It is apparent throughout the country that the interests of the farming community are at stake. It is realized that there is a great deal implied in the final ratification of this arrangement. Should the government be defeated in this connection, it is a foregone conclusion that agriculture will be the worst for it. Should victory smile on the Conservative party, or on whatever is left of that party, that would mean a recurrence of the protective system of that famous so-called National Policy which makes for high protective duties. On the other hand, these reciprocity proposals if carried out would tend to promote and foster agriculture in Canada, through the greater facilities afforded to trade intercourse between the two countries.

What was Canada's economic condition when the Conservative party fell from power? What was its condition in the years preceding 1896? As a matter of fact, was out of business in a complete state of stagnation? Were not industry and agriculture at a standstill? Our farmers were looking around for a market in which to sell their products. An attempt had been made to instil life into trade and industries as well as in agriculture, which all were on the decline. A new state of things has arisen in the meantime and the agricultural, industrial and business conditions of the country have undergone deep changes.

And why, Mr. Chairman? Because the government have managed to find out for us new markets. They have put in practice the principles which should guide a liberal government. Shortly after coming into power they sent delegates to the United States government requesting that Canadian products be granted free entrance to the American markets. That proposal was not accepted, but our government was not discouraged on that account, and introduced a policy of preference in favour of Great Britain, with a view to developing our trade in that direction. That was an anti-protection policy. That preferential duty, which amounted at first to 15 per cent, and subsequently was raised to 25 per cent, and later still to 33⅓ per cent, resulted in opening a new market for us in Great Britain, but that was not without heavy sacrifices on our part. I may point out what occurred in this connection. The stand taken by the government of the United States, when we sent representatives to open negotiations towards the concluding of a treaty with them, was not without influence on the political and fiscal measures which followed. By perusing the reports of the two colonial conferences of 1902 and 1907, one may ascertain what efforts the Canadian government made towards obtaining wider and more profitable markets on the British market. These efforts have had a most important result. Thus, in 1902, it may be seen that resolutions were submitted tending to the development of reci-

procal trade relations between the United Kingdom and the colonies. But that preference which we granted did not give the results which we expected from it. I may say that it caused serious disappointment in Canada. The principle embodied in those resolutions was asserted anew at the 1907 conference, and is summed up in the following paragraph:

'That the prime ministers of the colonies respectfully urge on His Majesty's government the expediency of granting in the United Kingdom preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the colonies, either by exemption from or reduction of duties now or hereafter imposed.' In other words, Great Britain was requested, in exchange for the preference which we granted them, to grant us either a reduction of the duties in existence or a preference on their market.

Well, there was an interchange of views, and here are the very words which Sir Wilfrid Laurier used at the colonial conference of 1907, as recorded on page 410, volume 1 of the proceedings:

As to dutiable goods.. .. ..

We give you a preference of 33⅓ per cent, which is certainly a valuable contribution on our part to British trade. Not only have we done it by preference, by legislation, but we have forced our trade against the laws of nature and geography. If we were to follow the laws of nature and geography between Canada and the United States, the whole trade would flow from north to south. We have done everything possible by building canals and subsidizing railways to bring the trade from west to east into British channels. All this we have done, recognizing the principle of the great advantage of forcing trade within the British Empire.

We admit that principle. We are bound to say that if this preference which we have given has not brought perhaps to the English trade as much as the English merchant and manufacturer would have desire, we have told at the same time to the English people that it was possible to have more; that is, the mutual preference which we had in view when we adopted the resolution of 1902.

As it can be seen, the policy of the Canadian government towards the English government was very simple, very comprehensible. We were forcing nature and geography for the purpose of getting a market in England and in all English colonies. But on what condition? On the condition that this preference that we are giving to England would be recognized and accepted, and at the same time followed with a preference from England towards Canada.

This is the basis of our policy towards the English government. As the right hon. premier truly said, it was not a question of sentiment, it was a question of business.

But England, putting aside sentiment and considering the question only as a matter of business, refused to the colonies what they were asking in 1902 and 1907, and has still continue to ask.

Well, taking a business view of the matter, the Canadian government said: If we cannot, notwithstanding this violence we are making to geography and nature, change the natural course of the trade; if, notwithstanding this preference of 33⅓ per cent in favour of England, half of our natural products are going to the United States even while there is barrier almost unsuperable; we will not fight any longer nature and geography, and when the President of the United States made offers to Canada—for we must take notice that this time we did not go to them—our government was glad to respond to the appeal and to go on with the negotiations which are about to close between the two countries.

Statistics show that invincibly trade of the United States comes to Canada, just as the trade of Canada goes to the states, and no barrier can stop that exchange.

When we tried to compete on that market, we have to pay custom duties so high that this competition becomes impossible. Nevertheless exchanges between the two countries continue to be very considerable, so much that they reach hundreds of millions every year.

The gentleman believed—and in this he was right—that such a state of things should cease. Therefore he accepted the offers made by the government of Washington, and his acceptation brought to him the sympathies of the whole Canadian people, not only as a matter of politicians, but also from the businessmen. This arrangement is of such a nature that it will be equally advantageous to the population of the United States and of Canada. This is how the question stands before us and this is the way in which we should consider it.

The proposal which is before us appeals to the good sense of every impartial citizen. To be convinced of that we need only read the first paragraph of the resolution submitted to this House on the 26th January last by the hon. Minister of Finance. In the first resolution we see that the products cultivated or manufactured in the United States, specified in schedule 'A,' will be admitted in Canada free, when imported from the United States, and that the products cultivated or manufactured in the United States mentioned in schedule 'B' and 'D' will be admitted in Canada on payment of the duties specified in the said schedules, when imported from the United States; that the advantageous resulting from this modification to our custom laws will apply to every other foreign country which may be entitled to it through any treaty or convention with England. Upon this question, our friends opposite

have spoken much about the meaning of this clause applying to the foreign countries called the most-favoured nations in the treaties entered into with England. Two very different opinions have been expressed upon that subject. There are those who believe that we are obliged to grant to all the favoured nations the same advantages which we give to the United States, but there is also some very intelligent people, in the United States and in Canada, and even in all civilized countries, who say that if we have made concessions in return of the favours that we have bought, as it is in this case to-day for the United States, we are not bound to grant this most favoured treatment.

Mr. PAQUET. Will the hon. member allow me to ask him if he could give us the opinion of the hon. premier and the hon. Minister of Finance on the meaning of this clause of the most favoured nation? He said that intelligent people were of opinion that such a clause was not binding us——

Mr. TURCOTTE. I will not give the opinion of the hon. Prime Minister or of the hon. Minister of Finance. These gentlemen have their opinions, which are very respectable, certainly, as are also the opinions of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. I say that the best diplomats and business men differ greatly on this question; that the two opinions of which I have spoken are worthy of the highest respect. We must remark that in this case the most favoured nations clause come only in treaties with England, passed after negotiations in which these countries had received compensation. But since that time Canada has conquered his commercial independence and is now negotiating herself her commercial treaties, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) said in his motion at the beginning of this session. Having obtained this independence we make ourselves our own commercial conventions in the way we think best. If, by making concessions we buy certain advantages in our commercial relations with a country, we should not be obliged to grant the same advantages to all nations coming under this most favoured nation clause, because we have not been party to the contract. It is not necessary to know if this question is governed by international law; I say it is only the common sense law. I may be mistaken, but I say it is the current opinion to-day, principally in the United States. Nevertheless, I sincerely believe that the opinion which I have stated will finally prevail. But, before continuing the quotation, I will say that what is called the most favoured nation clause in the treaties passed with England, could not benefit of the mutual advantages that we are now considering in the trade between Canada and the United States and it is added:

That the advantages granted therein to the United States will be extended to the United Kingdom and to the different colonies and British possessions in their trade with Canada.

That is reasonable. We give to the United Kingdom and to the British colonies the same advantages which we propose to grant to the United States. And the resolution continues:

Provided that nothing contained therein will have the effect of increasing any tariff duty now stipulated on the British preferential tariff.

This is a protection for the preferential tariff, and upon this question something very extraordinary happened. Our friends opposite have asked if the government intend to increase the British preference up to fifty per cent. The government answered no; but there is something underneath. Just as much as the Canadian government is anxious to protect the interest of the Canadian consumer and manufacturer, just as much the English manufacturer,—I will not say the English government, have interest, either directly, or through their agents in Canada, to secure a higher preference and would like to have it at fifty per cent, which would give to their product advantages detrimetnal to the Canadian manufacturers just as much as our agricultural classes, answered no; we are giving you to-day a preference of 33 1-3 per cent, we will not go further; you have given us nothing in return, we will leave things as they are. This is how the question stands. But all these things are bound together, and we are called to-day to support principals which are truly liberal, principals which will be of a very great benefit to the people of Canada. We are sent here to secure the triumph of the liberal ideas prevailing in this country, and in doing so, we are truthfully following the wish of the people. It is with the object of apply these liberal principles in the government of the country, that we have approved of this treaty, for it contains the principles which this government has always professed. When commercial treaties have been negotiated with other countries, these were the guiding principles. I hold in my hands some documents proving that it has been so in the commercial negotiations with other countries such as France, Germany, Italy and Holland. To all these nations the government has granted certain advantages in return for those granted to us by these countries. This is truly Liberal principles, 'Laissez farne, laissez passer,' that is to say, 'let go free.' This is the

principle which we desire to govern our commercial intercourse with the United States.

Why, then some one may say, have you not included manufactured products in this agreement as you did for the natural products? The answer is very simple. It is because we need a revenue. It is not for protection purposes, but simply to have a revenue necessary for the administration of the country. Our traiff is a revenue tariff, nothing else. If this tariff has the effect of giving certain advantages to our manufacturers all the better. But the principal object of the government in maintaining these duties is to get revenue sufficient for the administration of public business. Besides customs duties we all have also excise duties; these are our two principal sources of revenue. These are only means we have to collect the money necessary for civil government. Our sole object is thus the revenue, and not protection.

As a conclusion of all what I have said I will add that by this tariff agreement we aim to come back to the state of things which was prevailing under the old reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. We still need to-day a market for our products, and this is why we are supporting this treaty convention.

It has been said that the reason why we benefited so much of 1854, was that the U.S. were then engaged into a war, which was paralyzing their activities in a great very great measure. It has been contended that Canada was thus able to make profits much more greater than he would have made if it had not been of the war. But there is a fact which the people cannot forget, and that is that the twelve years of reciprocity have given a great abundance to the farmers and progress to the whole Canada. The result is evident for every one and this result has been brought not by the war, but by the natural free exchange between the two countries.

I hold in my hand a book written by Frederick A. Haynes, doctor in philosophy and a member of the American Economic Association. He is studying the whole treaty of 1854 and its consequences. His conclusions are remarkable. I draw specially the attention upon this point, because the state of things which existed at that time seem to come back to-day.

Speaking of the causes which brought the abrogation of the treaty he says that they were more political than economic and commercial : 'The cause was political rather than economical or commercial. There is very little doubt, as has been said already, that the attitude of the English towards the North during the civil war, was the direct cause of the abrogation of the treaty '.

As we can see, England having favoured one of the belligerent nations against the other, this had created a bad feeling in her relations with the United States and as, at the same time, England was sovereign in the making of her commercial treaties, we had not the liberty we enjoy to-day of negotiating our treaties ourselves and the treaty was abrogated. Further on he says:

The unfortunate fate of the reciprocity treaty has given it a false position in the economic history of the country.

And he ends in saying, that the liberal idea which brought the adoption of free trade in England, the abolution of the corn laws, and also the German zollverein had been accepted by all other nations in Europe, but was abruptly stopped in the United States by the civil war and a few years later, by the Franco-German war. The consequence was as he says, of these two last events was the downfall of the liberal movement in Europe and America.

With the downfall of the liberal movement disappeared the best hopes of better trade relations between the United States and the British provinces.

Mr. Chairman, I will end here. Liberal ideas diminish in that time, and that is the reason why the reciprocity treaty with the United States was abrogated. To-day there seems to be a reappearance of the liberal ideas in the United States and in Canada on account of the change of governments which has taken place. To-day the party in power is governed by the liberal traditions which are at the bottom of the democratic sentiment. This sentiment is not limited to one country only. But it is universal of this nature. It is the sentiment which has inspired the people before the elections and which is bringing the results that we see to-day. This sentiment is so much developed that it carries in this movement a great part of the republican forces of our neighbouring country. A considerable reaction has taken place in the United States. At the end, the abuse of a thing brings very bad results. Extreme protection brought the formation of gigantic trusts, which pressured the consumers, who are now in open revolt against that regime. Nothing extraordinary, then if the reaction is so terrible in the United States and if it is not so marked here in Canada, it is due to the English temperament which dominates in this country. The evolution here has not been so fast, but it tends almost as surely towards the liberal ideas, I say that it is a magnificent result that diplomacy gained. Canada has acted as an independent nation, as it is said in the correspondence of the 21st January last between the representatives of both

countries, after the President of the United States had told the English ambassador at Washington that he desired to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with Canada, this ambassador immediately communicated the proposition to the Canadian government, sole arbiter of its commercial destinies and business relations between Canada and United States. This is the great progress that has been accomplished, and I have no doubt that this custom agreement will be ratified by an immense majority, composed not only of liberal members, but also of a good many Conservative members, because it is in the true interest of the Canadian people. This convention will be accepted by this House and sanctioned by the representative of His Majesty in Canada. Notwithstanding the veto which still exists in theory and which permits England to disallow colonial laws upon finances, not a government, not a sovereign, would undo what our government has done here. This convention which is all to the advantage of the great agricultural class and to the consumers of Canada will be acclaimed through all Canada.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM (East Huron). Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to make a speech until a short time ago on this matter, but I find that I must make a few remarks to put myself right with regard to certain things which have been said in the newspapers published in my neighbourhood. I find that they say that I have declared myself in favour of reciprocity because, when I spoke on the address here, I made certain statements with regard to the prospects that were in view at that time. Our representatives had not then gone to Washington at all. I had said that if they went there it was absolutely necessary that they insist as a preliminary to negotiations that we should have an equalization of rates between the two countries. I said that they should insist upon that as a preliminary to the negotiations. I said that if they would insist upon that I thought both political parties in Canada would agree to any fair and reasonable agreement that might be made between the two countries. They have gone so far in the local legislature as to declare that because I said that I was in favour of reciprocity. Under these circumstances I feel that I must say a few words. I would like to know if these gentlemen have secured equalized tariff rates between the two countries. If this compact is enforced the United States will be charging 42 per cent on dutiable goods going from Canada to the United States as an average duty, while on dutiable goods coming from the United States into Canada would only pay an average duty of 24 per cent. Is that an equalization of tariff rates? I think not.

But what can we expect from a newspaper that would say, when my building was burned in Wingham, that I was away in the west, and why did I not stay and attend to my business in parliament. One said: Why did I not resign and get out. That is the kind of Grit papers we have in my riding. I will buy that editor a new hat if he will find half a dozen men in this House who have lost fewer days during all the long years that I have been here than I have. I was here attending to my duties when they put that in the newspaper, and when they brought it up in the legislature in Toronto, and said that I had declared myself in favour of reciprocity because I said that if they would get this preliminary I would stand up to it. I am in favour of reciprocity now, but it is the kind of reciprocity that Sir John A. Macdonald was in favour of. I am opposed to the kind of reciprocity that Sir John A. Macdonald was opposed to. The last effort that Sir John Macdonald ever made in the political battle was to fight reciprocity as it was brought forward by the Liberal party, and he made such an effort in his later days that when he came back to parliament he came back exhausted, and shortly afterwards died. Yet, they will tell us that Sir John A. Macdonald was in favour of reciprocity. He was like me; he was in favour of a fair deal, but can we get a fair deal from the Americans? I fear not. This newspaper was kind enough to say that it wondered how I would square myself. I would like to know how the editor of that paper is going to square himself for saying that I was in the west when I was here attending to my duties. He is a kind of local preacher, and he goes around preaching on the Sabbath day, but he falls from grace during the week.

I would just say that the principal objection to this compact is that the United States are getting the privilege of interfering with our tariff. The United States went into rebellion against Great Britain, they actualy fought against Great Britain, and they gained their independence because Great Britain threatened to interfere with their tariff. Now they want to stick their noses into the Canadian tariff. Are we prepared to enter into such an agreement that we will have to go to the United States and ask whether we dare make any change in our tariff or not? It is the entanglement that we are getting into that I object to. If we had only waited the Democratic party would have given us everything we have got by this compact, they were pledged to give it, they would have given more too, and then we would not

have had the entanglement that we have at the present time.

The last speaker (Mr. Turcotte, Quebec County) put a great deal of emphasis upon the favoured nation clause, and he explained to us, as nearly as I could understand him from certain things that he read, that the favoured nation clause meant nothing. He was explaining something that referred to the favoured nation clause of the United States, not to the favoured nation clause of Canada or Great Britain. I am in favour of a fair deal. That is what I said when I was speaking on the address. I am not in favour of a jug-handled policy, I am not in favour of a policy which gives us reciprocity only in one nation, and allows twelve or thirteen others to come in here free, although they give us no return whatever. I am not in favour of a jug-handle that is twelve times as big as the jug itself. I can think of nothing that is so unreasonable, so selfish, and so hoggish-like as this bargain, except a pig with one ear. The Liberal government have during the last fourteen years successfully played a double game with the tariff of this country. They have pleased the consumers and farmers by promising free trade while at the same time they were quietly promoting protection and secretly winning the support of the manufacturers, the mergers, and the middlemen in that way. But their ways were so devious, and they covered their tracks with so much skill that even a great many Conservatives were deceived. The deceptive manipulation of the tariff on agricultural implements may be taken as an example. The last speaker referred to our farmers. He said that the farmers would not be injured. The farmers have been suffering all the time. He spoke about the manufacturers, but the farmers have been deceived on every occasion. I have a couple of letters here, and I think I will just read them. I see that other people have been getting letters, and have been reading them to the House, and I think I have just as good a right to get letters as they have.

McCawl, April 18, 1911.

Dr. Chisholm, M.P.

Dear Sir,—I write to say I am inclined to favour reciproicity.

I am not going to do as some of the hon. members of the House have done. The Conservatives read letters that are opposed to this agreement, and the Liberals read letters that are in favour of it. I am going to read one that is in favour of it, and then I will read one that is opposed to it. That is fair.

I am sure the farmers will get a better price for their turnips and their calves. We raise a great many swede turnips in this country and the Yankees come over and buy them by the carload and sometimes by the train load. They take them over to the United States where they grind them up very fine and sweeten and colour them and then mix them with timothy seed that has been kept so long in some of their wholesale houses that it has lost its vitality and is no use for seed or any other purpose. This is then sent back to Canada as canned strawberries. Now it is plain that if we had reciprocity we would not only get a better price for our turnips but we would also get our canned strawberries at a greatly reduced price. Hurrah for reciprocity, bob veal, canned chicken and cheap strawberry preserves!

Yours truly,
J. D. COOPER.

That is a letter in favour of reciprocity, but now here is one opposed to it:

Wingham, March, 1911.

Dear Mr. Chisholm,—I thought I would drop you a few lines to warn you about reciprocity. Tell the government to be very careful when dealing with the Yankees. I got bitten with one of those gentlemen myself once. I had an old mare that had been a faithful servant to me for thirty years and I was at work ploughing near the highway one day with her when one of these chaps came along and asked me how I would trade that old mare for his brown colt. After driving a hard bargain for a while I gave him ten dollars and the old mare for his brown colt. He was scarcely out of sight when I discovered that the brown colt was two years older than my old mare, also that he was heavy and balky, and I only had him about three days when he kicked the brains out of my good collie dog, that was worth more than both the horses. Everybody was laughing at me, so I just knocked the brown colt on the head and drew the colt and dog out on the field so that I could bury them both in the one grave. The very next day the Yankee came along when I was in the field and sold my old woman three dollars worth of Bologna sausage, and he never told her they were made out of our old mare. When he was leaving his eyes fell on the brown colt and the dog lying out in the field, and he asked my old woman if he might take them home with him in his light wagon, and she said he could. I was told afterwards that he made a lot of sausage out of them, too, and sold their hides for three dollars and half. I got nothing except three dollars worth of sausage, and I buried that and erected a slab with an inscription on it to the memory of my old mare. Tell the government to be very careful how they deal with these people, for they always make sure to get the best of the bargain.

J. H. STEPHENSON,
Wingham, Ont.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, in the face of that conflicting evidence, how, in the name of common sense, the government is going to go on with this compact. As the hour is pretty late, and hon. members wish to have some time to think over these letters, perhaps it would be just as well that I should draw my remarks to a close. I thought these letters

ought to be laid before the public, and I do not see how the government, in face of them, can go on with the agreement. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Go on.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). All right.

Mr. STANFIELD. It is after twelve o'clock, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to adjourn the debate he should be allowed to do so.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). Oh, I don't care, I will continue. Now, when Sir John Macdonald introduced his National Policy many years ago, he stated distinctly that it was a temporary thing, and that it was only intended to protect infant and struggling industries, and that just so soon as these industries had secured sufficient strength and financial ability to enable them to compete with foreign industries of the same class in the markets of the world, these duties would be lowered or abolished. Under the National Policy the duty on farm implements was first placed at 35 per cent, but it was soon found that this was far too high even for protective purposes, and that such a high protective duty would have the effect of enabling strong and wealthy firms to crush the weak, and thus act in direct opposition to the protective principle. Consequently, after a few years, the Conservative government---and I wish to draw attention to the fact that it was a Conservative government, because there has been an effort repeatedly made during this discussion to show that this benefit to the farmers was effected through the Liberals---the Conservative government under Sir John Thompson reduced the duty from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, and in doing so they were acting strictly in accord with protection principles. Protection may be likened to a fence; a man may put up a fence around his field and he may make it eight rails high, and that will protect his field and keep the cattle out, but if he made it twenty rails high the wind would be sure to blow it down, and the cattle would get in. There is no greater mistake than to assume that protection has to be unnecessarily high ; protection must be regulated carefully, according to the requiremets of the industry it is intended to create, for if it is made too high it will defeat the very object it has in view, and that is the reason Sir John Thompson reduced the duty on agricultural implements. Shortly after that Hugh John Macdonald, the old chieftain's son, during his campaign, in Brandon advocated the entire removal of the duty and the free importation of agricultural implements into this country. That was the policy of the Conservative party in regard to the duty on agricultural implements 14 years ago. At that time, owing to misrepresentations and false promises made by the Liberals, the Conservatives were defeated and the so-called free trade party came into power. They at once introduced a two-faced system of tactics. Instead of giving free trade, as they promised, they actually increased, as I am prepared to show, the duty on agricultural implements, thus favouring the manufacturers and deceiving the farmers. That had vexed the farmers so much that after a while, as the House knows, they came down here 800 strong, saying that they could bear it no longer.

Previous to this in 1907 the government to deceive the farmers had proclaimed that they would reduce the duty from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent on mowers and binders. They did reduce the duty, but at the same time they increased the dutiable price of a six-foot binder from about $80 to $100, and afterwards, when the eight-foot binders came in, they increased the dutiable price still higher. Now, 20 per cent on $80 gave the old duty of $16, while 17½ per cent on $100 gave $17.50, so that a man importing a binder had to pay $1.50 more after the reduction than he did before. I am prepared to show that instead of increasing the dutiable price of the binder at that time, they should have reduced it. If a six-foot binder could have been manufactured 25 or 30 years ago for $80, surely, with the improved machinery they have in Toronto, and with the electric power which they get from Niagara Falls, instead of getting power from coal and steam—and I am told that a man with a machine can now do as much work in one day as twenty men could do formerly—surely, with the increased facilities for transportation, and with the enormously increased output, they should be able to manufacture one of these machines for one-half the money they did formerly, that is, $40. We have some proof of that. There was a strike in the Massey-Harris works a short time ago, and it went so far that the moulders on strike tried to get up a company in opposition, and they proved to the satisfaction of moneyed men who were talking of going into the company that the binders sold for $150 to farmers could be manufactured for $40, and I have no doubt that, with all the machinery and the advantages in manufacture at present, that is true. If one of these binders were sold at $50, this would give the manufacturer $10 for his legitimate profit; and the duty of 17½ per cent on $100 is exactly 35 per cent on $50. So that this free trade government is giving back to the manufacturers the old duty of 35 per cent, which was taken from them by Sir John Thompson. But that is not the

worst. At the very time that they put in that clause making this reduction of 2½ per cent in the duty on binders, they put in a clause giving a rebate of 99 per cent on all the materials used in the manufacture of mowers and binders. Under that provision, during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1910, the Massey-Harris firm alone received in rebates the enormous sum of $155,149 63; and, as the farmers of this country form two-thirds of the population, we may assume that $100,000 of that money was taken out of the pockets of the farmers and handed over to one single firm of manufacturers simply as a bonus. We all know that the bonus system is the most extreme form of protection; and yet these gentlemen call themselves free-traders. But that is not all. They took Mr. Jones of the Massey-Harris firm and Mr. Frost of the Frost & Wood firm, and put them into the Senate, and gave between them $5,000 a year, As the farmers form two-thirds of the population of this country, $3,000 of that money also must have come out of the pockets of the farmers. You will think that a bad enough story, but that is not the worst. For many years the farmers of Canada were prosperous; their products were protected; they had a continually increasing home market, and prices were good; they also had the advantage of the British market. But all at once, suddenly and unexpectedly, this government announced that they had made a secret compact with the United States, and that the protection which the farmers had enjoyed up to this time, that had given them this market, was to be taken away from them. Under the compact made between the manufacturers and the farmers at the time the National Policy was first introduced, the products of the farm were to be protected and the products of the factory were to be protected. Now, they take away all the protection from the farmer, and leave him to compete, not only with the United States, but with Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Venezuela, Spain, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Russia, Turkey and Japan. These countries all come in under the favoured-nation clause. Then, we have coming under the British preference New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, India, and all the British Crown colonies, and competing with our farmers. Just think of what it means. At the time the National Policy was introduced there was an understanding that there was to be a duty on coal for the eastern provinces, and a duty on wheat for the western provinces, and this was supposed to compensate the west for the duty on coal in Nova Scotia. But now the duty on wheat is to be taken away, and the duty on coal is to be continued. Wheat can be moved by water much cheaper than by rail, and it can be brought from Argentina to Halifax at 6 cents a bushel, whereas it costs 16 cents a bushel to bring it from Regina. So our farmers will lose their market right here in their own country, because we have no reciprocal compensation with Argentina. The favoured-nation clause of the United States is very different from ours. It means that they get a grant in return that is not conferred on other countries, whereas we have to give to Venezuela, Argentina and all the other countries free acess to our country and we get no reciprocal return. If we wish to send wheat to Venezuela or Argentina or Spain or Russia, we have to pay the duty, but any of these countries can bring their wheat to Canada free of duty. I know that the price of wheat is higher in the western states than in our own Northwest; but there is a reason for that. In the United States there is only a small district that will raise No. 1 hard, and they have to have a certain amount of No. 1 hard to mix with their soft wheat.

The result was that in those parts of the United States where No. 1 hard could be raised they had a monopoly and consequently received a higher price ; but when 100,000,000 bushels of hard wheat goes from Canada into the United States, that condition will be changed and the price in both countries will be lowered. Another reason why wheat has been higher in the United States than in Canada is because of the robbery and mixing of grain practised in our terminal elevators. Eight hundred men came down here after this matter had been discussed by every Grain Grower's Association in the west ; they thought they understood their business and they asked that the government should own and operate the terminal elevators. But the government pretended that they understood the whole thing far better than the farmers, so they proposed to give them free entry for their wheat into the United States. The farmers wanted the establishment of a chilled meat industry and abattoirs but the government could do better than that, they would let them get into the Chicago market and be subject to the operations of Swift and Armour and the meat trusts of the United States. Then they asked that the Hudson Bay railway should be built right away, but the government pretended that they knew something far better than that, they would let Jim Hill get his railroads in and in that way of course they thought the traffic would all go south and thus an excuse would be given for delaying the building of the Hudson Bay railway. To show the hypocrisy of all this thing, just after the last election, I went out to Prince Albert where I have a son. I forgot entirely that there was a deferred election. On the night I reached there there was to be a meeting in the town hall. I had not been there 10 minutes when I was

urged to go to the town hall to speak. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) and the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner were expected to be present but they had not come. One of the cleverest young members on that side of the House, the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) had been invited to oppose these gentlemen but there was no one to speak for our side. I refused at first but finally was induced to go to the meeting. My hon. friend concluded his speech by saying that if they would vote for the Liberal candidate they would get the Hudson Bay railway right away, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had said so and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had never made a promise that had not been fulfilled. I said: I do not know much about western politics, but I think I know that Sir Wilfrid came to Prince Albert in 1895 and told the residents that if the Liberal party came into power and they elected a Liberal they would get the Hudson Ray railway right away. They did not get it. Then, I said: In 1900 they came back with the same old story: If you will elect a Liberal you will get the Hudson Bay railway right away and they elected Mr. T. O. Davis, now a senator, and they did not get the Hudson Bay railway right away. I said that in 1904 they came to Prince Albert with the same old story and they elected Mr. Lamont, a Liberal. He came down here but they did not get the Hudson Bay railway right away. Mr. Lamont was made attorney general for Saskatchewan and afterwards a judge. There was a by-election and they elected Mr. McCraney by acclamation, and they were to get the Hudson Bay railway right away, and then I said: As I was coming down from the station to-night I saw a dray with a big placard on it, with letters two feet high: Vote for the Liberal candidate and get the Hudson Bay railway right away. I said: Take care of that board, put it behind the barn, do not change a single word and you can bring it out in 1912 and parade it up and down the street, and it will be the same old story, elect a Liberal and you will get the Hudson Bay railway right away. I hope the board is safe behind the barn because it is about time to take it out. This is the way the farmers of the west have been humbugged about the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. TOLMIE. What about the clock.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). Never mind about the clock. There is the man who promised me a clock but did not give it to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Have patience.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). The people in the west must have patience, they waited 14 years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Everything comes to the man who knows how to wait.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). But I know a man in North Bruce who is getting something nearly every day and I never raised my finger to protest against anything he got simply because he was a brother Scotchman, and when I asked for a clock for the Wingham post office I could not get it, he put in his nose. I have been in this House many years and I never got a thing for East Huron that I asked for. However, I never objected to his getting things and he has been getting, getting, getting. He has nearly as many harbours as there are in Nova Scotia, and he has Indians and two or three buildings. I asked about a clock and he came to me in the last parliament and told me if I would make a speech in favour of my good friend the Minister of Agriculture, of whom I have always thought so much, on the cold storage question, he would see that I got a clock. I made a good speech, as I think the minister will admit, but my friend did not keep his word. I am getting so that I will not believe one single word which comes from that side of the House. If there was a man on that side of the House whom I would have believed it would have been the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Tolmie) simply because he was a Scotchman, but I find that even a Scotchman, when he gets on that side of the House, cannot always be depended on.

It costs a cent to send a bushel of wheat 60 or 70 miles. Duluth is 70 miles nearer to Winnipeg than Fort William. When the duties are taken away and all trouble in regard to bond, &c., is done away with, it is quite evident that those who are handling wheat in Western Canada will send it to Duluth instead of Fort William because on 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, with a saving of one cent a bushel, they will make $1,000,000 and beyond doubt they would send it to the place where they would make the most money, they would send it to Duluth. When it gets to Duluth, what is the law? The American law provides that a foreign vessel cannot take a cargo from one United States port to another, and the 100,000,000 of Canadian grown wheat will go to Duluth so that our Canadian vessels will not get the carriage of a single bushel of it to Buffalo.

Mr. TOLMIE. We have the same law, have we not?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). I am not saying anything about the law. I defy any hon. member to show what will prevent the wheat going to Duluth.

Mr. TOLMIE. Answer my question.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). I have answered ited it; go and sit still. Mr. Chairman,

I do ont think this is fair; they insisted on my going on to-night——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chisholm, Huron) objects to interruptions, I will see to it that there shall be none.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). I do not object to reasonable interruptions, but I thought I had settled my hon. friend (Mr. Tolmie), and I do not want him interfering all the time. Now, take the question of barley—and there is great talk about that question. I remember when I myself got $1.40 a bushel for barley. And the old farmers have that in their minds to this day. But the whole barley situation has been changed in the meantime. In those days, the barley was sent to Buffalo, and the malting mills were there. It was made into a particular kind of ale, which, they tell me, has gone out of fashion. And the malting mills have been removed to Milwaukee, or away out to Minneapolis. A new country has been opened up there that was a waste at that time, and they can raise barley there of as good quality as we can raise in Ontario and raise a much larger crop of it. So, this barley question amounts to very little. Last year, we brought into this country $167,000 worth of barley, and paid $24,000 to get it in. How are our farmers going to make money raising barley in the face of that? If we spent so much to bring in barley from the United States, that must prove that barley is dearer in this country than it is in the United States.

Now as to cattle; the cattle business will be put into the hands of Swift and Armour and the meat trust. They will handle the meat situation here as they handle it in the United States, and my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Wright) explained how it would be done. The farmer will be compelled to sell his beef to the trust, and the consumer will have to pay whatever price is demanded for his meat.

Now, this compact is certainly going to injure British Columbia. We have heard speeches from the gentlemen representing that province, and it seems to me that the matter is a very serious one for the people of British Columbia. And Alberta and Saskatchewan will be greatly injured by anything that injures British Columbia. The natural market for the products of Alberta and Saskatchewan is British Columbia. As soon as the Panama canal is finished, the grain of those provinces will go by way of British Columbia. The people engaged in mining, lumbering and fishing in British Columbia will consume the farm products of these two provinces. And now they are asked to destroy British Columbia, to destroy the market for their own produce for the purpose of becoming part of the back-

yard of Chicago. I hope our farmers will consider that.

Now, take the question of lumber. Under this arrangement, $1.50 a thousand will be taken off lumber. That will raise the price of lumber to the farmers of this country. That means that our farmers will have to pay $1.50 more per thousand for their lumber. They have taken $2 a barrel off pork. And so our farmers will have to get less for their pork and will have to pay more for their lumber.

Then, take the question of apples; last year, we brought in $261,792 worth of apples into this country. What we should do is to have a proper system of cold storage; but if this compact goes into force it will prevent our getting this. The farmers of the west are asking for abattoirs. We should have a comprehensive system of cold storage, something I advocated in this House many years ago—a system owned and operated by the government and handled in such a way that it would just pay expenses. It would benefit both the producer and the consumer. If we had a proper system of cold storage properly carried on, it would pay the interest on the money, so that we could borrow the money and by having a small sinking fund the enterprise itself would pay off the debt. With such a system, a poor man could buy a quarter of beef and put it into cold storage, paying the commissioners who would run the thing for the country a small sum, and when he wanted a bit of that beef he could go and get it. Then the farmer who chose to put his beef into cold storage could put it there and wait for a better price. The poor man could buy eggs in the summer at ten cents or twelve cents a dozen, and for one cent a dozen they could be kept until he wanted them. When we send our perishable products down to the ocean—our fruit and things of that kind—on its way to Britain, we could bring back fish to be put into the space in cold storage from which our own goods had been taken. The owner could pay a small fee for keeping these fish, and when he wanted them he could get them. We could send our apples and perishable fruits to the west, as far as Edmonton or even to Lake Athabaska, and we could bring back in the same refrigerator cars whitefish to be put into cold storage for use whenever desired. If we had commissioners, such a system could be effectively run, and the producer and the consumer would both be benefited. But when a motion in favour of arbitrators was brought up in this House it had to be voted down by the government. In the same way, the motion for terminal elevators had to be voted down. Whenever there is anything to benefit the farmers it has to be voted down. The manufacturers are the pets of the government. If the farmers were put

on an equality with the manufacturers, if they were given a rebate of 99 cents on every dollar of duty they paid on a binder, they would get all their money back on that binder except eighteen or twenty cents. But favours like that are not intended for the poor farmer; these things are for the manufacturers. The manufacturers are supported, but the farmers are deceived and misled.

I know that hon. members opposite must feel very badly about this thing. Hon. Edward Blake, when an attempt like this was made years ago declared that it would lead to annexation. He was the leader of the Liberal party for many years, and a very talented man. Hon. members know what he said about an attempt similar to this. They know what Sir George W. Ross has said about it, and what Hon. Clifford Sifton has said about it. These are all Liberals, and they have all seen this danger.

Mr. TOLMIE. What were you once?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). It does not matter what I was once, I was brought up by a good Tory father, in the county of Halton.

Mr. TOLMIE. You told me differently.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). That does not make any difference. I would not believe you any way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Chisholm) has the floor, and he has the right to continue his address without interruption, and that right will be accorded to him if he desires it. Perhaps I should add that, in endeavouring to secure that right for the hon. member, he should not weaken my efforts by responding to interruptions.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). I admit that. Now, the hon. gentleman who spoke just before I began referred to the fact, if I understood him aright, that this compact had been carried in the House of Representatives at Washington to-day—it is now yesterday—by a majority of 175, in a House of 389 members. There are four delegates from the territories, I do not know whether they had votes or not. But if it has been carried by a majority of 175 in a House of that number, it shows that the United States people must think they are getting the best of the bargain.

Mr. BARKER. What was the whole number of members?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). There were 42 absent, I am told. The vote stood 263 to 88, the majority being 175. I think the very fact that Uncle Sam grabs at this thing with such zeal is enough to show that he thinks he has got the best end of the bargain.

Mr. W. O. SEALEY (Wentworth). Mr. Chairman, it appears by agreement between both sides of the House, that this question of the proposed trade agreement between Canada and the United States, is being considered at the present time, as a whole. I am sorry for this, because it scarcely gives a fair opportunity for expressing and discussing the real differences of opinion on specific items.

To illustrate: the schedules are evidently intended, in the main, to embrace items under two headings only, viz., natural products and agricultural products. As to the natural product, our lumbermen and others expect to be immediately benefited by having that free access to the United States market, which the United States have had in the Canadian market for years past. The mineral people, who are interested in coal, nickel, iron, are also well pleased with the agreement, and the agriculturists, on the whole, seem to be more than satisfied with their expected vantage, except possibly as to hog products. We must give those who are engaged in these various pursuits credit for understanding their own business, and knowing something of their own needs and advantages. But the horticulturists of the country make a serious complaint, the seriousness of which was evidenced on February 11 last, by a deputation of 1,500 people coming here from Ontario and Quebec, at a personal expense averaging about $20 each, or a total of $30,000, which is abundant evidence of good faith, to place their views and objections from a practical and experienced standpoint before the government. This deputation, I may say, was among the most numerous and most representative that has ever heretofore waited on any Canadian government. They placed their cause clearly and convincingly before the government, and I believe made out an exceptionally strong case, which was also supplemented by petitions, resolutions, and other representations from British Columbia as well as many other parts of the Dominion, all of which must get careful consideration, I hope and trust that the outcome of their representations will be the granting of immediate relief. Without repeating the able arguments and reasonings advanced by the various speakers on that deputation, I shall take the liberty of occupying the time of the House for a few minutes, in supplementing them with a few additional reasons that have occurred to my own mind.

The latest Trade and Commerce report for the year ending March 31, 1910, shows that we imported during that year to

Canada from the United States, fruit to the value in round figures of $6,500,000, while during the same period we only exported from Canada to the United States, fruit to the value of $500,000, or one-thirteenth of the imports. True, it may be said that $3,500,000 worth of our fruit imports were bananas, oranges, pine apples, and other varieties of fruit which we do not produce in Canada, and which therefore, come in duty free. But $3,000,000 of it, or six times more than we exported to the United States, was dutiable, and of exactly the same class of fruit as we produce in Canada.

Now, the Canadian tariff on peaches is one cent per pound, while the United States tariff on them is only one half cent per pound. The Canadian tariff on strawberries is two cents per quart, while the United States tariff on them is only one cent per quart. Our tariff on much of the fruit is twice as high as theirs; and if, under these conditions, they have been able to invade our markets to the extent of $3,000,000 a year and we have only been able to invade their market to the extent of half a million, or one sixth that amount, during the same time, with only half as much duty against us as we have against them, the result under free trade in these articles would seem to be apparent to every one they would swamp us in our own market, while we would be unable to meet them in their own market.

Climatic and labour conditions in the United States are so varied that they are enabled to begin the production of fruits and vegetables in Florida, California, &c., with coloured labour, in February, Georgia in March, Maryland in April, Delaware and New Jersey in May, &c., so when our fruit comes in during the summer, their Michigan, Wisconsin, New York, and Washington Territory fields afford as northerly a climate and production as ours, while the great Michigan and Wisconsin fields are 100 miles further north, so they can not only lead our season in the spring, equal it in the summer, but follow it in the fall, and in that way meet us on more favourable ground all the way through the year.

Then this United States 92,000,000 market is usually spoken of as though they were all consumers of Agricultural and Horticultural products while as a matter of fact 25,000,000 of them are producing the same kind of products as we are. The argument that the proposed agreement provides two markets, where we now only have one, must be supplemented by the explanation that it also provides two sources of supply, instead of one as now. Many of them are producing under more favourable conditions, especially in the south, as the coloured labour, Cooley labour, and eastern labour with which these things are produced is very cheap there, and properly positively prohibitive here by our immigration regulations and head tax, which again places the Canadian producer at a serious disadvantage as compared with the United States producer.

Our vegetable industry is also a large one, and concerning Reciprocal Trade considerations, I may say that last year's returns show that we have imported from the United States vegetables, not including potatoes, to the value of $822,675, $166,000 of which were tomatoes, while we have only been able to export during the same period $334,804 worth, or considerably less than one-half the amount. To save the time of the House by avoiding repetition, I may say that the same arguments as regards tariff, season, labour, &c., as I have applied to fruit, applies also to vegetables.

These arguments, coupled with those presented by the deputation, in addition to the petitions, &c., from the various parts of the Dominion, seem conclusive, and I believe warrant relief.

Now, as to the matter of fruit baskets, their cost in Canada is as follows: Strawberry baskets with crate, $18 per 100; 6 quart grape baskets, $32 per 1,000; and 11 quart peach and plum baskets, $37 per 1,000 when purchased in large quantities of ½ million lots or upwards, but higher in smaller quantities, while in the United States 6 quart grape baskets only cost the grower $18 per 1,000, and other sizes proportionately, which is on an average $14 per thousand cheaper than the cost to the Canadian grower, all of which come in free when filled with fruit, but are subject to 30 per cent duty when empty.

Some one may say, why not import baskets at $18, and pay 30 per cent duty which would make the cost only equal to $23.40 and freight per M, as against $32 here, but our Canadian Weights and Measures Standard prevents this, as the United States baskets are about 10 per cent smaller than ours and if we used them, they would all require to be stamped short, which reflects seriously against the sale, giving a bad impression against the goods, as well as the quantity, but the United States shipper would, under the newly proposed conditions, be enabled to place his 10 per cent short baskets without stamp alongside of ours, and sell 5 per cent cheaper, and in reality realize 5 per cent more, because to the casual purchaser the short size unstamped is not distinctly noticeable.

This is another strong reason why the fruit and vegetables should be removed from the schedule at the present time, especially until there has been a uniformity of standard sized baskets, packages, and measures adopted between the two coun-

tries, which is absolutely necessary before even a fair experiment could be made.

As the average small grower uses about 15,000 baskets during the season, the medium grower uses about 50,000, and the large grower about 100,000, so the Free Trade handicap against the Canadian producer in this respect alone is over $200 to the small producer, $700 to the medium grower, and $1,400 to the large grower annually, in addition to the duty on fertilizers, implements, machinery, &c. Now, I am not asking that these things be put on the free list, but rather that fruits and vegetables be retained on the Industrial schedule, because it is an industry in every sense of the word, converting the raw material of the soil, seed, trees, fertilizers, labour, &c., into finished products of fruit and vegetables, much of which requires from 5 to 10 and even 20 years to mature, whereas most other industries convert their raw material into finished products in a few weeks or months or once a year at most.

It may be said that I should stand up for Canadian industries generally, and so I do, for I feel that it is the duty of every hon. member of this House to do so, in as far as he is familiar with the circumstances and conditions, and able to make out a substantial case, and therefore if I lead in standing up for any and every Wentworth industry the conditions of which I am familiar with, that is adversely affected at any time, that is about as much responsibility as should be placed on me. For instance, shortly after the introduction of this proposition I feared our steel wire rod business was being badly hit, but on closer examination I find that steel rods were always free in Canada, and that their mention in the schedule is owing to the fact that the United States have now made them free without any quid pro quo from Canada, and the interests are seemingly trying to mistakenly impress the public with the idea that steel bounties should be continued because the reciprocity proposal has hit them so hard, whereas in reality it has opened the United States market to them in addition to the market they already had before without disadvantageously affecting them in the least. So, the more we study the proposal, the more we see the apparently unfair stand the Trusts are taking to further their selfish ends.

One important item of agricultural production, I have noticed is omitted from the schedule, i.e., wool, and I suggest that it be substituted for the horticultural schedule.

In discussing the matter, a gentleman from the prairie west said to me the other day: 'Sealey, cannot you give me any reason why we prairie people should not buy Canadian fruit?' After thinking the matter over, I said: 'No, I cannot, because so far as I could see, Canada produced most excellent apples, every one of which all doctors say are more wholesome and nourishing than two bananas; Canada produced the best of peaches, pears, plums, grapes, berries, &c., of all kinds, cheap enough for the everyday consumer, and delicious enough for the most luxurious taste, and therefore, there did not seem to be any good reason why the westerner should not buy his fruit from us. He then reversed the question, and asked for any good reason why they should buy it. I replied, that was easy, that Canada had given the people most of the western lands free, as well as transportation facilities, and other up to date comforts, under which they had prospered greatly, and, therefore, they should show their appreciation to Canada, by buying Canadian fruit, but if they could not show their gratitude voluntarily in this way, the only alternative seemed to be to prompt them to do so by a little tariff. Needless to say this did not harmonize with the westerner's views, and if under these new conditions, he is permitted to use his own free will and buy United States fruit, the recent reduction in freight rates and improvement in transportation facilities from the Niagara district to Winnipeg and the west, also the recent Railway Commissioners' order, reducing express rates, which we have struggled so hard for, and the result of which we looked forward to for greatly increased trade, will now all go for naught. This will be very disappointing and discouraging, because these advantages will more than be offset by the loss of the tariff.

I am glad that the government have seen their way clear to act on our urgent suggestions and have decided to have the representations of the fruit and vegetable growers deputation printed in Blue-book form, similar to the grain growers, so if for any reason we fail to get relief now, we will have it in presentable form to remind the commissioners immediately after, and, coupled with the arguments that are being made on the floor of the House, it will be easily available. If by any chance whatever, the pulp schedule is ruled out by the United States, then the horticultural schedule must be ruled out by Canada. I may further add that the census returns of 1901, show nearly 500,000 acres of land to have been devoted to the fruit and vegetable industry at that time, which, if valued at the most moderate price of $150 per acre, represents an investment of $75,000,000 in this industry at that time, engaging and supporting over 100,000 people. Assuming that the area has doubled since then and moderately increased in value, this, coupled with the statement of Mr. Delworth, of York, that

the result of a recent local census calculation showed that between the vicinity of Toronto and Niagara Falls, there are over 200,000 acres in fruit and vegetables, which at the modest valuation of $200 per acre (much of which is worth $1,000 per acre), represents a value of $40,000,000 invested in the industry in that small area, employing 15,000 extra people, would lead to the conclusion that a very conservative estimate of the situation to-day would be an investment of $200,000,000 in this industry, which is supporting 200,000 people.

Now, Sir, I believe that an investment of a one-hundredth part of this amount in any other industry would get the greatest amount of consideration and care, and I therefore hope and trust that this industry will yet not be discriminated against.

As to hog products, last year's Trade and Commerce returns show us to have imported from the United States $3,112,302 worth, while we only exported to the United States $8,567 worth. I do not think I can do better than repeat my statements made before the Agricultural Committee on December 14, 1910, which is applicable to the conditions of to-day. I then said:

For instance a short time ago I saw an official report published in the papers stating that the visible supply of live hogs in Canada and in the world generally was very much less than it had been for years past. I also noticed by the market reports at Liverpool that the price of bacon there is rather higher at present than for some time past. From market reports and from actual experience, I have found that about three months ago live hogs were selling in our vicinity—Hamilton and Toronto—at ten cents a pound on foot, and at that same time bacon was being sold for twenty-two cents a pound. Since then the price of live hogs has fallen to 6½ cents, while the price of bacon to the consumer has remained about the same. In Hamilton, live hogs were bringing 10 cents a pound, and in Chicago 9 cents. The price of live hogs has gone down in Chicago, Buffalo and New York, but not nearly so much as in Canada.

The result of a tabulated statement of the market would show that at the present time live hogs are bringing a considerably better price in the United States than in Canada, and that the price of bacon to the consumer in the United States is much below what the consumer has to pay in this country. I believe the present depressed price of live hogs is not due to conditions connected with the law of supply and demand, or to prevailing circumstances in the Liverpool and other foreign markets. I think it amounts to a case of the Canadian packers understanding that at this particular season of the year there is an abundance of hogs matured to about the two hundred pound mark, or slightly over it; that these hogs have got to be sold, and that the packers are seemingly taking an unfair advantage of this situation and keeping down the price. If such is the case, and I believe it can be established, this committee could not do better than institute an inquiry, which will provide a remedy, or, at least, cause the existing situation to be fairly and definitely exposed to the public.

I also feel that some improvement is needed in the matter of market reports. Take any of the daily newspapers, and in order to get a comparison of the market reports you have to study a whole page and make a summary of it yourself. In that way it is hard to compare prices as satisfactorily, and I believe that there are thousands of people who do not take that trouble. Now, this committee, with good grace, might do something to persuade the daily press to publish a summary of reports whereby a comparison could be made similar to the following:—At the head of the newspaper columns might appear the names Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and Liverpool. Immediately following might come Chicago, Buffalo and New York. This would permit the Chicago market to be compared with Winnipeg, Buffalo with Toronto, and New York with Montreal, as regards the interior and seaboard points. Had such a comparison been made for the past three or four months it would have shown the prices formerly paid for live hogs to be about as follows: In Chicago 9 cents, in Buffalo 9½ cents, in New York 10 cents, in Toronto 10 cents, in Montreal 10½ cents, and so on. As to bacon, the price in Chicago and Buffalo would be 18 cents and in Canada 22 cents. Since prices have fallen the rate per live hog in Chicago and Buffalo have been quoted at 7 cents or 7½ cents and in Canada 6½ cents. On the other hand, the price of bacon would be at about 16 cents there, whilst here it would be at 22 cents. I believe we would be doing a public service if we laid such a comparison of prices in such a convincing form before the public. Such a proceeding, in my opinion, would exercise a deterrent effect upon the Canadian factories and prevent them from taking the unfair advantage which they are taking at the present time. And I hope this committee will now decide to cause an immediate inquiry to be made.

Since then and shortly after the holidays the proposal of reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States has occupied the attention of parliament and the public as well, which, together with my personal illness, contributed to allow the matter before the Agricultural Committee to remain dormant. However, while present market quotations show live hogs to bring about 1 cent more in the United States than in Canada, and that for a much inferior quality, I fear it is more of a freak condition, rather than a stable one, and conditions may turn the other way before long, in which case our quarantine regulations will preserve us in the case of live hogs; but the hog products would be the same as now, and I therefore feel that in the matter of pork products, our safest position would be to place these on a schedule similar to that in force in Canada at the present time. For while they are an agricultural product, you will remember that the western grain growers and Ontario farmers' depu-

tation, specially exempted hog products from the application of the general representations. And I may add right here, that it becomes Canada to give the greatest amount of consideration and care to this most important industry, for, with all due respect to the importance of other products, I believe the production of hogs in Canada has paid off more mortgages in Ontario, than any other product of any kind, and in Wentworth fruit and vegetables are the next.

Now, there is a very grave evil existing in the hog market to-day, and I am quite willing to join in any other plan to remedy it, that may seem likely to give better results.

I may say that my idea was to propose an amendment excluding the fruit and vegetables, and also hog products from the schedule and adopt the resolution as amended. However, if the exclusion of hog products is likely to prevent the exclusion of fruits and vegetables from getting as much support as it otherwise would, I am quite agreeable to leave that out, and take chances of getting the hog products cared for later. It may be said that an amendment would not be admissible, as the schedule has to be adopted as a whole, or rejected as a whole. I do not agree with this idea, for two reasons. One is that in my judgment a majority of this House rules, and can amend any resolution; second, because Secretary Knox's letter to the State Department implied that the schedule with regard to pulp and paper could be changed. Certainly if the pulp and paper schedule can be altered by the United States, the fruit and vegetable schedule can be altered by Canada. We are satisfied, from the representations that the United States are making with regard to pulp and paper, that their commissioners overlooked the real meaning of the clause, and I think that perhaps our commissioners may have omitted to distinguish the difference between agricultural products and horticultural products. They might say that it would be rather humiliating to admit to the United States that they had made an omission of this kind, but that little humiliation is insignificant compared with the risk of wreck and ruin to a $200,000,000 industry in Canada supporing 200,000 people. They may say they had to give and take, but I don't think there is any industry in Canada that would ask the government to give away the fruit and vegetable industry to take some advantage for themselves, but we find from newspaper reports that the fruit and vegetable industry is the only one quoted by the United States representatives as a gain for the United States for all the losses complained of as having been conceded to Canada. In fact, Canada's position in the matter of trade is so good to-day that no industry should be sacrificed to meet the wishes of any other country, and I feel sure it is not necessary. I am satisfied that the exclusion of horticultural products would not stop the agreement, because the expression of the United States people in all the bye-elections last year, as well as the general election in November last was for a revision of their tariff downward, and for free food-stuffs, and so forceful and general was that expression that the United States government will not feel safe in declining it, even with this amendment. But of course the only way to prove this is to get a majority of this House to adopt such an amendment; but if by any chance we fail in this, then I presume I will be obliged to rely on the Canadian commissioners' statement that the day after it is in operation 'it can be changed', and in view of all the representations made by the immense delegation the other day, as well as others who know by experience, I shall feel it my duty to continue to pursue it along these lines until we have relief for this largest industry in Canada, except general agriculture.

Another strong reason why the best interests of the horticultural industry should be preserved, is to assist in the solution of that most difficult problem, 'overcrowded cities and towns,' by the only known practical remedy, 'back to the land.' Now, in a recent Ontario report it is said that last year this remedy had begun to succeed to the extent of 5,000 people having gone from the cities and towns back to the land; and almost all that improvement is traceable to the attraction of the horticultural industry. In fact, in older Canada it seems to be the only attractive kind of land life yet developed; and so attractive has it become that recently many people of means from outside Canada have invested and settled in the midst of this delightful industry.

There is one most favourable feature about the whole thing and that is, that it is not a treaty for a term of years, but only a proposal which can only come into effect to whatever extent it is mutually agreed to by both countries, by concurrent legislation which is only binding on either country so long as they keep that legislation in force, but can be changed by either country in five minutes after it is passed, so if after a fair trial of a year or two it is found to work badly for any particular industry or line, then it can and will be changed, and we cannot surely be ruined in a season or two. This is the one favourable feature of the proposal, which is a guarantee that any industry that is seriously hurt can and will be relieved.

One feature of the situation, however, from which we are getting immediate bene-

ficial results is the advertising side of the question, for nothing has happened in our whole previous history that has given us so much favourable newspaper publicity and advertising, as well as public discussion the world over, as has this proposed reciprocal trade agreement. Why every newspaper in the United States is talking about Canada and its advantages, so that to-day Canada is almost better known in the United States than the United States is itself. And in Britain and other parts of Europe we are much better known than ever before, on account of this reciprocal trade proposal.

A prominent Canadian who recently returned from a trip through Europe says, that in every hamlet in Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Russia, Norway and Sweden, as well as France and the British Isles, the newspapers are full of it, and the whole population are asking, what manner of place this Canada of 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 people is, that the President and Secretary of the great United States, of a hundred million population are running up and down the country, so earnestly urging their people to make a reciprocal trade agreement with this country called Canada. Surely they said, Canada must be the country we read about in the scriptures, that is flowing with milk and honey, and where the streets are paved with gold. That's the land we are going to, as soon as circumstances permit, to make our future happy home in.

Why on March 27, 1911, over 200 immigrants from Wales landed in Canada, with $400,000 to invest in Canadian lands. So you see whatever the eventual result of the trade proposals may be, we are getting much immediate benefit from the advertising, in vastly increased immigration, of a good character, without much additional effort on our part through the attention which the newspapers of the world are giving to our vast natural resources and advantages, in the ordinary course of discussing this trade proposition. Similar advertising if paid for in the usual way, would have cost Canada many millions of dollars, and then not be nearly so effective, as the editorial columns are seldom open to paid advertising, in fact it would be impossible even with millions of money to secure such advertising.

So the Paine-Aldrich tariff, with its countervailing conditions, that were to be used as a huge club against all other countries, to bring them to the commercial knees of the United States, and declare the United States to be dictator of the trade and commerce of the world, has really fulfilled the prediction of Representative Gardner, and been converted to the advantage of Canada, and has now declared Canada to be the commercial country that the remainder of the world are so anxiously seeking trade with. Because since the present proposal was made public, according to reports, other countries are almost tumbling over each other to make trade agreements with Canada.

As to the annexation sentiment and the insinuations of lack of loyalty displayed by the proposed reciprocal trade agreement, I have no fear, and I take no stock in the argument, for during the past year which is said to have been the ideal condition by many members of this House, we purchased from the United States, $239,000,000 worth of goods, and only sold them $113,000,000 worth, and if it has not made us disloyal to buy from them $125,000,000 more than we sold them, then I dont see how it will make us disloyal or annexationists if we now try to sell them that $125,000,000 worth of produce, rather than pay them that amount in gold; it would give us much additional business and profit, and retain that enormous sum of money in Canada with which to further develop this great country of ours.

The 'London Times,' Unionist tariff reform paper, seems to take about the same view of it, for on March 7, it says editorially:

TIMES SEES SOME GOOD

London, March 7.—The 'Times' says editorially: 'We cannot tell how far the sporadically raised cry of annexation is influencing Canadian opinion, but there is no reason to suppose that the reciprocity agreement would produce any tendency in that direction. On the contrary, bargaining on equal terms with the states might tend to foster rather than diminish the self reliance and independence of the Canadian people.'

Which further discourages fear in this direction.

Insinuations are being made against certain members of the government, implying that they are annexationists; well, Sir Allen Aylesworth might jocularly be classed a little that way, for it is said that at the Hague Tribunal recently he succeeded in annexing all the difference of opinion there had been about the Atlantic coast, and the Hudson bay, and he must have made a good job of it, for King George V. honoured him with Knighthood for the service.

Then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been a little inclined that way, for through Capt Bernier he succeeded in annexing to Canada, all the Thousand Islands, between here and the north pole, many of which may yet prove more valuable than Cobalt, while the United States have been wasting their time with Cook and Peary, in trying to annex the north pole, which seems to be 45 feet below the surface of the ice, and still undiscovered.

Then the Hon. Mr. Oliver, minister of the Interior, has done something along that

line as well, for it is he who has annexed about half a million of the best United States farmers to our Canadian west, and who is still working overtime at the job, in support of which I will quote from the 'Times,' dated Winnipeg, Man., March 10, 1911:

ANNEXING THEM.

Five train loads of United States farmers enter the Northwest.

Winnipeg, Man., March 10.—Daily hundreds of cars of American settlers with their families and effects are passing over the border into the prairie provinces. At Emmerson and North Portal yesterday five special trains of United States settlers came into Canada. On account of the early spring the rush has started much earlier than usual. A tremendous United States immigration is anticipated this spring. Many of the new arrivals are going through to British Columbia.

So he will likely annex another half million of them this year.

Then the right hon. the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, hasn't a bad reputation along that line himself, for it is said that at the Diamond Jubilee, he mesmerically annexed the hearts of all the British empire, and later he is said to have annexed the following of the whole Colonial Conference. But in attempting to moderate the displeasure of the Fruit and Vegetable Growers, for his oversight in forgetting their best interests in the reciprocity proposal, he has set himself, perhaps, the largest task of his life; he must annex the whole United States to Canada and Britain.

This would be a huge task, but he has performed, heretofore, apparent impossibilities. While representatives Champ Clark and W. S. Bennett are shouting about annexing Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier is always sawing wood, and it would perhaps surprise no one, if some morning we wakened up to find that he, like Sir Allen Aylesworth and Hon. Messrs. Brodeur and Oliver, had completed the job, for this is the only kind of annexation that is at all possible for the Canadian people to deal with or submit to, and you all know what stuff the men of the northern zone are made of.

Hon. members may smile at this, but I trust the smile is one of pleasure, rather than of sneer, for the movement has now actually begun, not by injudicious action on the part of the right hon. the Prime Minister, not by the terror of Sir Frederick Borden and his militia, not by fear and trembling at the thought of our new Canadian navy, but by the voluntary preference of many United States people, who believe in the honour and substantialness of Canadian institutions and government, which are based on British fair play and sense of justice which has stood the test of centuries. In support of this I will quote from the Daily 'Herald' of February 25, 1911, concerning Alaska:

Cordova, Alaska, Feb. 22.—A movement is on foot in Alaska looking to the annexation of that territory to Canada. The men behind the movement assert that the United States government does not seem disposed to relieve the territory of its present burdens, and that annexation to the Dominion seems to offer the only hope.

The movement is gaining the endorsement of a large number of business men throughout Alaska, and mass meetings will be held in Valdez, Seward, Fairbanks, Juneau and Cordova. It is planned to adopt resolutions asking the Congress of the United States to divorce Alaska from the American government, so she can become allied with Canada.

Why, at this very moment, the situation is being canvassed to a considerable extent in the New England states, and especially those industrial sections that rely largely on Canada for their raw material and foodstuffs. They are wondering whether Washington would grant the prayer of their petition for annexation to Canada willingly, or whether such action on their part would be obstructed by Washington, even to the extent of bloodshed. I have heard somewhat similar suggestions periodically during the past year, and a number of Canadians having business with the New England states have recenlty heard similar discussions. The history of Europe shows that the northern people have eventally dominated, and if there is ever any change on the North American continent, European history will be repeated and the northern people dominate.

Now, from a local standpoint, and as one of the reasons why I approve and support the agricultural schedule, I would quote, in addition to the general sentiment and expression of opinion by the farmers themselves that they believe it would be beneficial to them, a few produce prices for 1910.

1910 MARKET PRICE COMPARISONS.

Hogs, weekly; Steers, fortnightly; others monthly.

—	—	Averages.			—	Averages.			Difference in favour of	
		Low.	High.	Mean.		Low.	High.	Mean.	United States.	Can.
Hogs	Buffalo	9·28	9·64	9·46	Toronto	8·69	8·95	8·82	·64	
Steer	Chicago	4·84	7·60	6·22	Winnipeg	4·64	5·33	4·99	1·23	
Steers, Ex.	Buffalo	6·36	7·09	6·73	Toronto	6·38	6·87	6·63	·10	
" Butch	Buffalo	7·21	7·67	7·44	Toronto	6·16	6·53	6·35	1·09	
Cheese	Boston	14·62	16·06	15·34	Montreal	11·39	11·98	11·68		
"	New York	15·35	15·65	15·50	Toronto	11·05	12·43	11·96		
"	Chicago	15·11	15·98	15·54						
				15·46				11·87	3·59	
Butter	Boston	27·70	31·00	29·35	Montreal	24·38	26·15	25·26		
"	New York	27·17	31·12	29·14	Toronto	24·20	25·66	24·98		
"	Chicago	26·42	30·62	28·52						
				29·03				25·12	3·91	

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Taking the Toronto prices, does the hon. gentleman mean that is the highest price?

Mr. SEALEY. It does not mean that it is lower or higher, but the low prices and higher prices have been taken and averaged, and that is the average taken from the quotations of a whole year. I think the figures can be relied upon as entirely accurate.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I recognize the hon gentleman's anxiety, but it does seem to me that he is evolving these figures out of his own internal economy.

Mr. SEALEY. I have taken these figures from the regular market reports.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). What is your authority?

Mr. SEALEY. My authority is the government market reports that were taken before the beginning of this year, and before any insinuations could be made that they were got up for effect, in view of this proposition. I have full confidence in them; I have referred to them many times in years past, and I will stake my reputation that they are accurate. I believe they are the most reliable figures that have been quoted in the House yet.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The figures the hon. gentleman is quoting are altogether different from the figures that are used in the white-book laid on the table of the United States Senate.

Mr. SEALEY I will quote United States figures also before I get through. However, I prefer my own. Now take eggs:

Eggs	Boston	23·50	26·92	25·21	Montreal	23·60	25·41	24·51		
"	New York	23·03	27·71	25·37	Toronto	22·70	24·33	23·50		
"	Chicago	21·58	24·67	23·13						
				24.57				24·01	.56	
Chickens	New York	16.29	21·70	19.00	Montreal	12.50	14.40	13·50		
					Toronto	14.07	18.00	16·03		
				19.00				14.76	4·24	

Oats	Y. State	Paid Farmers.	44.50	Ontario	Farmers.	36·	8·50	U.S.
Hay	N. Y. "	"	13.71	"	"	10·21	3·50	"
Barley	N. Y. "	"	70.	"	"	53·	·17	"

In regard to grain, perhaps I should have taken the figures from a Canadian source, but it was more convenient to take the United States reports. I have taken figures for oats from the state of New York, and the price paid to farmers there was 44·50 cents per bushel of 34 lbs., and it figures out about 42 cents for 32 lbs.

The Ontario farmers receive an average of 36 cents, or 8½ cents less.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the price of barley in Quebec?

Mr. SEALEY. I have not got the figures for Quebec.

Mr. LENNOX. 71 cents.

Mr. SEALEY. Malting barley might be 71 cents in Quebec, but I doubt whether that is the average. What I have worked out I will bank on and bet on. The same United States report gives the price of land. I have taken the border states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut and Delaware, where agricultural land is estimated at $41 per acre; whereas in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island their average farm land is estimated at $32 per acre, or $9 less on the Canadian side. Then in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana and Michigan the average price of farm land is $71 per acre; whereas in Ontario it is $50 per acre, or $21 less.

Mr. BARKER. Does the Ontario average include the Niagara district along the border of Michigan?

Mr. SEALEY. It includes what is utilized for farming in the Niagara district, not what is used for horticulture.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman knows that in his own district land stands at $200 to $400 an acre.

Mr. SEALEY. Yes, but there is much in Muskoka that stands at $5 and $10; $50 is a fair average, and that is the average given by the United States reports.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman had gone up to James bay he might have got it for ten cents an acre.

Mr. SEALEY. These are United States figures, and I expect hon. gentlemen to criticise them. I will not bet on them that they are accurate, I will only say that they are taken from the United States official report, they may not be accurate. In Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota the average value is $71 per acre for farm land; in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta it is $23, or a higher price on the United States side by $48 per acre. Their estimate of farm help is from 10 to 15 per cent higher than it is in Canada.

The hon. the Minister of Agriculture has gone into the agricultural schedule fully, and with much detail, and has made out a most thorough case, which I am sure must have convinced the great majority of this House, and the country generally. This, coupled with the fact that a great majority of the farmers in Canada want it, confirms me in supporting this schedule. The hon. minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) and other hon. members have made out a most complete case on behalf of the natural products schedule, and the people engaged in that line of business want it. Therefore, I propose to support it. I feel conscious at all events, and I trust a majority of this House will agree with me, that I have made out equally as conclusive a case on behalf of the horticultural schedule being excluded, and therefore I trust it will receive the same generous support for exemption, that the other schedules will for adoption.

Mr. BLAIN. How about horses?

Mr. SEALEY. I have not the statistics concerning horses, and knowing something of horses myself I know it is pretty hard to make a fair comparison. We have had that subject discussed on the floor of the House, and I know that bronchos have been included with other horses in the United States report, and they are a poor class of animals. I think that a far greater percentage of our horses in Canada are of a better class. It did not seem practicable to me to make a fair comparison and therefore I have not made any comparison with regard to horses. But other people may think that the comparison is satisfactory to them, and if they do they are quite welcome to give it.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman having spoken about one schedule, and about trying to get an amendment in there, does he recollect that the Minister of Finance has declared distinctly that we will have to support this measure as a whole or not at all, that it is not divisible in any way? Has the hon. gentleman noticed that?

Mr. SEALEY. I have noticed that, and I referred to it a short time ago. I said that that was contended, but that I did not agree with it, and that I think the majority of this House can differ from it if they choose.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman not realize that the majority of the House have either to adopt this as a whole or reject it as a whole?

Mr. SEALEY. Well, that may be the result; you may be a good prophet.

Mr. LENNOX. They must do that.

Mr. SEALEY. I do not agree that they must do that. If they adopt my view they will not do it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) is not entitled to interrupt the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is usual that the gentleman who is allowing permission to interrupt to sit down while the questions are being asked so that two may not be standing at once.

Mr. LENNOX. Does not the hon. member realize that the proposition he makes is absolutely impracticable, and has no common sense in it?

Mr. SEALEY. I think it has good sound sense in it, or I would not propose it. It has to the best of my judgment, and if my judgment differs from that of my hon. friend who has just asked this question I cannot help it. There may be different opinions as to judgment and sense here, every person has a right to his own, and whatever construction may be put on my views, those holding a different opinion are welcome to it.

Before handing my amendment to this resolution to the Chair, I will take the opportunity of saying that the committee may regard it as out of order, on the ground that the resolution deals with tariffs that affect the revenues or expenditure of the country, by increasing or decreasing it, and that therefore, according to the constitution no one but a member of the cabinet can either propose such a resolution or move an amendment. This rule might apply in the ordinary course, but in this particular instance, you will note that my amendment does not come under the rule, because, it neither proposes to raise or lower the tariff, but just proposes to allow it to remain where it is, and therefore this rule of the House does not apply.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. gentleman can propose a decrease.

Mr. SEALEY. I do not propose any. I propose to leave it where it is.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Take off five cents.

Mr. SEALEY. I do not want to take off any. I think I ought to be able and I think the rules of the House will allow me to present my views and an amendment in whatever form seems, in my judgment, to be best. I hope it will prove to be, at all events.

Objection may also be taken to it on the ground that the committee have no authority to deal with an amendment, or its lack of notice of motion, but as to this I would refer the House to Bourinot (Flint), page 539:

'Committees are regarded as portions of the House, limited in their inquiries by the extent of the authority given them; but governed for the most part in their proceedings by the same rules which prevail in the House.'

Mr. PUGSLEY.

In the House the following rules prevail —Bourinot (Flint), page 659:

'When a member intends to move an important amendment in Committee of the Whole to a Bill, he is not required, according to Canadian practice, to give notice of such amendment.'

Bourinot (Flint), page 463:

Every member has a right of moving an amendment without giving notice thereof. This amendment may propose:—
1. To leave out certain words.
2. To leave out certain words, in order to insert or add others.
3. To insert or add certain words.

See for the above also May, page 276, and Cushing, page 517, which are other recognized authorities. Bourinot (Flint), page 522:

'According to English practice no motion or amendment in committee need be seconded . . . Amendments are moved to the proposed resolution.'

Thus the rule in committee is the same as in the House; in the House no seconder is required and no notice is needed. Based upon the authorities the following amendment is moved:

Mr, Sealey, moves in amendment to the resolution 'that it is expedient to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907.' That schedule A. thereto be amended by striking out in lines seven and eight thereof the words 'onions, cabbage, and all other vegetables in their natural state,' and in lines nine and ten thereof the words 'pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state,' and in lines eleven and twelve thereof the words 'peaches, pears and apricots, dried, desiccated or evaporated,' and that the resolution as amended by adopted.

I had included in the resolution, or proposed in the first place, to put hog products back where they formerly were, but with the view of getting the best possible support for the fruit and vegetable industry, I propose to leave hog products to be taken care of a little later.

Mr. BLAIN. Does it require a seconder?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Not in committee. I am not sure I can receive it in the form in which it stands. There is a resolution before the committee which I presume may be amended, but this amendment commences with the words: that it is expedient to amend the customs tariff, 1907.

Mr. SEALEY. That simply follows the opening words of the resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I see that these words are the same as in the resolution, but I would prefer before accepting it to receive the views of some experienced members of the House on it, or

to have an opportunity to consult authorities.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Agriculture will tell us all about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sealey) is at liberty to move an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. BARKER. Not an amendment to the law.

Mr. SEALEY. The resolution reads: 'Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Customs Act, 1907,' and my proposal is to amend that resolution.

Mr. BARKER. An amendment to the law might not be an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a very good proposition, though.

Mr. BLAIN. It is perfectly in order.

Mr. LENNOX. Let us vote on it; it would be a pity to have it thrown out on a technicality.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is an amendment to the resolution I presume it might be accepted.

Mr. FISHER. Would it impose greater taxation than the original motion.

Mr. LENNOX. On the contrary it would increase the revenues of the country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment does not apparently seem to add any burdens to those already existing on the people.

Mr. NESBITT. It certainly would as against the resolution because the resolution withdraws the tariff and the amendment is adding to it.

Mr. BLAIN. Not at all.

Mr. NESBITT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sealey) is seeking to amend the resolution, and he would by his amendment be adding to the tariff.

Mr. BARKER. It looks like a fake altogether.

Mr. LENNOX. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) is wrong in his view. The resolution proposes to do away with certain duties which contribute a revenue to the country, and the amendment proposes that there shall be a less sweeping change in the Customs Act, and therefore leaves a greater revenue to the country.

Mr. NESBITT. The resolution does away with the tariff, and in endeavouring to amend the resolution he is certainly adding to the charges and interfering with the revenue. It is out of order.

Mr. BLAIN. The explanation given by my hon. friend (Mr. Sealey) and the authorities he has quoted prove that the resolution is in order. I wish to say I am heartily in accord with the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Sealey), and I shall now or at any other opportunity give it my hearty support. It is along the line of justice and fair play to a very large proportion of the people of this country who will be injuriously affected if the motion of the Minister of Finance is carried in this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule with regard to the rights of a private member in seeking to either lower or increase the duties is that he may not move to increase the existing duties or lay an additional burden upon the people. He may move to reduce, and in this case I do not see that the amendment proposes to add any burden to those already existing on the people. But, as I understand the rule, I think it is merely that a private member may not seek to increase burdens already existing on the countrv. In that sense I think the amendemnt would be in order.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 7; nays, 22.

Mr. SEALEY. I just wish to take the opportunity of saying that I am sorry that this minority-represented industry of such great importance has not received a larger measure of consideration from this House. However, the hon. Minister of Agriculture has given it some consideration, and his best counsel and advice seems to have been that the best articles of fruit and vegetables command the best prices in the market, irrespective of where they come from or what competition they may have. That being the case, he sets up a standard for the people engaged in this business to produce the best, and, in order that they may produce the best, they require to be assisted and encouraged a little.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. The remarks of the hon. gentleman so far have no relevancy to the question before the Chair. What the Minister of Agriculture thinks or might do to encourage a certain industry is not relevant.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The resolution as a whole is before the Chair, and the remarks of the hon. member must, of course, be relevant to it.

Mr. SEALEY. The resolution makes a proposition that it is hoped will be beneficial to Canada generally and to the agricultural interest in particular. I trust that it is intended for the horticultural interest

as well. If I do not quite agree with the method proposed for benefiting that interest, I think it is fair to suggest that the minister might benefit it by assisting it to reach that standard of excellence which he sets up for it, by establishing an experimental fruit and vegetable farm.

Mr. LENNOX. I submit that this is not treating this committee fairly, and I rise again to the question of order. We are not discussing question of experimental farms, and I think the hon. gentleman is taking an advantage of this committee. I do not think it fair at this hour of the night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. member were speaking of experimental farms alone, he would not be in order. If he applied the argument to this resolution without too much delay, it would be in order.

Mr. SEALEY. The resolution is designed to improve the industry to which I am referring. I do not see that such improvement as we had hoped for will be effected by the resolution. I am suggesting as an alternative the establishment of an experimental fruit and vegetable farm in our district.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to the point of order again. There is no proposal before the Chair to benefit any industry whatever. The resolution does not bear that construction or purport to have that effect. The hon. member is quite astute enough to realize that he is endeavouring to address himself to a subject that is not before the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have ruled on the point. The resolution itself is very broad, and the discussion has been equally so; but the hon. gentleman will realize that it is necessary to apply his argument. Arguments arising from the establishment of experimental farms may in some way apply to the question, but they should be applied promptly to be considered relevant, and I would ask the hon. gentleman, if he continues his remarks, to make them bear promptly on the resolution.

Mr. SEALEY. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the suggestion, and I will remould my remarks and submit them at a later time.

On motion of Mr. Roche, committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fisher, House adjourned at 2.25 a.m. Saturday.

Mr. SEALEY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MONDAY, April 24, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VERDICT OF A MONTREAL JURY.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to make a statement in justice to the defending counsel in a case recently tried in Montreal. On the 12th instant I asked this question:

Has the attention of the government been drawn, or has any member thereof observed, the report of the action of the jury in the case recently tried in Montreal, where a man charged with assaulting another and stealing from him certain Masonic property, was by the jury declared not guilty, in response to an alleged fanatical appeal to creed passions on the part of the prisoner's solicitor. Although the prisoner admitted his guilt and the judge strongly charged against him.

I wish to state that the distinguished counsel defending the prisoner on that occasion has done me the honour to come and see me in that regard, and to say that he did not resort to fanatical appeals himself, but he merely illustrated the condition of of the prisoner's mind which was worked up into a fanatical state by fear that his church and his clergy were going to be injured. The distinguished counsel wished to show that the prisoner had no malicious intent towards the party that was robbed. I desire, in all fairness to the gentleman who defended the prisoner on that occasion, to say that he did not appeal to fanaticism.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). I have a clipping taken from 'Arms and Explosives,' dated April, 1911. This is a magazine dealing with rifles and military information generally. The item is headed 'Obituary of Lee-Enfield,' and the statement is:

In introducing the army estimates, Mr. Haldane stated the question of a new rifle is under careful consideration, and that as soon as a pattern had been determined upon it would be subjected to test and experiment. Captain Courthope asked whether reference was made to a magazine or an automatic rifle, and Mr. Haldane replied: 'A magazine rifle, of course. The automatic rifle is years away yet, and if we waited for it, I fear we should have to wait a very long time.'

I desire to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence, in view of the great success

which has attended the Long Ross rifle, whether it is his intention to draw the attention of the British government to the fact that the Canadian Ross rifle is now regarded as unequalled in any country in the world.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think I would scarcely venture to go so far as that. But if my opinion were asked by the Minister of War in England, I should be glad to express my entire satisfaction with the work done by the Ross rifle.

JUDICIAL VACANCY IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. FRASER. I desire to ask the Prime Minister if he has made an appointment to the vacant judgeship in Prince Edward Island, and also to the vacant senatorship? I just returned from there last night, and I should be glad to report as soon as possible that these vacancies have been filled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The appointment has not yet been made. It is being considered, and my hon. friend will have the answer at a very early day.

FLYING THE FLAG ON NATIONAL HOLIDAYS.

Mr. HUGHES. Now that the Minister of Public Works is in his place, I desire to ask why the British flag, the old Union Jack, was not flying from the tower of the parliament buildings yesterday until twenty minutes past twelve o'clock, yesterday being the anniversary of St. George, the patron saint of England. The least the minister could have done was to have seen that the flag was flying earlier in the day. On St. David's day it was not raised until nearly noon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to inform my hon. friend at the moment the cause of the delay. I did not look after it myself yesterday, because I was out of town. I will make inquiry with reference to it.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to inquire the reason for the delay in bringing down a return which I moved for two or three months ago. The return asked for a statement of all employees of the government who are serving as members of municipal councils or city councils. I moved for the return in consequence of the Department of Customs requiring the resignation as municipal councillor of Halifax of an officer of the customs drawing a salary of $60 a year, and whose duties would take but a very small portion of his time. I would like to have that return brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). The return is in course of preparation. I will have an inquiry made to see when it will be ready.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that on Thursday last he said he would inform me on Friday when the returns would be brought down in reference to aliens who are serving in the service of Canada and residing outside our jurisdiction. I think the minister forgot that on Friday.

Mr. MURPHY. In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox), I may say that the matter did not escape my attention. I made inquiry and ascertained that the order passed at the instance of the hon. gentleman called for a return showing, not only the aliens in the employ of this government, but aliens in the employ of the provincial governments. I may tell him that it is not an easy matter to obtain that information; however, the department has been working upon it. My information is that, with the exception of two provincial governments, returns have been received from the others, and it is expected that the return so far as this government is concerned, will be completed within two weeks.

Mr. LENNOX. It appears to me to be the proper procedure for the government, when motions are put upon the Order Paper, and at the latest when they are dealt with in the House, if any motion is too broad, that is the time for the government to object to it. I am not aware that the motion is as broad as my hon friend says. It could have been limited if he had called attention to it at the time.

Mr. MURPHY. If my hon. friend is prepared to accept the return without the information from the provincial governments, it can be brought down much earlier.

Mr. LENNOX. I am only prepared to abide at present by the order of the House. The proper time for taking objection to a motion is when it is proposed in the House.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to make a remark in reference to the question of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) in reference to a return he asked for. He seemed to blame the government for delay in preparing a return which the House had ordered which would take a long time to prepare. The House orders a return in deference to the request of a member, whether it takes a long time or not.

The question as to how long it will take to lay the return on the table is then considered, and it deals with another matter altogether. Hon. members are quite within

their rights in asking for any return they choose, but when a return takes a long time I do not think they have any right to grumble at the time it takes. It is a mere matter of courtesy to say that if an hon. gentleman will take less information than is asked for in the return he will get it earlier. But that does not necessarily imply that exception should be taken to the motion being passed by the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a question of privilege because my attitude is attacked and I wish to reply to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The hon. gentleman is not correct in his manner of dealing with this matter. When a motion is passed and made an order of the House, it is expected to be complied with.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. LENNOX. If it is too broad or embraces to much, the time for the government to point that out is when the motion is under discussion. It is not the time after three, four or five months have elapsed and nothing has been done in the meantime. Only when the matter begins to be agitated the government come down with a complaint that it is too broad. I have had that difficulty two or three times. The proper time is when the motion is made. It is on the Order Paper for several days, the government are in a position to ascertain whether it is too broad and whether it will involve a large amount of labour. Therefore, with regard to these two motions that I have been speaking of, there is no reasonable complaint because the government have done absolutely nothing for months. Then, after months have elapsed they come down and make the complaint that they are so broad that they involve an enormous amount of work. The truth is that there has been nothing done on either of these motions and no attempt made to get this information.

Mr. FISHER. I think that my hon. friend did not perhaps understand my meaning. If, in an order for a return, there is something included which the government cannot get then that ought to be explained to the House. But if it is simply a question of the time which may be taken in getting the information I do not think that the government ought to urge it, and I do not think the House ought to receive the statement that it would take too long a time. It is to be presumed that an hon. member who moves for a return knows what he wants and knows whether he wants the whole of it. If he does not want the whole of it he should not ask for the return. It is the duty of the government, if they accept a motion, to try and get the whole of the information asked for in the return. It may take a long time to get the whole of it while to get a portion of it may take a short time, and that is what I wished to point out. But, at the time a motion is made and an hon. gentleman asks for certain information I do not think it is the duty of the government to say that this will take a very long time or that it will take a long time. It is the duty of the government to carry out the order of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. It will take about four months to get this—that is all.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask when I may expect the return I asked for two months ago with regard to the change of route of the Newmarket canal?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is absent to-day, but I shall call the matter to his attention.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to inquire of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he is facilitating the inquiry with the view of getting the reports of the curators of banks that were ordered by the House some time ago?

Mr. FIELDING. I was under the impression that I had brought down the return dealing with the matter, but if not I will look into it further.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) bring down the abbreviated return with regard to the census which was arranged between himself and myself?

Mr. FISHER. The clerk informs me that it has been brought down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In connection with the matter I referred to a moment ago, I might tell the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) that it is to be found in the Votes and Proceedings at page 274, and the order was passed on the 23rd January last. It asks for the names of persons in the various departments who had served upon municipal, city or town councils within a period of ten years. That may have occasioned delay. There has been a great deal of delay with regard to it, but if that is causing the delay I would like to have an immediate return of those employed in any departments of the government who are now serving on city or other municipal councils. It seems to me, that could be procured inside of forty-eight hours, and the other information could be brought down afterwards.

Mr. MURPHY. I will try to get the information for the hon. gentleman as speedily as possible.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to ask again if the government propose to deal with the Bank Act this session. I referred to it some months ago, and at that time the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said it would be proceeded with. At a subsequent date the minister was somewhat afraid that it might not be proceeded with, but he would not say at the time whether it would be or not. I have not made any inquiry as to the matter since. I desire to ask the minister if he can inform the House now whether or not it will be proceeded with.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I can hardly add anything more definite than my former statement. It will depend upon the progress which is made with the general business of the House. As we approach that period when the desire for prorogation may seem general the government will have to determine, as between the various matters on the Order Paper, what will be proceeded with, and what can conveniently stand over. When that moment arrives we will have to decide. At the present moment I could not give my hon. friend a more definite statement.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister inform the House when a decision is come to without it being necessary to refer to the matter again?

Mr. FIELDING. I shall not object to my hon. friend reminding me, but I shall try to keep it in mind.

COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) proposes to introduce a Copyright Bill this session. I know something of the reason why the minister has been delaying the matter I think. There is a similar Bill before the British House of Commons, and I notice that it has just passed its second reading. I desire to ask the minister whether it is the purpose of the government to introduce a Copyright Act at an early day. I understand that the minister is anxious to have a Copyright Act passed this session if possible.

Mr. FISHER. The resolutions on which the Bill is to be founded are on the Order Paper. I have been waiting until the Bill was printed, because it is usual when the resolutions are passed to introduce the Bill at once. I had expected to have it printed for to-day. It may be ready to-night, and in that case I would like to introduce the Bill to-morrow if I may.

NEW BARRACKS AT TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) when the work of erecting the new barracks at Toronto is going to be proceeded with. Four or five years ago the Department of Militia purchased a new site for a barracks at Toronto on the banks of the Humber river. That land was carried for three or four years, and was sold by the government at a very large profit. Something like $100,000, I think, was made out of it. The government then purchased a new site further out from the town, and this has been held for three or four years without any appearance of the erection of the barracks. It is rumoured that the government, this land having largely appreciated in value, intends to make another real estate profit out of the property, and not proceed to erect the barracks on that site. Would the minister please inform the House whether or not it is the intention of the government to deal in real estate in this respect, and not erect a barracks on this property which has been purchased for the purpose, although there is every reason for expecting that work to be proceeded with, because as the minister knows the erection of a new barracks is urgently needed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) is so prone to listen to idle rumours. There is not one single word of truth in that rumour. I never heard of such a rumour and I do not think anybody else did except my hon. friend. The fact is that the land had not been purchased for three years. We have purchased land near the rifle range within a few months, and we are obliged to go to the Exchequer Court to purchase some more land which we need. It is the intention of the government to proceed at once with the erection of the building.

EXPORT OF CATTLE TO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BLAIN. The last report of the Minister of Customs shows the export of cattle to the United States for the last fiscal year as follows: Cattle one year old or less (produce of Canada) value $23,679; cattle over one year, value $618,995. Can the Minister of Customs say what portion of this export of cattle reached the British market via the United States, and were not consumed in the United States? The return sent me by the Minister of Finance leads to the conclusion that the Department of Customs has no record as to the large number of cattle purchased by American dealers and sent via United States ports to Great Britain. Can the Minister of Customs shed any light on that?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Customs was absent when my hon. friend put the question some days ago. I at once sent the question to the Customs Department and

the officials furnished me with the memorandum I handed to my hon. friend. All that the return says is that these exports were shown, according to the invoices as exports from Canada to the United States. If the destination were expressed on the invoice as being other than the United States, such cattle would not be included in those figures. Where the invoice simply mentions the animals as being exported to the United States, and there is no other destination mentioned, the department could not have any knowledge as to what became of the animals after they got into the United States. It is quite possible that many of these animals have been exported to Great Britain, but the department would not have a record of that.

Mr. BLAIN. The return goes further than the statement of the Finance Minister, because it says that these cattle were marked as exported to the United States without any other destination being shown on the entry. This is a very important matter in the discussion of the trade relations between the United States and Canada, because to my own knowledge a considerable number of the very best cattle in my own county are purchased by United States dealers and sent to the United States in bond for British destination. In this departmental report these animals are credited as being exported to the United States, and at the very time I put the question to the House the Minister of Customs was out telling the farmers what a great advantage they would have in the United States market for Canadian cattle. The government should be in a position to tell what number of Canadian cattle which go to the United States are ultimately sent to the British market.

Mr. FIELDING. How could the Customs Department make any other return if the exporters simply set forth in the papers that the cattle are being exported from Canada to the United States?

Mr. BLAIN. That is very misleading.

Mr. FIELDING. It may be or it may not be. My hon. friend may have knowledge that many of these cattle were re-exported, but if the shipper simply declares he is exporting these animals to the United States the Customs Department must return them as exported to the United States.

Mr. BLAIN. This is all along the line of lack of information.

Mr. FIELDING. Not at all.

Mr. BLAIN. We have here returns showing a large number of cattle exported from Canada to the United States when the fact is that a great many of these were sent to Great Britain.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. PATERSON. You do not know that.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not know it in every case, but I do know that from my own county a number of cattle set down as exported to the United States, ultimately found their destination in Great Britain. This is a very important matter in the present discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order at this juncture.

Mr. BLAIN. I will take the matter up later.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What further action if any has been taken by the government during the past month towards investigating the affairs of the Farmers' Bank? This is a very important matter for many people in western Ontario.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No action has been taken by this government, but as everybody knows this matter is now in the courts of Ontario.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then it is not the intention of this government to take any action until the courts of Ontario decide?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend asked what action had been taken, and I told him no action had been taken.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MONTREAL PARK AND ISLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 45) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Ecrement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Stand.

Mr. MONK. I have an amendment to propose to this Bill. The Bill has been postponed several times, and I have a letter from the hon. member (Mr. Ecrement) promoting it, asking me to be present to-day when the Bill would be proceeded with. I do not wish to take advantage of the absence of my hon. friend. but private Bills will be called to-morrow, and I shall expect him to proceed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a private Bill; it is not in our hands.

CANADIAN BAPTIST FOREIGN MISSION BOARD.

House in committee on Bill (No. 161) to incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.—Mr. Fowke.

On section 7: limit of time of holding property.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When the committee was last considering this Bill I was point-

ing out certain anomalies in this section which I was unable to understand. The first part of the section says:

The board may receive, take and hold real estate by purchase, gift or devise, and determine by by-law the manner in which such property shall be held and conveyed, subject always to the laws of the province in which such real estate is situated.

Then, the third subsection says:

The board shall, within ten years after its acquisition of any real estate, sell or otherwise dispose of and alienate so much of such real estate as is not required for the use and occupation of the board.

The first paragraph practically says that the real estate shall be held subject to the laws of the province, while the last one says it may be held for ten years. As I understand it, the tenure of real estate is a matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the province, and, therefore, if the province said that such real estate might be held for seven years only, while this Act says it may be held for ten years, there would be a conflict. I think the Act of the provincial legislature would override any provision which this parliament might make limiting the tenure of land. I would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice on that point.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Might I ask my hon. friend if there is any law of any of the provinces making a limitation of seven years or of any number of years?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would not like to answer that off-hand; but in the Ontario Mortmain Act there is a provision limiting the holding of real estate to two years. I think this clause should be struck out and a clause inserted to this effect:

Any such conveyance shall be subject to the laws relating to the conveyance of real estate to religious corporations which were in force at the time such conveyance was made, in the province in Canada in which such real estate is situated.

I am quite aware that the Minister of Public Works has pointed out one or two other Acts in which provisions have been made similar to this, but I do not think that should be a precedent for this parliament cutting into the jurisdiction of the provinces as to property and civil rights.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When this Bill was last before the committee, some reference was made to the law of Ontario, and I think the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) was only able to give as proof that there was such a law that in one particular case, in the letters patent incorporating some real estate company, it was provided that there should be a limitation of the holding. Of course, that would not apply at all, as my hon. friend knows, to this case. My hon. friend has called the attention of the committee to chapter 112 of the Statutes of Ontario, the Mortmain Act; but that applies simply to lands devised by will for any religious or charitable use; the land must be sold, except as otherwise provided in the statute, within two years of the death of the testator. That would not apply to a case like this, where a company or an association like the Baptist Foreign Mission Board is incorporated for the purpose of carrying on foreign missions. My hon. friend says, it is true that this parliament has incorporated a number of companies with similar powers and similar limitations, but our attention having been now called to the contention which he has made that this parliament cannot limit the right of the association to hold real estate, therefore, we ought to depart from what has been done in the past and leave the matter entirely to the provincial legislatures. The provinces he argues have exclusive jurisdiction over the tenure of real estate. Now, this I entirely deny. It is true, that property and civil rights are assigned by the British North America Act to the different provinces; but that is always subject to the other provision of the British North America Act, that the incorporation of companies with Dominion objects rests in the exclusive authority of this parliament. Take the case of a railway company. This parliament is the only legislative body which can incorporate a railway company with power to build a railway extending beyond the limits of any one province, and the courts have held on more than one occasion that in that incorporation, parliament can also legislate with reference to the tenure of real estate by the railway company. It can declare what land can be taken for the purposes of the railway, such as right of way, station grounds, &c. What the courts have said is that this parliament, once it is given the legislative authority over a company, must be the sole judge of what powers shall be conferred upon the company. So in this case. My hon. friend surely would not dispute that, having the power to incorporate this company, parliament can say what property it shall have the right to hold, whether real estate or personal property or both; and if parliament has that right, parliament and parliament alone has the right to say what shall be the limitations upon its holding of real estate. With all deference to the opinion of my hon. friend, for whose views I have very great respect, I have myself not the shadow of doubt as to the power of parliament to pass clause 7 of this Bill. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice did not hear the discussion the other evening. Of course, I would be guided by his judgment in the

matter; but according to my interpretation of the British North America Act and my study of the cases which have been decided under that Act, I have not the slightest doubt that parliament is competent to pass this section.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If that is the case, there is certainly a manifest contradiction in the section, because one portion says that the real estate shall be held by this corporation subject to the laws of the provinces, while the latter part of the section says that it can be held for ten years. I take issue with my hon. friend. If his contention is right, then the parliament of Canada has absolute jurisdiction as to the tenure of land, and not the provinces. I put it the other way. There was left to the provinces sole jurisdiction with reference to the tenure of land and there was only given to the Dominion what was left, that is the incorporation of companies. It is one thing to incorporate a society such as this, to make it a corporate entity, and an entirely different thing to say it shall hold land on a tenure different from that which the province sets up.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). What would the result be if we did not put in a limitation of term? They might hold the property for ever.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The amendment I suggest is in the line of all previous incorporations of such societies prior to the last two or three years.

The object of the incorporation is just to make them a legal entity; and if property be devised to them, they take it subject to the same tenure as is stipulated by the province in which the property is situated. In all these other cases, it is provided that the tenure shall be according to the law of the province, and they could not hold it on any other tenure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose the provinces have no law upon the subject, clearly this parliament would properly exercise its power of limiting the time within which the association must dispose of its property. It might possibly be that putting in the words 'subject to the law of the province,' might subordinate this clause to provincial law, if the time ever should arrive when the province would deal with the subject; but until the province does, it is eminently proper that this section should be enacted. Otherwise in all the provinces there would be probably no limitation whatever on the time during which this association could hold on to its real estate.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The only reason I suggest this amendment is that if a province should pass an Act of this kind, it will come in conflict with this section. There is no province which has no mortmain statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Mortmain Act does not apply to this.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would move that section 3 be struck out, and that would leave the tenure of real estate to be such as is provided by the various provinces.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has not given notice of the proposed amendment.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Surely we can amend an inconsistent provision in a Bill without notice. I understand it is only important amendments which require notice.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the society wanted the privilege of holding real estate for ever, they would ask that my hon. friend's amendment should succeed. Unquestionably in every province, so far as I know, and so far as the province of Ontario is concerned—from the reading of the statute to which my hon. friend called my attention—this association could hold this real estate in perpetuity unless the provincial legislature should at some future time place a limitation on its holding. So far as I am aware, there is no statute in any province which would prevent this association holding its real estate without limit. Therefore, it is right to follow what has been done for several years in this parliament and put some limitation on the tenure.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the hon. gentleman's contention be correct, the Missionary Society of the Methodist Chuch and the Missionary Society of the Church of England have been given power to hold real estate for ever. You can take one line of argument or the other. In each of these cases there is no expressed limitation on the tenure of property except such as is contained in the provincial Acts.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). What law is there in the province of Ontario which required that a corporation acquiring property by deed shall only hold it a certain number of years?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I have no doubt there is such a law but have not looked into the matter. I understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker to rule that I have not the right to move this now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the right to vote against the whole section.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the Bill stand over so as to allow my hon. friend to give notice?

Mr. PORTER. What is the object of those words in the main clause 'subject always to the laws of the province in which such real estate is situated,' if you subsequently declare that the society shall hold the property for 10 years? Suppose this parliament declares that they shall hold it 10 years and then the provincial legislature declares that they can only hold it 5 years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know what was the object of inserting those words in the Bill, but possibly the draftsman may have had this in his mind, that in holding this property, it must be held subject to the laws of the province—that is as to any law relating to taxation; or possibly he may have had in his mind the mode in which the conveyance of such property ought to be executed, and that the laws of the province shall apply to the conveyances to be made by this association. Or he might have had this in his mind. At present there is no law in any province which would limit the time this association may hold real estate, but in the future there might be some limitation, and yet, in the absence of any such legislation, the tenure should be limited to 10 years. But that if, in the future, the provincial legislature should legislate in reference to this subject, then the legislation of the province should prevail. It may be that that was the intention of the draftsman. But my point is that this parliament has a perfect right to legislate upon the subject, having authority to incorporate the company, it must also have authority to give it the power to hold real estate. Parliament must be the judge of the extent to which it will give the association that power and also there must necessarily go with it the authority of parliament to limit, if it chooses, the time within which the association must sell the property. Parliament may also, if it pleases, say that whatever legislation we may pass with regard to the tenure of real property shall always be subject to the legislation of the province. At the same time it does not appear that any province has so legislated as to put any limit whatever upon a corporation like this holding real estate. Therefore, having the authority to legislate, it seems to me eminently proper that parliament should place a limit upon the period during which the association may hold real estate.

Mr. PORTER. Granting what the minister says, for the sake of argument, that parliament has power to limit the holding of real estate in the way indicated in this Bill, what is the sense in saying that the land shall be held subject to the law of the province, and at the same time saying it shall be held for ten years? If the legislature should say to-morrow this land should be held for five years, then this parliament has said it shall be held for ten years, and at the same time it shall be held according to the law of the province. That is quite inconsistent.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It does not say shall hold it for ten years, it says, shall dispose of it within ten years. That would not conflict with the five years.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would suggest that we insert the phrase:

Except where otherwise provided by the laws of the province in which such real estate is situated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the committee decided to take up the clause subsection by subsection the hon. member would be at liberty to vote against subsection 3, alone, but at the moment the whole section is before the committee, and this amendment could not be accepted without notice.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Perhaps the promoter will accept my suggestion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know what my hon. friend in charge of the Bill (Mr. Fowke) will say, but it does not seem to me it is worth while to send this Bill back to the Senate amended as suggested. I do not think it carries it any further because by providing that the tenure be subject to the laws of the province, that is that if a province were to legislate in reference to this association limiting its tenure of real estate to five years, I think the provincial statute would override this provision in clause 7.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. To show the inconsistency of the minister, it is not 10 minutes since he said, upon his authority as a lawyer, that we had absolute jurisdiction, and right to pass this Bill, and that in that view we would have the right to state the tenure of real estate. Now he says that if any province passed an Act limiting the tenure to any time they choose, that provincial law would govern. We must be consistent in this, and the section as it stands is inconsistent. One part says it shall be subject to the laws of the province, and the other that it shall be 10 years, no matter what the province may say. That is simply inviting litigation. The suggestion of the Minister of Public Works that the laws of the province ought to govern is correct, and that is why we have been putting into statutes similar to this for 40 years a proviso that the tenure shall be subject to the laws of the province. That is only fair as the provincial legislatures have jurisdiction over property and civil rights, and that would cover tenure. If this amendment is not accepted, then I

might give notice of it. If we insert ten years, then perhaps to-morrow another association will want 15 years, and another 20 years, and we will be completely overriding the wishes of the people in the various provinces with respect to the time that real estate may be held.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend, I do not think deliberately, I think unintentionally, misrepresented the statement I made. I said that in my judgment this parliament has absolute authority to deal with the holding of property by this company. It has been granted authority to hold property and we can place a limitation on the number of years during which it may hold a particular piece of real estate or personal property, but that is not at all inconsistent with the authority of this parliament to say that its tenure shall be subject to the laws of the province in which the property may be situated. That is what this section says. If the legislature should deal with the subject then probably the provincial legislation would prevail over the legislation of this parliament. The federal or a provincial legislature may have a perfect right to legislate upon a subject until it comes into conflict with legislation of the other. Therefore I do not wish to be understood as taking back one word as to the authority of this parliament to deal with the subject. I do not think that this parliament has the exclusive authority to deal with real estate. All I say is that it has authority, when it incorporates a company within its power, to say whether or not that company shall hold real estate, and to place any limitations it chooses on its holding of real estate. I do not think my hon. friend's amendment would carry the matter any further than it is carried by the section, and as we have apparently no legislation by any province which would apply to this company I see no objection to letting the matter go as it is, placing the limitation at 10 years. Then if any legislature chooses in future to legislate in regard to it, very likely these words: Subject to the legislation; would make the legislation of a province superior to that of this parliament upon that particular point.

Mr. LANCASTER. The trouble is what the minister argues is not the section in this Bill; the Bill as it stands is conflicting. The minister apparently thinks that the probability is that the court will decide that legislation passed hereafter by a province, be applicable to this company under the early part of section 7.

Subject always to the laws of the province in which such real estate is situated, and in regard to any real property which, by reason of its situation or otherwise, is subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Now, there is a distinction between lands which are vested in the provinces, under the general laws applicable to the provinces, and property which, by reason of its situation, is subject to the legislative authority of the Dominion of Canada. There are two classes of lands dealt with there. Then we have that state of affairs before us when we are asked to pass subsection 3 with a ten-year limit. Unless language is put in there to show that we intend that subsection 3 shall apply only when a legislature passes a law which the early part of section 7 will apply to, we have got absolute chaos here. I could make as strong an argument one way as the other, whether the early part of the section means what the Minister of Public Works thinks, or whether it means subject to the laws of the province with regard to everything else except the ten-year limit. As to the time in which you shall dispose of it, that is specifically dealt with in section 7, and to make the statute consistent, you must hold that section 7 does not apply a time limit. It is just one of these things that will create litigation. Are we to pass statutes here that can be read both ways, or should we make them clear and distinct? The fact that we have to send it back to the Senate will not hurt them. They are not overworked, they are only divorcing a lot of people that they ought to leave alone, in my humble opinion. I do not sympathize with the argument of the Minister of Public Works that the Senate will get cross with us if we send this Bill back to them. They should be more careful in the legislation they send to this House. Let them divorce section 3 from this Bill, and they would be doing the proper sort of thing.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I move that subsection 3 be amended by inserting after the word 'shall' the following words:

Except where otherwise provided by the law of the province where such real estate is situated.

Mr. FOWKE. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) has not given notice of his intention to amend this clause, and therefore his motion is out of order. I would like also to say that the hon. member who has been obstructing the passage of this Bill in two sessions of the committee of this House, is himself a member of the Private Bills Committee, and raised no objection to this clause when the Bill was before that committee. I should like also to point out that at the last session of this parliament, three Bills of a similar character passed the Private Bills Committee, and also this House; the hon. gentleman was a member of the Private Bills Committee then, and I do not know that he raised any such objection as he is raising now to this ten-year clause. The clause to

my mind is a reasonable one. It was granted to two different religious orders of the Roman Catholic Church at the last session of parliament, and a similar Bill was granted to the Congregational Union. No inconsistency was apparent then to the mind of the hon. gentleman who is opposing this Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. What does the hon. gentleman say himself as to whether provincial or Dominion legislation would apply to the Bill as now drawn? Does the hon. gentleman wish the limit fixed by the provincial legislature, or does he wish the ten-year limit we are fixing?

Mr. FOWKE. The hon. gentleman has asked me a question which I am not prepared to answer. But I would like to say that if there were fewer country lawyers in the House we would have less difficulty in arriving at sensible conclusions in relation to Bills of this kind. The clause does not require that the property vested in this organization be held for a period of ten years, but that some limitation should be placed upon it. As a member of this House, I prefer to assume that this House has jurisdiction to deal with a question of this kind.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I take exception to the statement of the member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke) in characterizing my action as obstruction when I endeavoured to point out to the House the inconsistency of the present Bill. When an hon member rises in this House and, in a disinterested manner, gives his views on proposed legislation, it is very small politics to characterize his action as obstruction. It is also small politics for the same gentleman to characterize the action of certain other gentlemen of this House as that of country lawyers. I can tell my hon. friend that when hereafter he wants to pass other legislation through this House,he may have more difficulty than he is having now. I have pointed out before that the hon. gentleman is unable to say whether or not the ten-years' stipulation put in this Bill will apply, or whether the law of the province will apply. The Minister of Public Works says that he thinks the law of the province will apply, if they have a law in the province, or when they pass a law. If such is the case, what is the objection to making it perfectly clear? All we want is to pass legislation that will not be open to litigation; and if my hon. friend is looking after the interests of the Baptist Church, he will not favour any legislation that will give country lawyers an opportunity of making money out of his church in litigation. It will do no harm to introduce a clause saying that the ten-year limitation shall only apply when there is no provision in a province to the contrary. Under these circumstances, what right has the hon. gentleman to characterize the action of members on this side of the House, taken in good faith, as obstruction?

Nothing whatever, and I am surprised that he would say such a thing on the floor of this House. I can only say that I will move an amendment with the consent of the House, and if not I will wait till we come to the clause, to have that struck out altogether as being absolutely inconsistent with the other portion of the section. If wrong legislation was passed last year or the year before it is no argument for wrong legislation passing this House now. We passed legislation 25 or 30 years ago allowing the holding of real estate by these corporations subject to the laws of the province, and because we have departed from that Act is that any reason why we should continue that wrong now? If this House is supreme with regard to the tenure of land held by these societies then what we have done before has had the effect of giving societies the absolute right to hold real estate for ever.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke), to consult some of the country lawyers on his own side and find out just how this Bill should be drawn. First of all I would pay them this compliment, which my hon. friend does not see fit to pay to his colleagues on his own side of the House, of saying that all the lawyers in the province of Ontario, whether they live in a metropolis or a country village, have the same qualifications. I wish I could say the same for the storekeepers and merchants. I wish I could say that country merchants knew as much about business as the large merchants and manufacturers to be found in the great centres. I am afraid that I cannot say that, and I would say to my hon. friend that if he would acquire that same high standard of knowledge that all lawyers have to acquire in the province of Ontario, and which explains why so many of them are sent here to represent the people at Ottawa, and if he would set up that same standard for himself in his country store business, he would find a better reason why there are so few country merchants coming to this House. We find a great many lawyers in this House because the people in the constituencies think they are able, understanding the laws of this country, to make legislation which will be sensible and proper and who will not disagree with their leaders as to the construction of the legislation which they are asking the House to pass. The next time he is in caucus, if he is allowed into the caucus of his own party, because it may be that he is a bolter on reciprocity, let the hon. gentleman consult some of the lawyers of his own side

and see if it is not possible for him to draw a Bill which will not contain provisions which contradict each other. I think this committee ought to rise as far as this Bill is concerned. This legislation is going to do a public wrong if it is passed in the way in which the Bill is now drawn, and I think the committee had better rise for the purpose of allowing my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro') an opportunity of complying with the rules of the House and putting on the Order Paper his notice of motion to amend this Bill, so that he will not be met with an objection which is technically correct that without notice the amendment cannot be passed. It is manifest that this is not proper legislation and even the Minister of Public Works would not endorse the construction of the promoter, that provincial legislation would apply. Whether it be by country merchants or country lawyers, the Bill should be put in some more sensible shape. I think the committee ought to rise until we can get the necessary notice given which will result in having this legislation put into proper shape and prevent a lot of litigation which otherwise would take place if the Bill is adopted as it now stands.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It seems to me that there is a misconception with regard to the nature of this legislation. As I read it I think the section is perfectly right and is more in harmony with the law than the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro). A doubt was raised at one time whether or not the Dominion parliament had authority to give what is equivalent to a license to hold property under mortmain. It was urged with respect to a railway company in Ontario that it was only the Crown, as represented by the province, that could authorize a corporation to hold property. That came up in connection with one of the railways, but I forget which one. Chief Justice Armour, who tried the case, decided that the Dominion parliament, representing the Crown, had the right to license any corporation incorporated by the Dominion to hold property. Then the question comes up: what are the terms of the license that this parliament is to give? I submit that we can give a license to hold property forever if we wish, or we can give a limited license to hold it for a certain number of years. It has been usual to limit the duration of that license, and if this parliament is legislating, and giving a license to a corporation to hold property, this must be the parliament and the power which should say what the extent of that license should be. That is exactly what is determined by this clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. That license that you are referring to has only reference to such real property, by reason of its situation or otherwise, as is subject to the legislative authority of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Quite so. We can only give a license for what is subject to the Dominion of Canada, but whatever license we do give, we, in the first paragraph, give a license to hold real estate. Without that license this corporation could not hold real estate. There is no law in the province of Ontario which could authorize this Baptist Missionary Society to hold real estate unless a license were given by this parliament. If we give that license surely it is a proper thing to limit the time within which the property shall be held, that it is a proper thing for this parliament to say that it shall be limited to ten years or such other period as may be named. It is quite true in some respects, under the Companies Act of Ontario, under which a charter is obtained, that when a particular limitation is fixed the charter ceases. It is a mere arbitrary term, there is no general law which says that it shall be one year or that it shall be ten years. In this case they have chosen to make it ten years. With regard to the paragraph making it subject to the laws of Ontario, I submit that whether or not we say this shall be subject to the laws of Ontario, if Ontario has the right to legislate, then it shall be subject to those laws whether we say so in these words or not. But, there is another reason why these words are put in and it is by reason of these words 'the board may receive, take and hold real estate,' and 'determine by by-law the manner in which such property shall be held and conveyed, subject always to the laws of the province.' If you did not make an exception that it should be subject to the laws of Ontario it might be said that it was intended to give the board power to deal with the property in any way they saw fit. They might convey the property by by-law or they might convey it by word of mouth or by writing not under seal. The power is given to convey property but it must be done subject to the laws of Ontario.

Mr. LANCASTER. And it may be held.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Held and conveyed. It gives them power to do that and when that is done it seems to me that it is only proper, to make it consistent, to say that it must be in accordance with the laws of Ontario. I do not have very much fear of litigation over this matter. I do not see any great difficulty in the working it out and it seems to me that there is not sufficient objection to warrant the House in hesitating to pass it as it is.

Mr. PORTER. Does not my hon. friend see the inconsistency in the language? He says we can give a license to hold forever if we see fit. Granting that we can why say in this Bill that the land shall be held subject to the laws of the province and that it shall be ten years? Does not my hon. friend see the inconsistency of that? Why say that they can hold land for ten years and at the same time say that they shall hold it subject to the laws of the province? You are in effect nullifying the provincial legislation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is there any objection to amending the clause so as to make it read:

The board shall, except where otherwise provided by law of the province where such real estate is located, within ten years after the acquisition, &c.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). My objection to that is that it is not in harmony with the theory of the mortmain law. We are giving this license to hold land and we must complete it by saying what the duration of that license shall be.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the hon. gentleman say that we have the absolute right to declare that it shall be 10 years or 50 years, in disregard of the law of the provinces?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I suppose the provinces having jurisdiction over property could take away the property or do anything they like with it?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. And therefore regulate the tenure.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I suppose, in one sense the provincial legislature could deprive a railway corporation or any other corporation of its property.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am referring to the rights given by the British North America Act.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It seems to me that when we are giving certain rights we should complete them. We should not say we will give a license in mortmain and let some other authority say how long that license shall continue.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is inconsistent with the Minister of Public Works who said that if a province passed legislation saying that the land could only be held for seven years the provincial law would prevail. My proposition is that this shall be subject to the legislation in the various provinces.

Mr. MACDONELL. I wish to preface my remarks by saying that whatever criticism I offer is intended solely in the view of making this Bill intra vires of this parliament, and putting it in such shape as to best carry out the object of the promoters. The Minister of Public Works argues that it is necessary to retain the language in the Bill subjecting the holding and granting of lands to the laws of the province, because forsooth there may be no laws at present governing the holding of land of this kind in a province, and that until the province enacts such law the ten-year period mentioned in this Bill shall govern. The hon. gentleman from Essex (Mr. Clarke) knows, if the Minister of Public Works does not know, that all lands acquired by this corporation in mortmain for charitable purposes are governed by the law of the province, and if a province has no law of mortmain it would be held, as it has been held in the past, that the English law of mortmain would govern. We would therefore have a law of mortmain in every province of Canada except Quebec. In so far as the lands which this corporation may acquire of itself and not by demise or gift, the province of Ontario, and I think all the provinces, have laws governing the length of time within which such corporations shall dispose of such lands.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Where is that law?

Mr. MACDONELL. The hon. gentleman mentioned a case a moment ago; the laws are not codified.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That law would not apply to this company.

Mr. MACDONELL. I think it would. I differ fundamentally from the statement of the Minister of Public Works; that this parliament would have the right to say to any province: we shall incorporate such a society to hold land for a longer jeriod that the general law of the province would permit. The jurisdiction over property and civil rights enables the province to govern entirely in regard to real estate.

If the minister be right in his argument, then if this House chose to pass a thousand Bills providing that such and such a corporation should hold lands for a certain length of time in defiance of the law of the province you might have one thousand exceptions to the general law of the province, which of course would be absurd. If they are not bound by the law of the province with regard to the tenure then they are not bound with regard to any other feature of acquiring and disposing of property. I believe that this Act would be futile unless the laws of the province are allowed to govern. It would not only be futile, but it is so contradictory that I think the hon. gentleman in whose name the Bill stands should be thankful to those of us who are trying to get it

into proper shape. Last session this parliament passed, chapter 82, to incorporate the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Timiskaming, but in that Act there is no provision such as is in this Bill stating that these lands shall be held subject to the law of the province in which the lands are situated. True, the Act says the land shall be held for ten years, but there are many provisions in that which are not in this Bill, and there is not in that Act the contradictions we have in this Bill, namely, one section stating that the land shall be held subject to the laws of the province as to granting and tenure, and then another section stating that the lands are to be held only for ten years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This Bill follows the Act of last year.

Mr. MACDONELL. The Act incorporating the Roman Catholic Incorporation of Timiskaming says nothing about the law of the province governing. I think the objection of my hon. friend from West Hastings is well taken, and it would be in the interest of the Bill that it should be made consistent and avoid the contradiction contained in these two paragraphs.

Mr. PORTER. Perhaps the object of the promoter of the Bill is that inasmuch as there is no limitation provided by provincial statute to the holding of these lands, there should be some limitation passed by this parliament on the incorporation of this society. If that is his object, might I suggest that subsection 3 be amended to read thus:

The board shall, within ten years after its acquisition of any real estate, unless the limitation for holding such lands shall be otherwise declared by provincial legislation, sell or otherwise dispose of.

In the event of the provincial legislature not passing any legislation at all, this Act would limit the holding to ten years; but if the provincial legislature does pass an Act limiting it to a different number of years, that would have effect, just as the Bill declares it shall have effect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The proposed amendment of the hon. member for North Grey is one which I think should be given notice of.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then, with a view to putting the Bill in workable shape, I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion to report progress, negatived.

Mr. FOSTER. Though I am not a lawyer, it does seem to me that there is an inconsistency in these two sections. According to subsection No. 1, the provincial legislature must govern, while in subsection 3 an arbitrary period is set. It would seem to me that the suggestion of my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Porter) would do away with the appearance of inconsistency and make the whole clause homogeneous. Has my hon. friend who has the Bill in charge any objection to equalizing these two subsections in that way?

Mr. FOWKE. As this House is granting the license, it seems reasonable that it should say what the length of the license should be. I do not myself see any inconsistency in the section.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Allow me to point out that my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), in referring to the statute of last year, incorporating the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Timiskaming, did not refer to section 7 of the present Bill, which combines the provisions of sections 5 and 8 of the Act he referred to. I think section 7 is perfectly plain. The limitation, 'subject always to the laws of the province in which such real estate is situated,' applies to the words 'may receive, take and hold real estate by purchase, gift or devise.'

Mr. PORTER. If you do not limit it, but you do limit it by the third subsection.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let us consider the first subsection by itself. Is it not perfectly clear that if the law of mortmain applied in any province, it would apply as far as subsection 1 is concerned? Subsection 3 refers to all property, whether held in mortmain or not, and provides that this corporation shall within ten years after getting it take steps to dispose of it.

Mr. PORTER. That limits what you have said before.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I beg pardon, so far as property held in mortmain is concerned, the laws of the provinces would apply. The third subsection does not in any way take away the effect of the laws of a province regarding lands held in mortmain. Subsection 3 does not say that the board shall hold this land for 10 years, but that it shall within 10 years dispose of it. If there be any law in Ontario which would limit this holding to two years, that would apply.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose it made it 12 years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not quite sure whether this would override this clause.

Mr. PORTER. Why leave it uncertain?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You cannot make it more certain than it is. The Bill says that the real estate held by the board shall always be held subject to the laws of the province. But the effect of subsection 3 is, that if there be no provincial law limiting

the holding, the company must sell within 10 years. If there be any provincial law requiring the company to sell within two years, that law must prevail.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the word 'convey,' in the subsection imply sale and conveyance for the purpose of giving effect to the sale. If that word 'convey' were not there, section 1 would apply only to the reception or holding of property. But the word 'convey' being there, seems to imply that that subsection refers to the sale and disposal of the property as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would think that the words 'subject to the laws of the province' apply to the receiving of the property by the company and holding.

Mr. FOSTER. And to the sale of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is all subject to the laws of the province.

Mr. FOSTER. That is where there is an inconsistency. Subsection 1 says that the property is to be subject always to the provincial law. But suppose the law of a province says that the tenure must be 12 years and this law says it can only be 10 years. Is there not a contradiction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There might be possibly a conflict, but surely we ought to be reasonable and realize that there is no law in any province against the holding of property by an association of this character unless the property is held in mortmain. This parliament wants to put a limit, and it makes that limit 10 years, but that does not prevent any province making the limit two or three or five years. This would not at all conflict with the provisions of the statute of mortmain which in Ontario imposes a limit of two years. The land could not be held in mortmain longer than two years, notwithstanding the subsection, because the provincial law would apply.

Mr. SPROULE. If there were no other object except doing away with the chance of litigation, it would be very much better for the society to have this Bill amended by striking out the third subsection. Once the board acquires the property, if there be no provincial law to the contrary, they own the property forever, and consequently cannot suffer, but if there be any provincial law limiting the tenure, that provincial law would prevail in any event, according to the Minister of Public Works, so that no injustice would be done the board in that regard. But what I want to point out, is that in enacting a statute, we ought to see that we are not making an opening for litigation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we struck out the third subsection, they might hold the property forever.

Mr. SPROULE. Would that do them any injustice?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do not want that.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to consider whether after all more anxiety has not been felt than there is really any necessity for This board is being incorporated for a good object. It is very likely to have gifts of lands made to it. These lands may be situated anywhere in the Dominion. Now the laws governing real estate in the different provinces are not uniform. It has been said that in Ontario the limitation during which a corporation of this character may hold land, is very short, although learned gentlemen opposite are not at all certain whether that short period, as applied to this board or organization, would be seven or two years. But, however that may be, the laws of the different provinces on this matter are not uniform. Is it not in the public interest that there should be some limitation by this parliament, even if there be a province, as there may be, in which no provincial limitation now exists? I am not going to talk about the ancient subject of statutes of mortmain. Students are told that the reason which prompted the passing of those statutes five or six hundred years ago was because it was to the advantage of the feudal lords that there should be frequent transfers of property, and that property should not be held by the one owner for generations or forever. And so a limitation was put upon it. It is in the public interest still, for the reasons which were stated in the discussion on Friday evening, that land should not be held unimproved, tied up, not transferred, for long periods of time, by religious bodies or any other corporations, so that some limitation is usual, and is it not better that this statute which we are proposing to pass, incorporating this board, should contain some limitation than that it should be silent? Because it may very possibly be that the holding of land in some of our provinces would not be restricted by any provincial law. And is there any danger in passing a Bill such as this that there should be an outside limitation of ten years, that is a limitation presumably beyond the period which at present may be fixed by any provincial legislature? Bear in mind that this proposal is not in the shape of an enabling clause which purports to empower the company to keep its land for ten years; it is put in the negative, you must get rid of it within ten years, you must not keep it longer than ten years. However much that may imply

the power to hold for ten years, it does not, in terms, profess to confer upon this board any power to hold for a longer time than the provincial laws would authorize and the presence of such a clause as this might be very valuable in this way: When the period, whatever it is, which is fixed, expires, if the land has not been disposed of by this association such land is not transferred simply by the Act of parliament, the title to it does not pass out of the society and into somebody else without something being done and that something usually takes the form of legal proceedings. The Crown, either the Dominion Crown or the provincial Crown, whichever may be the proper authority, takes proceedings in court to declare the lands forfeit. The court then deals with the whole subject and can decide, and is in a better position to decide these interesting, old and abstruse legal questions, many of which were raised on Friday night, and which I understand have been a good deal discussed today. The presence of some limitation is very desirable and where we cannot have uniformity the presence of a period fixed by the Dominion statute, which period may be longer than any of the periods mentioned in the provincial statutes, will not embarrass anybody that I am able to see. If land which may be attacked by the Dominion Crown or the provincial Crown, at some future time, is situate in a province where a shorter period of limitation than ten years is fixed, I have no doubt that the attack would be based on the contention that both those statutes might and should be complied with by the incorporated body, the provincial statute saying, you shall within two years get rid of this land, and the Dominion statute saying, you shall within ten years get rid of it. It is, of course, manifest that both could be complied with, and in such circumstances I have no doubt the argument would be that the shorter period must govern. But the circumstance that some period of limitation seems advisable, is one which appears to me to be very manifest. This question sprang up on Friday night just in that way, it was not started as a lawyer's question of interest, but my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) questioned whether ten years was not longer than the period given in previous instances and suggested shortening it to seven. I have no views on the subject one way or the other. It is a matter simply of what is expedient. Is there any danger to anybody by leaving it at ten years, especially as that is the shape in which the Senate has passed the Bill and the Private Bills Committee has reported it? Instances were cited on Friday evening where ten years had been fixed, and where it is fixing an outside limit the danger which appears to be apprehended by many members in naming that period, is one that certainly does not appeal to my mind, and which I am not able to appreciate.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If there is conflict between the provincial law and this Act as to the period during which real estate may be held, which law will govern?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. My hon. friend is asking a question much easier to ask than to answer. It does not seem to me there is any occasion to trouble our minds over it. These are the very things which courts are for, we are not creating any conflict, we are not proposing that this body may hold lands for any given length of time, but putting an outside limit and saying: Beyond that limit you must not go.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would there be any objection to inserting the amendment which I proposed?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I have not considered and am not in a position to express an opinion as to the effect of this amendment. But when a Bill is proposed and asked for by the body being incorporated, if the Bill is granted it becomes substantially a contract from which the body incorporated cannot afterwards recede. That view of it, it seems to me, is of particular consequence when you are dealing with a question of this sort, where proceedings in the courts would necessarily be against the body incorporated. The courts would view with strictness such proceedings, because of the fact that they would work a forfeiture, to take from them their property without compensation. Anything of that kind the courts would deal with, with great strictness and in that view of it, it would be of value that the Bill should stand as they propose it, unless there is excellent reason for changing it, and where it has been passed upon not only by the other House but also by our own committee, I would not be favourable to making any change unless there is some strong necessity for it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. After hearing all the argument it boils itself down to this, taking the language of the minister himself: The Minister of Public Works says that subsection 3 is subject to the laws of the provinces where the real estate is situated, and I think that is right. If that is so, what is the use of us arguing here for hours as to the insertion of a few words that would put the question beyond doubt and remove any chance of conflict? Even the Minister of Justice will not say that there is any objection to my amendment.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Suppose after ten years they come to get a renewal of their

license; will they come here or will they go to the province? Who represents the Crown?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. We are all contending that the law of the province prevails, and that they do not need any renewal.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). After the time is up they may want an extension of their license to hold the land, and which power will give it?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Being an incorporated entity, and having power to hold the land, they hold it just as any other corporation would hold it. If in the province of Ontario, they are subject to the laws of that province. I have not heard any argument why we should not make the tenure subject to the laws of the various provinces in which the real estate is situated just as it has been for years and years—until the last two or three years, when somebody has sought to change it. The member for South Ontario himself admits that the matter was never called in question, nobody ever observed that there was a contradiction between the two portions of this section.

Mr. PORTER. It strikes me that if, for the reasons given by the Minister of Justice, it is expedient to have a limitation to the holding of land by this corporation, and if this parliament has authority to enact such a limitation, then why not say that the limitation shall be so and so, without making it subject to anything? If on the other hand, it is not desirable for this parliament to pass such legislation, and if it is desirable to leave it to the provinces, why not leave it to the provinces and let the limitation rest where it is placed by the local legislature? As it is now, you say virtually that the local legislature shall have absolute control as to how the land shall be held and conveyed, and in the same breath you say that the holding shall be for ten years, which is inconsistent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, you say it shall not be for more than ten years.

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 11,

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the promoter of this Bill for a little information with regard to this Baptist convention which shall cease to exist. In line 14 and 15 it says:

Upon such transfer being made the Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec shall cease to exist.

By what power is that convention incorporated? What is the nature of its existence?

Mr. FOWKE. It is a missionary organization wholly.

Mr. LANCASTER. Under what authority?

Mr. FOWKE. Do you mean as to provincial or Dominion authority? I have no doubt it is an incorporated body.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, is it an incorporated body? I don't think it is.

Mr. FOWKE. I have always supposed so, but I cannot answer definitely. This society has existed for the purpose of carrying on foreign missionary work, it is a society of the Baptist church in the province of Ontario, and in the province of Quebec. The idea now is that provincialism so far as its work is concerned shall become a thing of the past, and that the work of the denomination shall become national in its operation. This clause is to enable the merging of the provincial into the national idea to take place.

Mr. LANCASTER. What troubles me is the nature of the legislation. We are enacting that a certain convention shall cease to exist. I do not know what would authorize us to declare the confiscation of the rights of that body. My hon. friend says frankly that he cannot tell us whether it is a provincial or a Dominion organization, or whether it is incorporated at all. I would suppose it was one of those concerns incorporated by registration under a provincial statute. If that is so, what right have we in the Dominion parliament to declare an incorporated institution to be out of existence, an institution incorporated by a provincial legislature?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it will be found that this is incorporated by a Dominion statute; it is one convention of the two provinces. If you look at the Bill from the Senate (J-1), it is an Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, and it is stated therein to be incorporated under chapter 105 of the statutes of 1889.

Mr. SPROULE. The preamble says:

Whereas, by an Act of the legislature of Nova Scotia passed in A.D. 1865, the Foreign Missionary Board of the Baptist Convention of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island was incorporated for the purpose of carrying on foreign mission works——

That is part of the board that will be transferred to the authority of this new corporation.

—and whereas, the name of the said board was subsequently, by an Act of the said legislature passed in A.D. 1890, changed to 'The Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention of the maritime provinces'——

That adds another one.

—and whereas, the members of the said board are appointed by the Baptist Conven-

tion of the maritime provinces; and whereas, by an Act of the legislature of New Brunswick passed in A.D. 1890, the said board by its changed name was granted perpetual succession and given all the powers, rights and privileges made incident to a corporation by the law of the province of New Brunswick; and whereas, by chapter 105 of the Statutes of Canada of 1889, entitled 'An Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec,' the said convention appoints the members of 'The Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention' a corporate body.

I take it that the last Act included the whole of them and that it is now only necessary to refer to the last one passed.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have read the preamble and it may be as my hon. friend says, although its language is very peculiar.

And whereas, by chapter 105 of the Statutes of Canada of 1889, entitled 'An Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec,' the said convention appoints the members of 'The Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention' a corporate body.

Of course, the preamble may only be a meagre statement, and the statute itself may throw more light upon it. The promoter of the Bill ought to know about it, but if he does not that is all the more reason why the Bill should stand over until we can rightly understand it, and see what the effect will be of what we are doing here. This preamble recites that the 'said convention appoints the members of the Foreign Mission Board.' It does not get to the question I asked as to whether the convention itself was incorporated originally by provincial statutes, or letters patent, or how. I do not like assenting to legislation which declares that a company or institution of any kind shall cease to exist, as this section 11 undertakes to say in line 16, without having some very good reason for making that declaration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we may safely assume——

Mr. LANCASTER. We are assuming a lot here to-day that we should not assume.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are not assuming a lot. Those who prepared this Bill and who profess to set forth the various statutes relating to the different religious bodies connected with this association, or what is akin to the association, had a full and complete knowledge of what they were doing. I take it for granted that the Private Bills Committee was informed on the subject. As the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, there is no question that the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec was incorporated by this parliament, because section 1 of the Bill, which my hon. friend from North Toronto read, speaks of the Act of 1889 which was an Act dealing with this very Baptist Convention. Then, the preamble of the present Bill recites that the convention appoints the members of the Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention. My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) is wrong in saying that they appoint a corporate body.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not say that they appointed a corporate body. I was trying to find out who did appoint that corporate body. I was pointing, because of the reference made by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), to the actual language of the preamble which says that: Whereas this Baptist Convention appoints the Foreign Mission Board, a corporate body.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will read a little further he will see that it says:

'The Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention,' a corporate body constituted under the said chapter for the prosecution of mission work outside of Canada.

But that Foreign Mission Board is a corporate body constituted under the chapter that is referred to in the preamble. That chapter constitutes the Foreign Mission Board a corporate body, and then the convention appoints that body to prosecute foreign mission work. If my hon. friend will look at section 11 of this Bill he will see that there can be no harm in providing that this foreign mission board shall cease to exist, because it is only in the event of it transferring its property over to the present board that such a thing can take place. It does not cease to exist until it does that and, therefore, it will itself be the instrument which will cause its existence to terminate. This statute does not put it out of existence, but it only goes out of existence after it has conveyed all of its property to the board with which we are now dealing. It will only cease to exist when it has denuded itself of its property and transferred it over.

Mr. PORTER. By section 1 certain persons are declared to be incorporated under the name of the 'Canadian Baptist Mission Board, hereinafter called the board.' Under section 7, which we have just been discussing, the board—that is the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board—may hold and convey property in a certain way. As I take it the Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention and these others mentioned in section 11 are really branch institutions of the church and they are, by this section 11, given power to transfer all the property that they now have to the board which is now created by this Act. Then, let me put this case. You will notice that the last paragraph of section 11 says that:

The board shall hold all moneys, funds and property so transferred to it subject to any trusts to which the same may be subject at the time of the transfer.

But they may get property from these other auxiliary or subsidiary institutions that would be, or ought to be, governed by clause 7 which provides that they shall hold property subject to the laws of the province or subject to the ten year limitation, while under clause 11, they would hold it only subject to any trust which might have affected it before it came into the hands of this board.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend think it would be subject to the laws of the province which govern the property? But, in addition to that it is subject to any trust upon which it is already held by the association or board proposing to convey it to this board.

Mr. PORTER. I would certainly think that if the words had been that the board shall hold subject to the limitations hereinbefore enacted and subject to any trust. If that were the declaration I would think so, but with this declaration that it is only held subject to the trust——

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not say 'only.'

Mr. PORTER. No, but it says 'subject to any trusts,' and that language would not be a broad enough declaration to indicate that it held it under the provisions of section 7 as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would think so.

Mr. PORTER. I should not think so. We might use specific language as to what it shall be held subject to. If you leave it general and say subject to the limitations herein contained, and to any trust then it certainly would cover it, but as the section is now framed it is clear that it would be subject only to any trust which might affect it, and would not be subject to the provisions of section 7. If the intention is that it should be subject to both of those clauses then it should be amended by declaring that it shall be held subject to limitations hereinbefore enacted and to any trusts.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Justice observed in the course of the discussion that we need not worry ourselves about the meaning of this law or as to whether it was conflicting or not, because as he said it was the duty of the courts to determine its meaning. Let me tell him that there is a feeling prevalent all over the country that parliament passes too many laws which are obscure and contradictory and invite litigation. Indeed, some of this legislation cannot be understood by either laymen or lawyers, and the judges themselves disagree upon it. In my opinion it is our imperative duty to make laws so plain that they can be understood by all. Wherever it is brought to attention that there is obscurity or conflict in the wording of a Bill it is our duty to provide a remedy for that. Such an argument coming from the Minister of Justice is unworthy of him.

On section 12,

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the language of the existing section which we are repealing. Will the promoter tell us?

Mr. FOWKE. Not being a country lawyer, perhaps, I cannot say off hand.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowke) who introduces this Bill has told us several times that because he is not a country lawyer he is supposed to be a know nothing. Whether the promoter of a Bill be a country merchant or whatever else he should know something about the legislation he introduces, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowke) sits there and laughs and thinks he ought to know nothing. The committee should rise until the hon. gentleman learns something about his Bill. Whenever he is asked for information he answers in the most flippant way that because he is not a country lawyer he does not know anything about the Bill.

Mr. FOWKE. I did not say that.

Mr. LANCASTER. If he were a country lawyer he would know something about this legislation. There are dozens of lawyers on his own side of the House (besides those who have bolted on the recent question, and others who are ready to bolt), and if the hon. gentleman knows nothing about this Bill he can consult them, and they will perhaps tell him, as several of them are fairly representative country lawyers.

Mr. FOWKE. I would like to suggest to the hon. member for Lincoln as to whether he means to insinuate that he is getting ready to bolt himself. We are not looking for bolters, and are not overly anxious to receive them.

Mr. LANCASTER. You get more than you want without looking for them.

Mr. FOWKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) being learned in the law I thought he would know the statutes referred to here, but if he does not the eminent solicitor who prepared this Bill does, and in the absence of that gentleman I shall inform my hon. friend.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then it is the first thing that you knew about the Bill.

Mr. FOWKE. Paragraph (b) reads:

The board for the prosecution of mission work outside of Canada to be called the Foreign Mission Board of the Baptist Convention.

That is what is referred to.

Mr. PORTER. By section 11 of the Bill you have already put that out of existence and now you are repealing it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Under this statute that paragraph becomes useless, and it is right that the draftsman should provide that thereafter such a board should not be appointed by the convention.

Mr. PORTER. Under section 11 you declare that the foreign mission board shall go out of existence when it transfers certain property; and by this paragraph you declare that it shall go out of existence after the next session of parliament which is another inconsistency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Evidently they fixed the end of the next session of parliament so that if there is any delay or hitch there may be new legislation.

Mr. PORTER. I do not see how that works out. If the foreign board transfers all its property it is out of existence under section 11 but under section 12 it shall not go out of existence until next session of parliament so that you have it out of existence and still in existence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The duty would rest on the convention to appoint a board until next session of parliament, and as I suppose that is done to give ample time to have the property transferred, what harm can be done by leaving paragraph 12 as it is?

Mr. LANCASTER. There is this harm. Why should we give them power to go out of existence before we know it is right it should be done. Suppose they do not carry out what the Minister says they will, why give them this clearance so to speak?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What would the hon. gentleman suggest?

Mr. LANCASTER. I would try to protect the people, and make sensible legislation, and I would not be always satisfied that it is sound legislation because some solicitor promoting the Bill asks for it. I try to approach all our legislation whether public or private, from the standpoint of the interest of the country, and I am getting a little weary of hon. gentlemen opposite taking the position that it does not matter very much what the legislation is so long as its promoters are satisfied. We are not supposed to pass this legislation simply to benefit a private corporation, but because it is presumed to be in the interest of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend has misunderstood me. I was suggesting that if my hon. friend could show how this could be improved, my hon. friend from South Ontario, I was sure, would be glad to accept his suggestion.

Mr. FOWKE.

Mr. LANCASTER. Surely the hon. minister does not expect me to try to improve a thing I do not approve of. He wants to do a thing which I do not think ought to be done, and he coolly asks me to suggest a way in which he can do what I think should not be done at all. I do not think paragraph 12 should be in the Bill at all, for the very reason given by my hon. friend from West Hastings, that it is inconsistent with section 11.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With the object of meeting the views of my hon. friends, I would suggest adding at the end of section 12 the words, 'provided that the transfer mentioned in section 11 shall by that time have been completed.' That is to say, if they have done all their work provided for in section 11, so that they have no further property, it would be quite right that paragraph (b) should be repealed.

Mr. PORTER. To use my hon. friend's own argument in regard to section 7, would not that be mere surplusage? I take it that the object of the clause is to retain the Foreign Mission Board in existence long enough to enable it to transfer its property to this new creation, and as soon as that has been done, it shall go out of existence. All that is declared by section 11. Then by section 12 you say that it shall go out of existence, no matter what happens, after the last day of the session of parliament next following the passage of this Act.

Let us take an extreme case. Suppose the Foreign Mission Board is not in harmony with this new creation and should refuse to hand over to it its property, and the last day of next session of parliament arrives and that property is still in the Foreign Mission Board. That board goes out of existence by section 12, and there is no corporate board or association against which proceedings could be taken by the persons incorporated by this Bill to force the transfer of that property. If you strike out that clause 12 altogether and simply leave clause 11 as enacted here, which declares that upon the transfer of the property, the Foreign Mission Board should cease to exist, you have effected the whole purpose. There would be no inconsistency, nothing which any one cannot perfectly understand, and the board is always in existence until that property is transferred, so that there is some one against whom proceedings could be taken to compel the transfer, if such became necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose the object of the draftsman was to do away with the apparent obligation upon the Baptist convention to appoint this foreign mission board. It is one thing to say that on the transfer of the property it shall cease to

exist and another to leave on the statute an obligation binding on the convention.

Mr. PORTER. What I suggest is that instead of having the words in section 12 'and after the last day of the session of parliament next following the passing of this Act,' these should be struck out, and we should say that upon the transfer of such property, clause B shall be and is hereby repealed. That will effect the purpose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved that clause 12 be amended by striking out all the words in the clause after the word 'Quebec' in the third line, and by inserting the following words thereafter:

Shall immediately after the transfer of the said property, as mentioned in clause 11, be repealed.

Amendment agreed to.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 13, rules and regulations.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That section is slightly irregular. It says that the board shall be governed by the rules and regulations set out in the schedule until the said rules and regulations are altered as therein provided. The rules and regulations are a unit and if the word 'until' is left in then if the least change is made in one of the rules and regulations, the balance would be no longer valid. I would move that the word 'until' be replaced by the words 'except in so far as.'

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RESTIGOUCHE RIPARIAN ASSOCIATION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Association.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On the preamble,

Mr. MONK. I have received a number of communications from the localities to which this Bill is to apply stating that there is something in this legislation affecting the rights of municipalities in the district to develop and avail themselves of the water-powers. I have looked over the Bill with care and I see nothing in it of the nature complained of; in fact sections 6 and 9 absolutely safeguard the rights of the province, and all other rights generally guaranteed by law. I fail to see anything that puts in peril the rights of the public in that locality.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 163) for the relief of Mary Jane Beatty.—Mr. Congdon.

Bill (No. 165) respecting a Patent of the Goldschmidt Thermit Company.—Mr. Rivet.

Bill (No. 173) for the relief of Robert William Logan.—Mr. Rankin.

REVILLON FRERES TRADING COMPANY, LIMITED.

Mr. DEVLIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the Revillon Fréres Trading Company, Limited.

Mr. FIELDING. When this Bill was last before the House, an hon. member suggested that it should go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, for the reason that some of its clauses were of a financial character. I see no objection to that course being pursued; but with the understanding that the committee will still, at a later stage, send it to the Committee on Railways, because some of its clauses come distinctly within the authority of that committee. I move that for the present the Bill be sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, with that understanding.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL AFFAIRS AT PILES.

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Has the government received complaints, petitions or warnings with respect to the administration of federal affairs at Piles, county of Champlain, during last summer or autumn, 1910, and especially a petition of the citizens of Piles, dated 5th August, 1910, requesting a public and general inquiry respecting federal affairs at Piles?
2. Has the government taken action on this petition, and has an inquiry been granted?
3. If so, who represented the government at this inquiry and what was the result?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I feel a difficulty in answering this question, because the complaint referred to was submitted by the hon. member who has asked the question in a confidential letter addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). That letter was referred to the officers of my department, and I have appointed an engineer to make an inquiry

into the facts set forth in this letter, and the report is necessarily confidential because it refers to the letter. Now, if the hon. member will withdraw the seal of confidence from his communication, I will be glad to lay his communication and also the report upon the table.

Mr. MONK. There are two other questions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They all relate to the same thing. I took action upon the confidential communication, and the report makes reference to that confidential communication and the complaints therein. Therefore they would both, I presume, be necessarily confidential. I will be glad to lay the report upon the table, if the hon. gentleman will say that his communication is not confidential.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

CANADIAN LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

*Mr. MONK:

1. Has the Canadian Light and Power Company submitted to the government the plans of the new works the company intends to execute in connection with the development and increase of its power on the Beauharnois canal?
2. On what dates were said plans sent in for approval?
3. Has the government caused a report to be made upon the said plans and proposed works, who has been intrusted with the preparation of said report, and has the report been completed?
4. Is the government satisfied that the proposed works will not interfere with the navigation of the St. Lawrence river?
5. Has the government taken any action in respect to the application for the approval of said plans?
6. Has any order in council been passed?
7. On what date was such action taken, and said order in council passed?
8. Will said plans be laid upon the table of the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend let me know whether he refers to the application which has been lately made and which is now pending in my department for the large works, and I will be glad to give the answer?

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—WESTERN DIVISION.

Mr. LENNOX:

Based upon the latest information available to the government, what will be the cost to Canada incurred for the building of the western division of the Transcontinental railway, given in such detail as to show how the total is arrived at?

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimated cost to Canada is the interest for seven years on the bonds required to finance 75 per cent of the cost of construction of the Mountain section, and this interest is estimated at $13,293,000. In addition, the direct cost to the government for inspection, auditing, &c., in connection with the western division, is estimated at $135,000.

The details upon which the above estimate is based are as follows:

Estimated cost to complete, March 31, 1914:

Cost of construction, as per estimate attached	$ 58,520,000
Terminals, Prince Rupert, as per estimate attached	3 000,000
Interest during construction	6,000,000
Total estimated cost	$ 67,520,000
Amount to be financed by 3 per cent government guaranteed bonds, 75 per cent of $67,520,000	50,640,000
Par value of government guaranteed 3 per cent bonds required to finance cost of construction, estimated to be sold at net price of 80 per cent	63,300,000
Interest on $63,300,000 at 3 per cent for 7 years	13,293,000
Estimated direct expenditure by government for engineering, auditing, &c., in connection with western division	135,000

The above estimate is made on the assumption that the liability of the government as guarantor of the bonds, will be in accordance with the judgment rendered by the Supreme Court of Canada, as to the meaning of paragraph 5 of the agreement of February 18, 1904, schedule to chap. 24 of the Acts of that year.

ESTIMATED COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE MOUNTAIN SECTION OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Description of Service.	Amount.
Preliminary and legal expenses, engineering	$ 3,200,000
Right of way and real estate	250,000
Grading and tunnels	33,000,000
Bridges, trestles and culverts	10,000,000
Ties	1,500,000
Rails, fastenings, frogs and switches	5,700,000
Tracklaying, surfacing and ballasting	2,390,000
Buildings and water stations	1,500,000
Fencing, crossings and cattle guards	20,000
Snow sheds	500,000
Docks	200,000
Telegraph line	260,000
	$58,520,000
Terminals at Prince Rupert	3,000,000

The foregoing details of estimates are subject to revision. The fluctuating labour conditions prevailing, and the tendency to an increasing cost for labour, on the line of construction, renders this statement necessary.

ELMIRA RAILWAY STATION, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. FRASER:

1. Who is the contractor for the railway station at Elmira, P.E.I.?
2. What is the amount of the contract?
3. What is the date fixed by the terms of the contract for the completion of same?
4. Is the minister aware that it is alleged nothing has yet been done towards the erection of this station?
5. Is it the intention of the government to insist upon the completion of the contracts, or will they call for new tenders?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. F. S. McDonald.
2. Bulk sum for station $1,655.37 and estimated schedule prices for foundations and platforms.
3. October 31, 1910.
4. When the contractor was about to commence the building of this station, last year, objection was taken to some of the timber he proposed using; he then said he could not replace this material until it could be got out in the winter, so asked for an extension of time on his contract till the 1st September, 1911, which was granted by order in council.
5. The department will insist upon the completion of this contract within the time specified.

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What quantity of material has been purchased for repairs to the covering of Hillsborough bridge, P.E.I., during the last twelve months?
2. What is the name or names of the persons who supplied this?
3. What price was paid per 1,000 feet, superficial measure?
4. At what date is the contract to be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1, 2, 3 and 4. No material has yet been purchased for repairs for the covering of the Hillsborough bridge, P.E.I., but a contract was entered into with F. S. McDonald, Souris, for 22,300 superficial feet of yellow birch or rock maple plank for covering of Hillsborough bridge, contract price $13.50 per thousand superficial feet, f.o.b. cars. Contract to be completed on or before April 15, 1911. Eighteen thousand superficial feet already supplied. No payment yet made on account of this contract.

IMPORTS OF SHAFTING.

Mr. WALLACE:

1. What are the quantities and values of the importations of shafting exceeding 2½ inches in diameter which have been entered at the different customs ports in Canada since 1st April, 1910?

2. What are the quantities and values of the importations of shafting not exceeding 2½ inches in diameter which have been entered at the different customs ports in Canada since 1st April, 1910?

Mr. PATERSON:

FISCAL YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 1911.

Ports	Forgings of iron or steel of whatever shape or size, n.o.p., and steel shafting, turned, compressed or polished, and hammered, drawn or cold rolled iron or steel bars or shapes, n.o.p.		Shafting, round, steel in bars, not exceeding 2½ in. in diameter.	
	Lbs.	Value.	Cwt.	Value.
Ontario.		$		$
Belleville	10,958	781	.....	.....
Berlin	30,829	526	661	1,447
Brantford	98,280	5,762	22,491	44,754
Bridgeburg	40	4	2	4
Brockville	10,322	1,074	10	1
Chatham	282,843	15,616	168	493
Collingwood	1,410	97	.....,	.....
Fort William	5,700	223	.....	.....
Galt	16,586	919	835	1,941
Gananoque	1,906	265	.....	.....
Goderich	14,013	698	3	15
Guelph	39,068	2,052	43	87
Hamilton	212,176	12,438	957	1,562
Ingersoll	399,956	10,826	.....	.....
Lindsay	7,523	344	.....	.....
London	55,482	3,492	207	426
Midland	7,145	668	18	73
Napanee	510	19	.....	.....
Niagara Falls	15,143	454	83	166
North Bay	536	32	.....	.....
Orillia	63,943	6,228	.....	.....
Oshawa	8,240	821	.....	.....
Ottawa	68,928	2,933	1,692	3,360
Owen Sound	10,294	383	.....	.....
Paris	4,054	183	10	19
Parry Sound	1,540	77	.....	.....
Peterborough	14,347	1,631	7	34
Port Arthur	8,831	238	9	44
Prescott	400	75	.....	.....
St. Catharines	129,320	2,286	374	1,277
St. Thomas	10,802	446	11	23
Sarnia	1,300	131	27	79
Sault Ste. Marie	19,846	936	361	1,037
Stratford	2,651	175	132	200
Tillsonburg	112	14	.....	.....
Toronto	324,178	14,543	21,127	40,963
West Toronto	115,524	7,864	1,782	4,135
Trenton	50	4	.....	.....
Whitby	1,288	21	.....	.....
Windsor	62,954	4,924	66	525
Woodstock	29,375	1,164	18	33
Quebec.				
Ccaticook	1,728	186	.....	.....
Montreal	112,467	7,588	3,208	5,624
Quebec	8,748	533	.....	.....
St. Johns	710	34	.....	.....
Sherbrooke	39,445	2,480	120	213
Sorel	150	11	20	45
Three Rivers	436	56	.....	.....
Nova Scotia.				
Amherst	28,920	1,905	.....	.....
Glace Bay	7,860	626	.....	.....

Ports.	Forgings of iron or steel of whatever shape or size, n.o.p., and steel shafting, turned, compressed or polished, and hammered, drawn or cold rolled iron or steel bars or shapes, n.o.p.		Shafting, round, steel in bars, not exceeding 2½ in diameter.	
	Lbs.	Value.	Cwt.	Value.
Halifax	2,700	190	.....	.....
Lunenburg	.....	.....	20	73
Yarmouth	5,560	345	.....	.....
New Brunswick.				
Fredericton	.....	.....	10	36
St. John	.....	.....	256	697
St. Andrews	.....	.....	2	21
Woodstock	200	23	90	211
Manitoba.				
Winnipeg	21,040	863	428	1,553
British Columbia.				
Grand Forks	1,675	404	.....	.....
Nanaimo	782	41	.....	.....
Nelson	1,720	102	13	60
N. Westminster	361	32	173	598
Vancouver	125,609	5,907	2,974	7,276
Victoria	18,509	663	9	33
Edmonton	3,325	90	.....	.....
Lethbridge	.....	.....	62	150
Regina	.....	.....	21	56
Saskatoon	68	141	.....	.....
Dawson	54,547	1,443	85	214
Grand total	2,424,963	125,030	58,585	119,498

MILITIA REGIMENTS.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. How many regiments are there in the city of Montreal and in the city of Quebec, respectively?
2. How many regiments are there in the Quebec command?
3. How many regiments are there in the city of Ottawa and in the city of Kingston, respectively?
4. How many rural regiments are there in the eastern Ontario command?
5. How many regiments are there in the city of Toronto?
6. How many rural regiments are there in the western Ontario command?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Montreal—4 regiments (1 artillery, 3 infantry). Quebec—3 regiments (1 cavalry, 2 infantry).
2. 20 regiments (6 cavalry, 1 artillery, 13 infantry).

Mr. PATERSON.

3. Ottawa—2 infantry. Kingston—1 infantry.
4. 12 (3 cavalry, 9 infantry).
5. 3 infantry.
6. 25 (6 cavalry, 19 infantry).

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. How many regiments are there in Winnipeg?
2. How many regiments outside of Winnipeg are there in Military District No. 10?
3. What is the total number of officers appointed to command the Canadian contingent at the coronation of King George?
4. How many of these officers are members of the regular or permanent force?
5. How many of these officers, and what are their names, who saw service in South Africa?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. 1 battery of field artillery, 3 regiments of infantry. 1 company of the Canadian Army Service Corps. 1 Field Ambulance.
2. 7 regiments of cavalry. 1 battery of field artillery. 4 regiments of infantry.
3. The total number of officers appointed to the coronation contingent is 53, including two officers now in England.
4. Ten officers of the Permanent Staff and Force have been appointed for the coronation contingent.
5. Eight officers saw service in South Africa, viz:

Lieut.-Colonel V. A. S. Williams, A.D.C., Royal Canadian Dragoons.

Captain H. D. B. Ketchen, Lord Strathcona's Horse.

Captain W. A. McKee, 19th Battery, C. F.A.

Captain A. A. Durkee, 7th Heavy Brigade, Canadian Artillery.

Captain A. C. Gray, 18th Mounted Rifles.

Major W. Hart-McHarg, 6th Regiment.

Lieut. E. B. Rattray, 10th Hussars.

Lieut. R. P. Clarke, 5th Regiment, Canadian Artillery.

FARM PRODUCTS ENTERED AT WINDSOR.

Mr. WILCOX:

1. What quantities of hay, cereals, vegetables, poultry, eggs, fruit and general farm, garden and dairy produce, respectively, were entered for consumption at the port of Windsor from the United States of America during the fiscal years ending March 31, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910?
2. What were the values of such imports, respectively, and what was paid thereon?

Mr. PATERSON:

—	Unit of Quantity.	Fiscal Years.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
				$	$ cts.
Cattle	No.	1910	1	0 50	12 50
Horses	No.	1906	43	3,216	643 20
		1907 (9 mos.)	44	5,640	978 75
		1908	26	2,166	541 50
		1909	22	2,223	455 75
		1910	33	2,505	626 25
Barley	Bush.	1909	50	54	7 50
Beans	Bush.	1906	517	1,028	77 55
		1907	274	621	46 80
		1908	415	1,013	103 75
		1909	352	834	88 25
		1910	374	922	93 50
Buckwheat	Bush.	1906	14	13	1 40
		1908	101	96	15 15
		1910	35	29	5 25
Indian corn for purposes of distillation	Bush.	1906	325,144	170,079	24,385 78
		1907	210,510	110,140	16,788 25
		1908	352,056	208,478	26,404 19
		1909	99,817	92,888	7,486 26
		1910	129,783	86,222	9,733 63
Pease	Bush.	1906	895	1,484	89 50
		1907	936	1,668	108 10
		1908	345	702	50 75
		1909	295	606	44 25
		1910	498	1,199	74 70
Rye	Bush.	1906	16,344	10,925	1,634 40
		1907	27,256	19,136	2,725 60
		1908	26,701	23,183	2,670 10
		1909	21,453	18,147	2,145 30
Eggs	Doz.	1906	720	82	21 60
		1907	570	83	17 10
		1908	10,403	1,920	312 09
		1909	462	93	13 86
		1910	2,720	630	81 60
Apples	Brls.	1906	18	49	7 20
		1907	2	7	0 80
		1908	12	65	4 80
		1909	56	224	22 40
		1910	61	271	24 40
Berries	Lbs.	1906	5,334	574	106 68
		1908	2,219	439	44 38
		1909	5,077	780	101 54
		1910	6,712	1,012	134 24
Cherries	Lbs.	1910	170	20	3 40
Cranberries	Bush.	1906	235	466	116 50
		1907	266	648	162 00
		1908	175	480	120 00
		1909	104	283	70 75
		1910	154	425	106 25
Grapes	Lbs.	1906	1,442	174	28 84
		1907	3,751	370	75 02
		1908	8,347	719	166 94
		1909	3,852	443	77 04
		1910	7,431	867	148 62
Oranges in boxes	Boxes	1906	5,344	17,923	1,336 00
		1907	1,844	6,529	461 00
		1908	Free.		
		1909	Free.		
		1910	Free.		
Oranges in ½ boxes	½ boxes.	1906	10	16	1 29
		1907			
		1908	Free.		
		1909	Free.		
		1910	Free.		
Oranges in bulk	No.	1906	3,288	77	4 93
		1907			
		1908	Free.		
		1909	Free.		
		1910	Free.		

—	Unit of Quantity.	Fiscal Years.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
				$	$ cts.
Peaches	Lbs	1906	6,498	296	64 98
		1907	580	33	5 80
		1908	9,875	531	98 75
		1909	11,535	508	115 35
		1910	7,709	357	77 09
Plums	Bush	1906	43	124	31 00
		1907	3	7	1 75
		1908	16	58	4 80
		1909	14	67	4 20
		1910	29	122	8 70
Green fruit, n.o.p	$	1906		154	30 80
		1907		7	0 75
		1908		72	11 75
		1909		243	52 75
		1910		151	25 25
Hay	Tons	1907	6	72	12 00
		1908	10	77	20 00
		1909	13	63	26 00
Honey	Lbs	1908	1,235	96	37 05
		1910	421	12	12 63
Butter	Lbs	1906	2,133	501	85 32
		1907	1,865	452	74 60
		1908	4,253	1,076	170 12
		1909	2,999	240	119 96
		1910	4,281	1,154	171 24
Cheese	Lbs	1906	712	94	21 36
		1907	612	117	18 36
		1908	293	39	7 79
		1909	385	67	11 55
		1910	356	47	10 68
Lard	Lbs	1906	47,084	3,904	941 69
		1907	69,126	7,009	1,382 52
		1908	82,552	8,371	1,651 04
		1909	80,700	7,947	1,614 20
		1010	30,737	3,539	614 74
Bacon and hams	Lbs	1906	15,280	1,387	305 60
		1907	12,166	1,283	243 32
		1908	873	121	17 46
		1909	1,872	213	37 44
		1910	4,756	627	95 12
Pork, in brine	Lbs	1906			
		1907	1,008	102	20 16
		1909	1,000	69	20 00
		1910	17,000	2,040	340 00
Melons	No.	1906	8,940	836	209 00
		1907	8,630	657	164 25
		1908	11,173	1,583	335 19
		1909	9,277	1,460	278 31
		1910	10,335	1,473	310 05
Potatoes	Bush.	1906	2,501	1,389	375 15
		1907	2,253	1,282	392 35
		1908	6,301	4,396	1,260 20
		1909	2,773	3,495	554 60
		1910	3,491	4,239	698 20
Tomatoes, fresh	Bush.	1906	59	154	27 20
		1907	2	5	1 90
		1908	58	156	46 80
		1909	51	137	41 10
		1910	68	150	45 00
Other vegetables, green	$	1906		3,171	792 75
		1907		794	213 80
		1908		1,714	514 20
		1909		1,283	384 90
		1910		2,440	732 00

Mr. PATERSON.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MR. JOHN GASKIN.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

Was a letter or memorial, signed by J. R. Coggon and others, presented to the government or any member thereof, during the month of February, 1909, or at any subsequent date, by one Mr. A. F. Landry, asking that an investigation be held respecting certain charges contained in solemn declarations accompanying said letter or memorial, concerning one John Gaskin, an employee of the government in the electrical department of the Intercolonial railway at Moncton, N.B.?

Mr. GRAHAM:

Yes, a memorial was received, addressed to the honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals, dated January 28, 1908, asking that an investigation be held concerning Mr. John Gaskin, an employee of the Electric Department of the Intercolonial railway, at Moncton.

WILHELM TELEPHONE FACTORY.

Mr. LALOR:

1. Was there a seizure of the Wilhelm telephone factory, located at Dunnville? If so, what is the amount of the duties due the government?

2. Has there been any offer of compromise? If so, what does the government offer to accept?

3. Who was the informant and officer responsible for the seizure?

4. What is the amount due him as commission upon said seizure, and has he been paid? If not, what is the cause of the delay?

Mr PATERSON:

1 and 2. Certain imported articles in the telephone factory at Dunnville have been seized for contravention of the customs laws. No definite offer of payment has yet been made in respect of the customs claims in this case. The decision rendered in the case calls for payment of $3,000 to cover customs duties and penalties—the goods to be forfeited in default of payment.

3. The customs officers named in the report as making the seizure are John E. Potts and James R. Dunlop.

4. There has been no award made to the officers concerned in this seizure, as the minister's decision has not been accepted and the matter is not yet closed. The awards to seizing officers are discretionary with the department, but not exceeding one-fourth of the amount forfeited.

ESCOTT POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. What is the present salary of the postmaster at Escott, county of Leeds, Ontario?

2. When was this salary last increased, and why was it increased?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Present salary $95; rent allowance, $6; total $101.

2. (a) April 1, 1909; (b) the revenue of the office for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, entitled the postmaster to an increase.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing in detail the expenses incurred and paid for the Paris exposition in 1900, as payments of the colonial committee on account of space, &c., $87,000, as shown in the report of the Auditor General for 1899-1900, page D—15.—Mr. Paquet.

For a return showing all convictions and fines reported from the electoral division of Victoria, N.B., including the county of Madawaska, for violation of sections 148 and 150 of the Criminal Code, respectively, with the names and residences of defendants and of the persons to whom the said fines were paid, and showing the disposal made of the fine in each case; also for a return showing all fines collected in said electoral division for violation of said sections without the formality of a conviction, with the names and residences of the persons paying the same, and of the persons to whom paid; and showing the disposal made of the fine in each case; also for a return showing all weapons seized under section 148, or delivered under section 144, and the disposal made thereof.—Mr. Crocket.

WAYS AND MEANS—PRESS REPORTS OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. LENNOX. Before you leave the Chair, I wish to call the attention of the House to the manner in which the proceedings of this House are being reported by a journal which was once regarded as trustworthy in the province of Ontario particularly, and throughout the Dominion of Canada—I refer to the Toronto 'Globe.' I regret to say concerning the report of the proceedings of this session, I can not give it much of a certificate. There was a time, notably when Mr. Matthews represented that journal in the Press gallery, that the 'Globe' contained what I regarded as exceedingly honourable and straight reports. I recognize that this article of which I am complaining, may not have emanated from the press gallery, but it emanated from some one identified with the 'Globe,' of course. I have been in public life for some time; I recognize that it is not necessary for the members of this House to be thin-skinned and that if it relates to a mere matter of comment, although injurious, ill-timed and unjustifiable, I generally think it all right to let it go. If I had been sensitive about the conduct of this journal, for instance dur-

ing the present session—I refer as much to editorial comment as otherwise—I would have spoken very often of the slanders with which that journal has distinguished me. But, naturally, under the circumstances, I would be disposed to subscribe to the doctrine enunciated by Sir John Macdonald, that the most stones and sticks are found beneath the best apple trees. I need not be sensitive about that matter, but when it comes to a deliberate, inexcusable falsification, not comment, but a representation of fact and an absolutely untruthful, unfounded representation of fact, a slanderous statement which goes perhaps beyond anything that we have had for many years in journalism in Canada, I think it is time, not so much for myself, but for the vindication of the honour of parliament, that the matter should be dealt with, on Saturday last——

Some hon. MEMBERS. At an early hour.

Mr. LENNOX. At an early hour, I should say on Saturday morning. A few members of the House were here attending to their duty. We acting, as we believed, in the public interest. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey), chose that time to discuss a very important phase of the reciprocity question, and to move that, in so far as the schedules now before the House relate to fruit and vegetables, the tariff, as it at present exists, should remain unaltered. We, on this side of the House, did not consider that—speaking for myself at all events, I can say that I did not think that there was very strong evidence that the hon. member for Wentworth was acting in good faith but being, to a man, I believe, opposed to the reciprocity proposals of the government, and this being an amendment in opposition to a portion of them, we seized that opportunity to evince our thorough opposition as far as it went to the reciprocity scheme. It will surprise you, Mr. Speaker, to know that our action in that regard has been characterized by the 'Globe' as a Conservative vote for reciprocity, taking the black and big headlines as a starting point.

CONSERVATIVES VOTE FOR RECIPROCITY.

That naturally means the Conservative party. It would surprise you, Mr. Speaker, it would more surprise, I suppose, the Deputy Speaker, who was here at the time, to know that that was followed by other headlines almost as black though not as big.

Mr. LENNOX.

ALL BUT FRUIT AND VEGETABLE SCHEDULE RECEIVES THEIR APPROVAL.
MR. SEALEY'S RESOLUTION.
OPPOSITION EAGER TO SUPPORT AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT.
(Special despatch to 'The Globe.')
Ottawa, April 23——

That is Sunday. If this nefarious, this diabolical, this utterly unjustifiable, concocted falsification had occurred next morning in the newspaper there would not be much to say in mitigation, but there might be a little. But, when we find that, perhaps under the sanctimonious ægis of the pious editor of the 'Globe,' it was conceived and concocted on Sunday, I was going to say we are surprised, but we are not surprised very much at the hypocrisy and the dishonesty of that gentleman. I am not going to say for certain that he is the father of this; I do not know. He would make a very good step-father, however, judging from some things that have occurred before.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He reads it.

Mr. LENNOX. He may read it and is responsible for it to some extent.

Ottawa, April 23.—At an early hour on Saturday morning, six Conservative members of the Commons joined Mr. Sealey of Wentworth in voting general approval of the reciprocal trade arrangement negotiated for Canada by Hon. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson. It was a striking commentary on the insincerity of the 'annexation,' 'disintegration,' 'no mandate' and 'lack of information' objections raised in turn by the opposition against the whole proposal.

The Wentworth man submitted his amendment to Mr. Fielding's resolution approving the schedules——

Mark you, approving the schedules.

—shortly before 3 o'clock, at the conclusion of an address in which he upheld the agreement with the exception of the single schedule dealing with fruit and vegetables. He moved that that portion be struck out, and that the entire balance of the proposals be confirmed and approved—'that the resolution as amended be adopted,' to quote the words of the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was the amendment.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Public Works is always too quick in suggesting something that he does not know anything about. That was not the amendment, nor does any hon. gentleman say it was. This will not be the last time, judging from what has already occurred, that the hon. gentleman would get up and rush in where honest men or angels would fear to go. It was not the amendment and I have the records by me. I will prove what the amendment was. The hon. member for Wentworth rode two horses throughout his whole speech. It

was good lord and good devil all the way through, nobody on this side of the House was deceived, and from expressions by hon. gentlemen on that side, I judge that they too were not deceived as to the utter insincerity of the hon. gentleman in his motion. As I noticed that he was trying to gain some kudos where he was not entitled to any praise I asked him a question before he moved his resolution. I wanted to point out that the hon. gentleman was insincere and I, for my part, was determined that when he moved the resolution, which was part of what we wanted, I would support him and I would not allow him to sneak out by having it withdrawn from the House and saying that he could not get a vote for it. I did not want to put this hon. gentleman in a hole, but to enable him to still save his reputation if that is what he would call it. So I asked the hon. gentleman this question:

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman having spoken about one schedule, and about trying to get an amendment in there, does he recollect that the Minister of Finance has declared distinctly that we will have to support this measure as a whole or not at all, that it is not divisible in any way? Has the hon. gentleman noticed that?

Mr. SEALEY. I have noticed that, and I referred to it a short time ago. I said that that was contended, but that I did not agree with it, and that I think the majority of this House can differ from it if they choose.

Of course the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) is a very high authority. He is the gentleman who went over to the United States and introduced this whole scheme. I have a record of his speech on this famous occasion, and I hope to make some remarks upon it when the proper time comes.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman not realize that the majority of the House have either to adopt this as a whole or reject it as a whole?

Mr. SEALEY. Well, that may be the result; may you be a good prophet.

Mr. LENNOX. They must do that.

Mr. SEALEY. I do not agree that they must do that. If they adopt my view they will not do it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. Pugsley rushes in here where he had absolutely no business, but because he wanted to detract from the force of my remarks, he interupted ; and he had no right to do so because I had the leave of the hon. member for Wentworth to ask a question. Mr. Pugsley says:

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) is not entitled to interrupt the hon. member who has the floor.

And for that gratuitous interference which was thoroughly unjustifiable and characteristic of my hon. friend, the Deputy Speaker called him to order. I may say that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) although he gave me liberty to interrupt him continued standing and the Deputy Speaker says:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is usual that the gentleman who is allowing permission to interrupt to sit down while the questions are being asked so that two may not be standing at once.

Mr. Sealey then sat down. Then I made this remark which shows pretty well what my attitude was:

Mr. LENNOX. Does not the hon. member realize that the proposition he makes is absolutely impracticable, and has no common sense in it?

Well I think that was a little harsh. I felt so utterly indignant that such a fake motion should be brought before the House that I probably expressed myself a little more strongly than I ought to. I do not think that was quite the proper language to address to the hon. gentleman, but at all events he answered that everybody was entitled to his view of what was common sense and he was quite right in that. Now I will read to the House, and it will be specially and directly intended for the Minister of Public Works who was not here but who has been recently posted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who was here.

Mr. LENNOX. I was wrong then, I thought he was not here, the hon. member for Wentworth, by way of riding for a fall and hoping and praying that the amendment would not be put from the chair, recited a number of authorities pro and con and beclouded the issue to some extent, and then he says :

Thus the rule in committee is the same as in the House; in the House no seconder is required and no notice is needed. Based upon the authorities the following amendment is moved.

Then what was moved, and what was voted upon, and what is said by the 'Globe' to have been an endorsement of the reciprocity part, and what I say I am prepared to stand by any time as part of what the country is entitled to, and what I am prepared to meet any hon. gentleman on that side of the House including the Prime Minister and discuss before the people and I will tell the people then what I have already told them that this is an absolutely unjustifiable pact from beginning to end, was :

Mr. Sealey, moves in amendment to the resolution 'that it is expedient to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907.' That schedule A, thereto be amended by striking out in lines seven and eight thereof the words 'onions, cabbage, and all other vegetables in their na-

tural state,' and in lines nine and ten thereof the words 'pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state,' and in lines eleven and twelve thereof the words 'peaches, pears and apricots, dried, desiccated or evaporated.'

That is the motion that Mr. Sealey read, that is the motion that was read to the House, that is the motion that we voted upon, if the Minister of Public Works will bear it in mind, and that is the motion upon which the 'Globe' founded its utterly lying article in saying that six members of the Conservative party voted their approval of reciprocity. Now having read that, I may say that the 'Globe' does make one true statement and that is that I said it was an excellent motion or something of that kind, by way of sarcasm. I propose to read part of what the 'Globe' has to say for the purpose of specifically characterizing some of it in a way that such a lying disreputable article deserves. I see the Prime Minister smiling—I hope he likes this kind of thing. I hope he thinks that the 'Globe' has done itself credit by this article. I beg to say to the right hon. gentleman for whom I entertain a very great respect, that I also have the right to judge of what is fair play, and what is not. I am prepared to give the press every latitude and I am prepared to get a thrashing when I deserve it, and I have got some blows and some of them I deserved.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. I have. But I have fought for what I thought was honest in this House from first to last, and I have never said behind any man's back what I was afraid to say to his face. While I have not the ability, I have just as keen a sense of honesty and fairness as any man in this House. I have said in the House—and I am not a wobbler—I have said in the country that this pact is the most unfair proposition so far as the farming community is concerned that was ever imposed upon any farmers in any country at any time in the history of the world. Yes, and I will meet the right hon. gentleman if he likes, and although I recognize that his ability towers mountains high over mine, I will meet him upon that platform, and I have no fear that I will carry with me the sensible, thoughtful, earnest, intelligent people of the country, against my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some people also say the same thing in the United States.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not guided by the United States, and thank God I am not guided by my right hon. friend either. I am guided by the sober-second thought of the great farming community of this country, and they are going almost to a man against my hon. friend.

Mr. LENNOX.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. Not when they get these lying articles, but when they get the truth from the Conservatives upon the public platforms of the country. Here is the heading in the 'Globe:

Conservatives vote for reciprocity.

There are some men on that side of the House who like the tailors of Tooley street think that two or three of them constitute the whole people of Canada, but the men on this side of the House do not think so. The 'Globe' says:

Conservatives vote for reciprocity.

That is the first fair square falsehood of the "Globe' and it is put in big headlines. Then it says:

All but fruit and vegetable schedules receive their approval.

That is falsehood number two deliberately concocted on Sunday by the pious people who represent the 'Globe:

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman who interrupts can just look after his own kitchen. If he has nothing more to be ashamed of than I have, he is more respectable than I think he is.

Mr. TALBOT. Once more.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, twenty times more, if necessary. There is one hon. gentleman in this House who fills but one role, and fills it often, but fills it badly, because he fills it to the discredit of his own party, and that is the hon. gentleman who has no ability except to interrupt other hon. gentlemen when they are speaking.

Mr. TALBOT. He does not block any.

Mr. LENNOX. Now, here is a statement, which is true:

Opposition Eager to Support Amendment to Agreement.

They were perfectly eager to support it, because the hon. gentleman who moved it wanted it bowled out to save his friends and himself at the same time. But we did not want him to play that game on us. I said it was a good motion, and urged the opposition to vote for it, and tried to prevent the Chairman ruling it out of order, although the hon. member for Wentworth was praying that he should rule it out of order. There was a note on the resolution that it should be ruled out of order, and he scratched that part out, and the motion stood as originally read, and was of course voted down by the government. Now, I will read another few lines:

Ottawa, April 23.—At an early hour on Saturday morning six Conservative members of the Commons joined Mr. Sealey, of Wentworth, in voting general approval of the reciprocal trade arrangement.

Mark you Mr. Speaker, the wording 'General approval.'

That is lie number three. No one member of this House on the Conservative side has ever voted general approval of that arrangement, and I do not think any hon. member on this side of the House ever will. Now, I will skip a few lines, although it is all good reading:

The Wentworth man submitted his amendment to Mr. Fielding's resolution approving the schedules shortly before three o'clock.

That is falsehood number four. There was no amendment submitted approving of the schedule. Then, further down:

He moved that that portion be struck out—

That is, referring to the portion dealing with vegetables and fruits——

—and that the entire balance of the proposals be confirmed and approved "that the resolution as amended be adopted."

These quotation marks are intended to indicate that the words quoted were taken from the amendment. Well, the hon. member for Wentworth and another hon. gentleman who has had a good deal to say about this will have to get up a little earlier in the morning before they can fool the Conservative party or any one of them on any such bogus ideas as that. The hon. gentleman read out no such resolution, and no such resolution was read in the House. I hold in my hand the records of the House, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to say that he can find in them one word to justify falsehood number five of the 'Globe' article. The article goes on, under the head, 'The Conservative vote,' and says:

And after weeks of denunciation of everything in connection with the agreement, every Conservative in the House at the time, with one exception, voted for confirmation of the remaining proposals.

Now, I want to characterize that as the meanest and most contemptible falsehood that I recollect ever having read in the journalism of the Dominion of Canada. There is no excuse for it. There could be no mistake. It was not one of those hurried messages sent from the press gallery. Whilst we can compliment the press gallery for their general accuracy, we can realize that there will occasionally be some misapprehensions. But this was done in cold blood, on Sunday, after going to church and praying for the general evangelization of the world, I presume——

An hon MEMBER. And the peace of the world.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, and the peace of the world, because the pious editor of the 'Globe' is right at that business now, in order to distract attention from the proposals of the two gentlemen who went to Washington. After all this, and with 'Hansard' lying before him all Saturday, they make the most contemptible attempt at falsehood that has appeared in Canadian journalism for a very long time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has thought proper to refer to me, and at first said that I was not present.

Mr. LENNOX. I corrected that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was present and I voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Wentworth, and I may say that we all noticed that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) rose at first as if to vote for it, but apparently it dawned upon him that he would be voting for a resolution approving of the reciprocity agreement, with vegetables and fruits struck out.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not true.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Hamilton gave his reason for not voting. Why does the hon. gentleman not give that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Hamilton immediately took his seat, and I did not hear him give his reason.

Mr. BLAIN. 'Hansard' will tell you.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no doubt a reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should be angry. I would be angry myself if I had gone about the country telling the people that the reciprocity agreement meant annexation and the dismemberment of the empire, and then found myself voting for a resolution which approved of the agreement with that portion referring to vegetables and fruits struck out. I would have been angry too, even on Sunday.

Mr. LENNOX. You cannot be angry; we cannot make you angry.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Now, I think my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has not been just to the reporter of the 'Globe.' I think he has treated him most unfairly. That gentleman is in a position where he cannot reply, at the present time at all events, although he may have an opportunity, and I trust that he will avail himself of it, of doing that in another way and on another occasion. Now, I wish to say, as one who was present, and I am sure that the Deputy Speaker will verify what I say, that the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Wentworth stated distinctly that the resolution should be amended by striking out those portions of the schedule which referred to vegetables and fruits, and that the resolution as amended

be adopted. The Deputy Speaker read those words twice. The deputy clerk told me a few minutes ago that he had given it to 'Hansard,' and that one line had been omitted by 'Hansard.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If any one looks at the resolution and sees the portion erased in pencil by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey), he will see that the words below the part erased escaped the attention of 'Hansard.' The amendment, as read by the hon. member for Wentworth and twice by the Deputy Speaker, contains the words: 'That the resolution as amended be adopted.' This is the resolution:

Mr. Sealey, moves in amendment to the resolution 'that it is expedient to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907.' That schedule A. thereto be amended by striking out in line seven and eight thereof the words 'onions, cabbage, and all other vegetables in their natural state,' and in lines nine and ten thereof the words 'pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state,' and in lines eleven and twelve thereof the words 'peaches, pears and apricots, dried, desiccated or evaporated', and that the resolution as amended be adopted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) look at the amendment itself—the amendment obtained from the assistant clerk in the last ten minutes.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask if this document is the one which was handed by the hon. member for Wentworth to the Deputy Speaker—the original copy?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and handed me within ten minutes by the assistant clerk. Whether or not hon. gentlemen opposite, in their frenzied desire to vote for any motion which apparently was against the government, stultified themselves, I know not, but certainly the reporter of the 'Globe' cannot be blamed for having taken the resolution exactly as it was read, and the votes of hon. gentlemen exactly as they gave them. So far from any fault being found with the reporter of the 'Globe,' he ought to be commended for having reported correctly the amendment submitted to the committee and the names of those who voted for it. He could not be supposed to know that hon. gentlemen opposite did not understand what they were doing. He would assume that they had understood the amendment moved by the hon. member for Wentworth, and twice repeated by the Chairman of the committee before it was put to the vote. I think that on reflection hon. gentlemen opposite, though they may regret having placed themselves in a position in which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) says they had no intention of being, will acknowledge that the reporter of the 'Globe' can in no way be blamed, because he reported exactly the amendment as it was moved by the hon. member for Wentworth, and as it was voted upon by hon. members.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). As an old newspaper man, I can quite understand a reporter making an error, especially at a late hour of the night, but I have no hesitation in saying that the man who reported this was not present that night at all. There can be no doubt that there was a small clique present that night who intended to put up a plant on the Conservative party, and this was part of their game. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) may have been one of them for all I know. But I know that the facts were not such as the hon. minister says they were because I was present during the debate and distinctly heard the Deputy Speaker ask the hon. member from Wentworth to read over the resolution a second time. He did so and the hon. member for Wentworth read it over. Then the resolution was sent back, and the hon. member for Wentworth was asked by the Deputy Speaker, if he wanted the portions struck out with the pencil put to the House, and he said he did not. Then something was said with reference to hogs, but the strange part of the thing was that the news about what was going to happen was known in the wine room.

Mr. LENNOX. I thought there was none.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). There happens to be a wine room or a boozarium. I took the trouble the next morning, as soon as I got hold of the 'Hansard,' to see if there was such a clause in the resolution, but found nothing of the kind. I did not hear that clause read in the House nor could the 'Globe' reporter have heard it because he was not present. I was here and did not see him, and I know the reporters of the 'Globe' as a rule. I consider that this article is a deliberate attempt to falsify what took place in this House; and if the traditions of the 'Globe' newspaper hold, as they always have hitherto done, the man who wrote that article will be dismissed. He would be without any hesitation on any respectable newspaper. The records of the House, with the exceptions of some errors, are shown plainly on 'Hansard' the next day; and if that resolution had been offered to the Deputy Speaker, with that clause added to it, he would have ruled it out of order. But it was struck out, and for that reason the amendment was accepted, and put to the House. The whole thing is a tempest in a tea-pot, but I quite understand how frantically the government grasp at straws in the hope of making out that some members on this side are supporting this pact. They know that

they are sitting on a keg of gunpowder, and that at any moment something may go up, and they are anxious to impress upon the public that prominent members of the Conservative party are supporting this proposed agreement. This is not the first sample which the Conservative party have had of this sort of thing. One Liberal paper had a commissioner going through my riding, doing what is called back-firing. Those who live on the prairies will understand what is meant by that expression. It was trying to make the public believe that the Conservatives are supporting something which they are not. They sent a commissioner through my riding who put down a large number of Conservatives as supporting this pact, which was not the case, and some of them publicly repudiated his yarns. I know that the members of the press are as a rule highly honourable and desirous of telling the truth, and that reporting is usually correct. It is not the news colums but the editorial which is usally the lying end of a paper. But the man who wrote this as an item of news did it deliberately, and he got his news from parties who get their information in the boozarium of the House, and who did not give the facts as they were.

Mr. SPROULE. As one interested in this because it is really a question of privilege, I desire to say a few words regarding it. I say deliberately that the article is a libellous reflection on the members of this House, and that the party who wrote it knew—if he knew anything at all about what took place—that he was absolutely writing a libel. I want to say that every reporter representing the press of this country is here by the courtesy of parliament and enjoys the privileges of parliament under certain conditions, one of which is that he must observe the rules.

One rule is:

> Any stranger admitted into any part of the House or gallery, who misconducts himself, or does not withdraw when strangers are directed to withdraw, while the House, or any committee of the whole House, is sitting, shall be taken into custody.

Every member of this House enjoys freedom of speech. Every one who reflects upon the conduct of members of the House or misrepresents what they have said or the records of this House, is reflecting upon the members. This is a libellous reflection on the members. The third edition of Flint & Bourinot says, at page 151:

> Any scandalous and libellous reflections on the proceedings of the House is a high breach of the privileges of parliament, but the libel must be based on matters arising in the usual transaction of the business of the House.

This was the usual transaction of business. This refers to the record of parliament. This refers to what members of parliament said and did. This is an absolute libel on those members of parliament, a libellous reflection. It is within the rights of any member of this parliament to move to bring before the Bar of the House the man who wrote this and have him dealt with by the House as to his merit or demerit deserves. This has been done before and no doubt will be done again, and if the writer of that article got what he deserves he would be brought before the Bar of this House and made to apologize for his libellous conduct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For telling the truth?

Mr. SPROULE. I say I am justified in saying that because there is the record of parliament. Does the record of parliament bear that out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. There is the 'Hansard.' What does the 'Hansard' say? The 'Hansard' gives the resolution as read by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and there is not one single word of the concluding portion of it that the writer in the 'Globe' declares it contains. Then is it not a libel on the members of parliament and of the House? The hon. Minister of Public Works, wishing to defend this reporter, said it was quite clear from the conduct of the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that there was something wrong because he first started to get up and vote for it and then, thinking he would be committing himself (this appeared to be something that emanated from the inner recesses of the Minister of Public Works mind), he sat down again. How did he know he did it for that reason?

Mr. LENNOX. He did not do it at all.

Mr. SPROULE. He did not do it. The Minister of Public Works said the 'Globe' said the same thing that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) read at the end, finishing up as the 'Globe' article says, 'and that the motion as amended be adopted.' What does Mr. Sealey say in 'Hansard' with regard to that? When the motion was read from the Chair the hon. Deputy Speaker said: I find at the bottom here, something to the effect that this may be withdrawn. Does the hon. member wish that to remain here? That note was evidently intended to let the Chairman know that the mover was willing to have the motion ruled out of order. He went on to say that there was something about pork. The Minister of Public Works said that the motion if adopted meant that the whole resolution as amended be adopted in Committee and yet the hon member for

Wentworth himself says after he had read it:

I had included in the resolution, or proposed in the first place, to put hog products back where they formerly were, but with the view of getting the best possible support for the fruit and vegetable industry, I propose to leave hog products to be taken care of a little later.

How could they be taken care of a little later? By another resolution. If the resolution as amended had been adopted, then how could it be amended again? Is it not as plain as it could be that that was the intention of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) to move another resolution or have some of his friends do so, to put hog products on exactly the same footing as they were before this resolution was introduced. That is what the member for Wentworth says, and yet the Minister of Public Works said that the member read and included in his resolution that the motion as amended be adopted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say if the Minister of Public Works makes that statement that I was sitting a good deal closer to the chairman than he was, and I will take my solemn affidavit that I never heard such words read out. I was listening very closely, and I say positively that they were not read out, and the man who made the statement that it was a portion of the resolution is a liar and a libeller, and is unworthy to occupy a position in the gallery, or receive the privileges of this House to do so. I say this with the greater pleasure and force, because I have generally recognized that the reporting that goes to the 'Globe' newspaper is tolerably fair and correct, and this was to my mind the most outrageous, the most untruthful, the most slanderous, and the most libellous article I have ever known to go from that gallery to the 'Globe' during the 33 years I have been here. If justice was meted out to that gentleman he would be brought before the bar of this House and made apologize for his libellous article.

The authorities quoted by the hon. member for Wentworth all go to prove exactly what I have said that he had the right to move that resolution, because he gave the quotation showing that according to English practice:

Every member has a right of moving an amendment without giving notice thereof. This amendment may propose:
1. To leave out certain words.
2. To leave out certain words, in order to insert or add others.
3. To insert or add certain words.

And:

'When a member intends to move an important amendment in Committee of the Whole, to a Bill, he is not required, according to Canadian practice, to give notice of such amendment.'

Before that he quotes:

'Committees are regarded as portions of the House, limited in their inquiries by the extent of the authority given them; but governed for the most part in their proceedings by the same rules which prevail in the House.'

He read all these authorities to justify his right of submitting the resolution which he had, and that resolution was submitted, and read. I listened to it carefully, and the resolution was word for word as it appears in the 'Hansard'; there is the official record of this House that it was so. Now, when and where was the devilish scheme concocted to libel members of this House? (Was it inspired by the Minister of Public Works)? I am much inclined to think it was, from the observation he made with regard to what he quoted from the member for Hamilton.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order. I ask you whether it is competent for an hon. gentleman to state that he believes I inspired this devilish scheme, or language like that? I ask you if it is parliamentary, and I ask him to withdraw that statement. I desire to say further that not until I heard this statement read by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), did I know that it was in the 'Globe.' But I have seen a similar statement in one of the Ottawa papers. Now while I am on my feet I do think——

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman talking to a point of order?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a right to speak to the point of order, and I say that the Minister of Public Works deliberately misstates what I said. I asked the question whether it was inspired, and I asked again, was it inspired by him? Then I said, I am very much inclined to think it may have been—those were the words—and I respectfully submit to you that they are within the rules of parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), does not directly charge the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), with concocting a devilish scheme, but I think he, as an old member of the House, must know that he comes very near being out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will you not agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that it is a cowardly thing to say on the part of the hon, member for East Grey?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for East Grey says that he did not make the statement, but merely asked the question.

Mr. LENNOX. I ask the Minister of Public Works to take back the expression that the statement of the hon. member for East Grey was a cowardly statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question I asked you was this: Do you not think it is a cowardly thing for a man to say that he believes I did such a thing, and afterwards to say that I may have done it? Do you not think that is cowardly?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member for East Grey had made the statement affirmatively he would have been out of order. I have already ruled several times that the word 'cowardly' should not be used in debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was simply endeavouring to obtain your opinion. If it is to be inferred that I called the hon. gentleman or his action 'cowardly' I will take it back of course.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not feel too much inclined to follow it up, knowing the source from which it comes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, do you think that is in order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. member for East Grey to say he had not made the statement that the Minister of Public Works had inspired or concocted this devilish statement. I understood him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not make that statement, therefore, I have no occasion to withdraw it. I said, from the circumstances connected with what he said concerning the member for Hamilton, was it not likely that he inspired it? And I said circumstances led me to believe it. I was quite within my rights in saying that. Now, I have only to say in conclusion that it is a libellous reflection upon the members of parliament. Hon. gentlemen may laugh. They would do well to take to heart that psalm which speaks of 'the noisy laughter of the fool.' That laughter is the greatest reflection on the hon. gentlemen who indulge in it. I say the characters of members of parliament are sacred, and they should be respected by those who are allowed to enjoy the privileges of sitting within the precincts of parliament and sending out reports to the world of our proceedings. The rules of the House provide that severe punishment may be meted out to any one who violates the privileges of parliament, as this hon. gentleman has done. He has done it, I have no doubt, knowingly, done it deliberately, done it I believe maliciously, done it untruthfully, and, therefore, he is unworthy the name of gentleman, either in this House or out of it. Now, I listened carefully to the resolution, I heard every word of it, and I am willing to make affidavit to every word I have said with regard to the resolution that was read, and it is corroborated by the records of this House. Any one that will go beyond that and falsify a record, and libel members of this House, deserves the supreme contempt of every honest and truthful man in this country.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to voice my complaint that we on this side of the House are not fairly reported by the Toronto 'Globe,' as set out in the copy that is before you, 'Conservatives vote for reciprocity. The fruit and vegetable schedule receives their approval.' Mr. Sealey's resolution. Opposition eager to support amendment to agreement.' I will not read the balance of the report, because my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), has read it all, with the exception of one statement which refers to myself, and my conduct in the House on this question, both on the occasion which is under discussion, and when I spoke previously on the general question some time ago. I have before me what was in the original motion handed in by the hon. member for Wentworth to the Chairman, and I will read it:

Mr. Sealey moves in amendment to the resolution 'that it is expedient to amend the Customs tariff, 1907.' That schedule A thereto be amended by striking out in lines 7 and 8 thereof the words 'onions, cabbage, and all other vegetables in their natural state,' and in lines 9 and 10 thereof the words 'pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state,' and in lines 11 and 12 thereof the words 'peaches, pears and apricots, dried, desiccated or evaporated.'

That is the motion as it was read by the Chairman, and read by Mr. Sealey, the member for Wentworth, as the 'Hansard' I have in my hand will show. The resolution continues in these words, all of which have been erased, either by Mr. Sealey, who made the motion, or by the Chairman of the committee.

Also that schedule B thereto be amended by substituting the figures '2' for '1¼' in the fourth line thereof, and by substituting the figures '2' for '1¼' in the seventh line thereof, and by substituting the figures '2' for '1¼' in the eleventh line thereof, all of which refer to hog products.

By way of explanation, I am willing to withdraw for the present, the section which applies to hog products, if any hon. members hesitate to support it on that account, because I am most anxious that the favourable support, I trust the House will give the fruit

and vegetable industry, should not be disarranged in any way.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is that addressed to?

Mr. BLAIN. It is the resolution as handed by the hon. member for Wentworth to the chairman, as stated in the House tonight, and the chairman is within the hearing of my voice when I say that the former part of the motion that I read is the only part of the motion that was read by the chairman, either when it was handed to him or subsequently to these erasures having been made by the hon. member for Wentworth. I was here in my position in the House of Commons and in the presence of my hon. friend the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of the Committee when this was up for consideration, and I make the statement without any fear of successful contradiction that the Deputy Speaker did not read the resolution as stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with very great hesitation indeed that I say anything with regard to this matter, but the words of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) become almost to me a distinct challenge to give my memory at least of what occurred. I have seen 'Hansard,' and I have read it. With regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey), it appears in 'Hansard' only where it was read by the hon. member for Wentworth; it appears as part of his speech. With regard to its correctness or incorrectness as it appears in the speech I have nothing to say; I offer no opinion whatever. When the amendment was sent down to me in the chair I read it to the committee. At the close of what I read I added some words to the effect that there appeared other words in the paper that did not, to my mind, have anything to do with the amendment, nor do I recall his having read them. I sent the amendment to the hon. member for Wentworth, and he having said that these words had nothing to do with it, the amendment then came down to me with these words erased. They were not the only words erased in the amendment; unfortunately there were other words in a previous part erased as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Peel. Unfortunately, 'Hansard' does not in any way report the fact that I read the amendment at that stage, nor the remarks that I added after reading it, so there is nothing but my memory and the memory of the hon. members of this House as to what actually was read at that moment. If the reporters had taken what I read, not from any copy nor waiting for a copy, but if they had taken my actual words it would probably have cleared up some of the misunderstanding that now exists. Whether hon. members paid very much attention to my reading or not I cannot tell, but the fact that I had to send the amendment back to the hon. member for Wentworth probably took up their attention. In addition there arose two points of order that had to be discussed to some extent, and had to be ruled upon. This probably took up the attention of members more than the reading of the amendment. When these were disposed of and it became necessary to submit the amendment to the committee I read the amendment again, but unfortunately 'Hansard' took no note of the fact. The amendment was put and lost. There is now, therefore, on 'Hansard' as a report of what that amendment contained only 'Hansard's' report as it appears in the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth. It therefore comes back to this that as to what the chairman did and what he read, the members of the House having heard it, they will have to decide whether he read all of that amendment or not each having his own view. Acting as chairman, I have always endeavoured to read carefully every amendment, and not only have I done that, but I have endeavoured to read it in a clear, careful, tone of voice, with careful articulation and careful attention to punctuation, in order that the meaning may be conveyed. I believe that I gave that same careful attention to this amendment that I have given to all. It is true that the memory of men as to their actions is sometimes deceptive. I accept fully the good faith and honesty of hon. members who have declared that they did not hear these words read. I can quite understand and believe that these words could be read under these circumstances and read clearly and distinctly and not sink into their attention. It was two o'clock in the morning, it was after a long day's debate, and it was after they heard this amendment proposed by the hon. member for Wentworth himself. It frequently happens—and hon. members, if they look into their inner consciences will agree with me—that the ultimate reading of a motion or amendment by the presiding officer is considered a perfunctory act and the members of the committee pay slight attention to it. It is with great reluctance that I rise to make these remarks, and I would very much have preferred not to have done so. I had not seen the amendment from the moment I disposed of it, and declared it lost until a moment ago when the hon. member for Peel showed it to me to ascertain if it was the same document. It appeared to be the same document, and in the same condition. If that document was read properly and correctly by me, I should have read the words 'and that the resolution as amended be adopted,' because these words exist in the amendment now and are not struck out. If they were not

read it would be a fault of mine. I have some reluctance in speaking exactly and clearly from memory with regard to these words inasmuch as 'Hansard' has not reported them at all, inasmuch as in all these matters, when a man does not hear, he may think perhaps that certain things were not done and inasmuch as a man may perhaps be somewhat clear about doing a certain thing while he may not have done it. But, I must say that, as a matter of justice both to myself and to others, I believe I read all of that resolution as it now stands. If I have made an error I am sorry for it, but I can tell the House that there was that special character to these words that held my attention, I was conscious of it when I read them, and it would not have been a surprise to me if some point of order had been raised with regard to them because it is a debatable point as to whether such words could properly be added to such a motion. It is, therefore, with me, a case in which my ordinary memory is strengthened by that particular feature of it. If you ask me do I remember any particular allusion with regard to certain vegetables I would say no, I do not remember any such single allusion, but I must frankly tell the House that I have a consciousness of reading these particular words for the reasons I have given.

I read them with as much emphasis and clearness as I gave to other parts, but I would say this, that I do not believe the hon. members who voted for that resolution, apart from the hon. member for Wentworth, realized the force and effect of these words; I do not think so. I did not feel that it was my duty to call attention to them unless I was prepared to rule them out of order, and I therefore put the amendment as I believe it existed, and I think I may fairly say that I gave the amendment word for word, including the particular words that have been objected to. I say this in consciousness that any man might believe very distinctly as to what happened on a certain occasion, and yet may have been mistaken, and I say this believing that the members who say that they did not hear these words, speak in all honesty and good faith.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not going to offer any comment upon my hon. friend's statement. I am going to say for myself that this is what was read:

Mr. Sealey moves in amendment to the resolution 'that it is expedient to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907.' That schedule A. thereto be amended by striking out in lines seven and eight thereof the words 'onions, cabbage and all other vegetables in their natural state,' and in lines nine and ten thereof the words 'pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state,' and in lines eleven and twelve thereof the words 'peaches, pears and apricots, dried, desiccated or evaporated.'

I am going to say that I was sitting here in my place in the House, and took part in the discussion; that I listened very carefully because I was particularly interested in what was read, and I make the statement from my place in the House, that the motion which I have just now read, is what was read, not only by the chairman, but by the member for Wentworth. Now, as to whether I was fairly reported or not in the 'Globe,' I have a word or two to say. The 'Globe,' newspaper says this:

Mr. Blain went further and intimated his readiness to second the amendment should his services have been required. I wish to say, declared the member for Peel, that I am heartily in accord with it and I shall now or at any other opportunity give it my hearty support. The significance of this twist in position is emphasized by the fact that Messrs. Blain, Lennox, Sproule and Currie had already spoken and condemned the entire agreement.'

That is the statement of the 'Globe,' and now I shall read what I did say, and it is reported in 'Hansard,' so that the House and the country will see whether there was any occasion for misrepresenting me as the Toronto 'Globe' did in this article. I quote from page 7703 of 'Hansard':

Mr. BLAIN. The explanation given by my hon. friend (Mr. Sealey) and the authorities he has quoted prove that the resolution is in order. I wish to say I am heartily in accord with the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Sealey), and I shall now or at any other opportuuity give it my hearty support. It is along the line of justice and fair play to a very large proportion of the people of this country who will be injuriously affected if the motion of the Minister of Finance is carried in this House.

Surely that is plain, surely there can be no misunderstanding about that. And, there was no misunderstanding of it by any member on either side of the House when I made that statement. And there was no misunderstanding about it on the part of gentlemen on either side of the press gallery. Had the report been sent by telegraph to the 'Globe' and appeared the morning after I made the statement there might be a mistake, and I would not offer special criticism, but when that statement was made, and Saturday intervened, and Sunday intervened, and in cold blood on Monday morning the Toronto 'Globe' absolutely misrepresents my position and falsifies my statement to the House, I have a right to complain. I may tell the 'Globe' and all that are associated with it, that the gentlemen who read the 'Globe' in the county of Peel, will believe

my statement in preference to the statement of the 'Globe' upon this occasion. I shall say nothing further on that point. I may add that my position on this question was explained long ago. Every man on this side of the House, and every man on the other side of the House too, knows that I was always in favour of a fair measure of protection for every interest of the farmer. I have moved resolutions in the House, and I have voted for resolutions moved by other gentlemen in this House in favour of not only leaving the protection to the farmers, as it now is, but in favour of the government increasing the protection afforded the farming interests of this country. For the 'Globe' to say now that I have twisted—when it is the 'Globe' itself that has been twisting—is untrue. I may add that if the reports which appear in the Toronto 'Globe' from day to day, as to the converts it is making, and that the government is making, in favour of their reciprocity proposition, have no more solid foundation than has this article, the people of the country will, when they get an opportunity to vote, condemn the government and its policy.

Mr. ROCHE. I have only a word or two to say in corroboration of the statements which have been made by my colleagues in regard to the untruthful character of the reports appearing in to-day's 'Globe.' I was one of the seven who voted in favour of the resolution of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey). I was fully seized of its contents. I think my character for sobriety is well enough known in this House, even at that hour in the morning, and my intelligence is at least of the average. I think I know the effect of every motion that is read in this House before I cast my vote upon it. I will not vouch for it that the gentleman who wrote that article possesses the same qualities that I have just laid claim to in regard to myself. If he was temporarily bereft of his senses I could understand him writing such an article, or if he deliberately wrote the article knowing it to be untrue, it is a still worse position for him to occupy. But at any rate I wish to state that I heard the motion read by the hon. member for Wentworth, and it did not contain these words that the 'Globe' states it contains, namely, that the resolution as amended be adopted. And when the Minister of Public Works states that he heard the chairman read that twice he states something that is absolutely without any foundation. I heard the resolution read by the chairman. I do not impeach his veracity in any way. I give him the credit that he thinks he read these words, but I say the chairman is mistaken and that these words were never read by him or by the member for Wentworth either. When the Minister of Public Works states that the reason the member for Hamilton did not vote for the amendment was because these words were in, he states something that is not so. I sat behind the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and 'Hansard' gives his reasons for not supporting the amendment because it reports his statement that it was a fake motion. The member for Hamilton raised the point that the member for Wentworth could not amend the tariff law, and this is what occurred:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sealey) is at liberty to move an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. BARKER. Not an amendment to the law.

Mr. SEALEY. The resolution reads: 'Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Customs Act, 1907,' and my proposal is to amend that resolution.

Mr. BARKER. An amendment to the law might not be an amendment to the resolution.

This was the reason the hon. member for Hamilton did not vote for it. Further on he stated that it looked like a fake resolution. The Minister of Public Works should have noted that before making the statement he did. Some of the reports sent out to the 'Globe' newspaper would be a disgrace to a country newspaper, and possibly we could have expected nothing else. We are not surprised when we find them characterized by gross partisanship but when we read in the 'Globe' untruthful accounts of the proceedings of this House, they become a disgrace in a paper that claims to be a great moral leader. We had our doubts as to the sincerity of the hon. member for Wentworth in bringing forward this amendment. He waited till the small hours of the morning before moving it, no doubt with the idea of deluding his constituents to believe that he was doing his best for them; and having shot his bolt, he swallowed the whole resolution after his amendment was defeated. But he is paying a very poor compliment to the intelligence of his constituents if he imagines that they cannot see through his very transparent trick. I am not going to discuss his position any further; I simply desire to state, on my honour as a member, having followed closely the resolution moved by the hon. member for Wentworth, and put to us by the chairman, that those words were not contained in the one or the other. That is what I unhesitatingly avow.

Mr. CONGDON. Mr. Speaker, it is always unpleasant to take part in a debate in which any question of veracity arises, as in this case; and in saying what I do, I do not wish to question the veracity of any hon. gentleman who makes the oppo-

site statement. I was present on the occasion in question, and distinctly heard the chairman read that portion of the resolution, and I made remarks upon it to gentlemen sitting about me, expressing my wonder how members of the opposition could vote for the resolution with those words in it.

Mr. HENDERSON. As one who has obtained his information on the matter only from 'Hansard' and the 'Globe' newspaper, I am not able to speak of the report as other gentlemen have done. I confess I was surprised when I heard the Minister of Public Works declare, in the most emphatic terms, the absolute truthfulness of the report of the Toronto 'Globe.' He was satisfied with its statement of the men who voted for the resolution. But if the hon. gentleman had asked myself whether that was correct or not, I would have told him that it was absolutely untrue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was here and heard it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I was not here, and I did not vote for it. Now, what does the hon. minister say about the truthfulness of the 'Globe' report and his own as well? He was only trying to bolster up something that I scarcely know how to characterize. About two o'clock in the morning I was not feeling very well. I had had a cold during the week, and I went to my room; the motion had not been presented when I left; I never heard it. I do not know what was in it except by what I got from 'Hansard', which I had a right to believe was a correct report. But I cannot conceive why the 'Globe' newspaper should couple my name with something which it denounced. Evidently it thought it was going to have a nice slap at the member for Halton, and present him to his constituents in a light that they would not approve of. I have been here 23 years, and I think the 'Globe' reporter knows me very well, and it was not necessary for him to insert my name along with those who voted, because he must have known that I was not in the House. This leads me to believe that the whole report was not intended to be a truthful report of what took place. If it had been, the writer would never have mentioned me as having been present, and having voted for the resolution. I need not say what I would have done had I been here. The motion was a very simple one. I would have been heartily in sympathy with any motion to strike out all the items relating to fruit, to vegetables, to swine, to horses, to cattle, to butter, to cheese, or to a hundred other things. I would have supported a resolution of that kind, but I never would have supported a resolution approving of the pact that has been presented to this House by the Minister of Finance, and I never will. Consequently I can only conclude that the writer of that article desired to do me an injury when he inserted my name under the comments he made with reference to those who voted.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I was present during the whole discussion on Saturday morning, and I listened very attentively to the speech made by the hon. member for Wentworth, during the course of which he distinctly stated that he was in favour of the reciprocity agreement with certain exceptions, including fruit, and a few other articles. He said:

> As to the natural product our lumbermen and others expect to be immediately benefited by having that free access to the United States market, which the United States have had in the Canadian market for years past. The mineral people, who are interested in coal, nickel, iron, are also well pleased with the agreement, and the agriculturists, on the whole, seem to be more than satisfied with their expected vantage, except possibly as to hog products. We must give those who are engaged in these various pursuits credit for understanding their own business, and knowing something of their own needs and advantages.

The whole speech of the hon. member for Wentworth was in that line. He was taking exception to the agreement with respect chiefly to fruits, while approving of it with respect to other matters. I was not at all surprised, therefore, to find that at the close of the amendment he was willing to ratify the agreement with respect to other matters, and I have a distinct recollection of hearing the Deputy Speaker read the resolution to that effect, and I was at the same time surprised to see hon. gentlemen opposite voting for it. It may be that they did not understand what they were doing——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SINCLAIR. —but there is no doubt that they voted for it as it stood.

Mr. RUTAN. I was present on Saturday morning and paid very particular attention to what was said by the chairman, and I distinctly remember that he read every word in that amendment clearly and distinctly so that every one could understand it.

Mr. BLAIN. How does the hon. gentleman explain the fact that neither 'Hansard' nor any other newspaper in Canada reported it as read?

Mr. RUTAN. I am not responsible for that.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) read the resolution as it was sent to the chair, and

the chairman repeated the resolution as the hon. member read it. The chairman then asked him—which of course is not in 'Hansard'—if he wished him to read any further, and the hon. member for Wentworth said that he wished to move another resolution with reference to the hog matter. Now if the hon. member for Wentworth had desired that the resolution should be adopted subject to the amendment he moved, that would have precluded him from making a subsequent amendment, but he struck out the reference to hogs because he intended making that the subject of another amendment later on. That is my view, and I think the Deputy Speaker will bear me out.

Mr. NESBITT. My recollection is that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey), started in about something which the Minister of Agriculture was going to do.

Mr. LENNOX. That was after it was all over.

Mr. NESBITT. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) interrupted him, and it was then he said he would bring that up again under another resolution.

Mr. BLAIN. The statement which my hon. friend has attributed to the hon. member for Wentworth was made after the resolution was read.

Mr. LENNOX. And the other thing he spoke about occurred after the vote was taken.

Mr. NESBITT. That is my recollection. That was after the vote was taken. With reference to the resolution——

Mr. BLAIN. Not after the vote was taken. The statement made in respect of that was made by the hon. member for Wentworth before the vote was taken and immediately after he read the resolution.

Mr. NESBITT. After the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) had spoken, the chairman said: 'The resolution as a whole is before the chair' and practically allowed the hon. member for Wentworth to go on. It was then that the hon. member for Wentworth said:

> The resolution makes a proposition that it is hoped will be beneficial to Canada generally and to the agricultural interest in particular. I trust that it is intended for the horticultural interest as well. If I do not quite agree with the method proposed for benefiting that interest, I think it is fair to suggest that the minister might benefit it by assisting it to reach that standard of excellence which he sets up for it, by establishing an experimental fruit and vegetable farm.

Then the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) spoke again and also the Deputy Speaker and the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) said:

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe).

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the suggestion, and I will remould my remarks and submit them at a later time.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. member not see that what he has spoken of was not at all a reference to the hog products, but after a motion had been negatived—Yeas 7, Nays 22, as shown on page 7703 of 'Hansard.' The hon. member for Wentworth then began to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the desirability of establishing an experimental farm in his locality. I objected to that as being irrelevant because it had no reference to what the hon. member for Wentworth referred to when he said he would at a subsequent time move with reference to the hog products.

Mr. NESBITT. I am not pretending to say that what the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) states is not correct. There was considerable discussion at that time, but coming to the resolution itself, I was arguing the point of order and trying to find an authority and therefore did not pay much attention to the resolution as read. But I was seated beside the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) and when the vote was taking place, he drew my attention to the fact that hon. members opposite were voting for the balance of the resolution. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GOODEVE. I was present during all the discussion and I was one of those who voted for the amendment, although my name does not appear in the Toronto 'Globe,' which is another evidence how very untruthful that report is and how utterly regardless of the facts in connection with the debate. I would say further that the explanation as given by the Deputy Speaker bears out to my mind clearly the contention we have made on this side. He has clearly and deliberately stated that the resolution, as it appears in 'Hansard,' is the one which was read by the hon. member for Wentworth. When an hon. member is presenting a resolution, that is the regular order of procedure. He first reads his resolution and then sends it to the clerk of the House. The Deputy Speaker has assured us that the resolution, as it appears in 'Hansard,' is the resolution as read by the hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When I said that the amendment as it appears in 'Hansard' is part of the speech of the hon. member for Wentworth, I did not intend to convey the meaning that I believed it to be exactly word for word the amendment which I read. If my remarks have been taken properly by 'Hansard,' it will be found that what I said was that the only report of the amendment which appears in 'Hansard' is where it appears as part of the

hon. member's speech. That is the point I was making. I was not in any way guaranteeing the accuracy of the report. The amendment appears as part of the speech, but does not appear on 'Hansard' as subsequently put by me.

Mr. LENNOX. That amendment appears as part of the speech of the hon. member for Wentworth, and after it are these words:

I had included in the resolution, or proposed in the first place, to put hog products back where they formerly were.

Now, I call the attention of the Deputy Speaker to this fact. The hon. member for Wentworth concluded his speech with the resolution, and sat down, and then the Chairman, after reading, as I submit, exactly what is in 'Hansard,' called attention to the matter. The hon. the Deputy Speaker called attention to the fact that he found at the foot of the resolution a memorandum about withdrawing the motion or a portion of it. He said in effect: I do not understand that the hon. gentleman intended to include this in the amendment. The hon. member for Wentworth intimated that he did not and it was then sent back to him and he amended it by striking out certain words and added:

I had included in the resolution, or proposed in the first place, to put hog products back where they formerly were, but with the view of getting the best possible support for the fruit and vegetable industry, I propose to leave hog products to be taken care of a little later.

And then the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) says:

Does it require a seconder?

That is the order of events. This passage which appears by 'Hansard' to be a portion of the speech made by the hon. member for Wentworth, occurred after the amendment had been sent back to him to be amended.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is quite possible that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is correct as to the order of events. It is true that when the amendment was sent to me, I found at the bottom of it words that did not appear to have anything to do with it, and it was sent back, just as he states. I am not controverting that in the least; I am simply pointing out to the hon. member from British Columbia (Mr. Goodeve) that I did not in any way intend to guarantee the accuracy of the events as given by 'Hansard,' I only pointed out that the resolution was not given in 'Hansard' in any place except as part of the speech of the hon. member for Wentworth, and I was not pretending to guarantee the accuracy of that in any way.

Mr. GOODEVE. I agree with what has been stated by the Deputy Speaker, but I was proceeding to take the line of argument of the member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), which effectually answers the argument just advanced, namely, that the member for Wentworth, in submitting his amendment, distinctly says that the amendment is based upon the authorities. He first quotes his authority, and then distinctly submits an amendment that is taken down by 'Hansard,' but he sends down an amendment that has certain other additions to it, and lays it before the Chairman. The Chairman of the committee proceeds to read the amendment submitted by the member for Wentworth. Having read the paragraph already read by the hon. member, noticing that there were other paragraphs, he mentions them, he turns with a note of interrogation towards the member, and the member gives an explanation, which immediately follows in 'Hansard':

I had included in the resolution, or proposed in the first place, to put hog products back where they formerly were, but with the view of getting the best possible support for the fruit and vegetable industry, I propose to leave hog products to be taken care of a little later.

And asked that the amendment be sent back to him. A messenger immediately takes that to him and he strikes it out, that was our understanding. He agreed to strike it out, except the portion read. The amendment was then submitted, and certainly as I understand it, was worded as it appears in 'Hansard.' The whole attitude of the members, the well-known attitude of the members on this side, the very explanation given by the 'Globe' itself, all bear that out. But, Sir, if we wanted to prove the utter unfairness of this article, it is seen not only in the heading but in the way in which partial truths are worked in. I think it is the very best illustration we could possibly have of the oath that is submitted to every man who goes to give evidence in a judicial court, that he will speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. This man has deliberately, and with great cunning, worked in certain partial truths in order to make out a strong case for his own particular object. Since the debate opened there has not been advanced an argument so strong against this iniquitous measure on either side of the House as this article headed 'Conservatives Vote for Reciprocity,' in this daily 'Globe' of Monday, April 24. When we find a paper of the place and standing of the 'Globe' in the Dominion of Canada taking pains to falsify the debates in the House of Commons, in order, if possible, to prove that certain members on this side of the House

had decided, as this paper says, to twist, in order that they may support this reciprocity pact, shows how very hard they are pushed. There is nothing I would prefer to having this article published in every Conservative paper in Canada, but side by side with it I would like to have the actual facts, as brought forth in the debate of Friday evening. I am sure nothing further would be wanted to show how this measure is received throughout the length and breadth of this land, when they would deliberately take the names of Conservative members on this side who have spoken very strongly against every portion of this pact, not only schedule 'A,' but also schedules 'C,' 'B' and 'D,' realizing that it is to the detriment of this country, to the injury of every class of people, not only the farmer, the producer, but the consumer, the manufacturer, and every one who has part and parcel in the building up of this country. It is iniquitous for such a paper to publish such an article as this, and I can only add that I trust those papers which are favourable to this side of the House and agree with the position we have taken, believing that it is the best for the country, will take pains to make it known throughout the country that the 'Globe' has taken this action. That is all I ask from the press of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), ought to feel that he owes an apology to the reporter of the 'Globe' for the statements which he has made regarding him. The member for Peel——

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has spoken on this question; has he the right to speak again?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Other gentlemen have spoken two or three times, and I think I should be permitted to say a word.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point is raised; I have got to enforce the rule.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it would be seriously raised because the member for Peel (Mr. Blain), spoke two or three times.

Mr. BLAIN. He did nothing of the kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), certainly spoke more than once.

Mr. LENNOX. On matters of personal explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to speak for the reporter of the 'Globe,' just for a moment. The hon. member for Peel said that he would appeal——

Mr. GOODEVE.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask your ruling again. The hon. member is not rising to a point of explanation but is again attacking the member for East Grey, and I claim he has already spoken and has not the privilege of speaking again.

Mr. KYTE. I hesitated to take part in this debate, inasmuch as it appears to be a question of veracity or at least of recollection between the hon. members who have spoken on opposite sides. For my part I sat during the whole of Friday evening and Saturday morning, and when the resolution was placed in the hands of the Deputy Speaker I was sitting beside the Minister of Agriculture. My recollection of the circumstances is very distinct, and I paid particular attention to what occurred, and with all deference to hon. gentlemen whose recollection varies from mine, I must say I am quite positive that the words in the resolution presented to the House by the Deputy Speaker contained the line which is omitted in the 'Hansard' report. With all deference to hon. gentlemen whose recollection differs from mine, I am quite positive that the words in the resolution presented to the House by the Deputy Speaker contained the line omitted from the 'Hansard' report, the words being that the resolution as amended be adopted. While I am on my feet I desire, in justice to the reporter of the 'Globe,' to read a note which he has sent in to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is the writer?

Mr. KYTE. H. W. Anderson, reporter of the 'Globe.'

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that that gentleman wrote the article?

Mr. KYTE. Yes.

Dear Sir,—I would be well satisfied to appear at the bar of the House on this matter and justify myself. I was not only present, but wired the story out that night briefly. Especially in view of the charge of 'liar and libeller' made against me, I would be gratified if the House summoned me.

H. W. ANDERSON.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), think he owes an apology to the reporter?

Mr. EDWARDS. This article in the 'Globe,' along with others, indicate that there is a mania for misrepresentation in the offices of more than one of the Liberal newspapers in this country. The Kingston 'Whig' of Saturday the 22nd instant, has an article headed 'After Frontenac's member. J. A. Robb, M.P., made hit at Dr. Edwards' expense.' The article goes on to refer to Mr. Robb's speech in the House and to say:

Considerable amusement, resulted from Mr. Robbs' response to Mr. Edwards', who interrupted to criticise the sending of Hon. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson to 'bind Canada in this manner.'

Now, as a matter of fact, I did not interrogate any one at all at that particular part of Mr. Robb's speech, which is to be found on page 7488 of 'Hansard,' neither did any other gentleman in the House ask any questions in regard to it at that time. It could not be taken as something that the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb), said in answer to my speech, because the member for Huntingdon preceded me. So the article to which I refer has not a particle of foundation in fact. I did not interrogate the member for Huntingdon at all in regard to the matter, nor did any other member of the House. So this article in the Kingston 'Whig' is an absolute misrepresentation from first to last.

Mr. LENNOX. Before you leave the Chair I would ask the hon. member who has just read the communication from the reporter of the 'Globe' to lay the paper which he read upon the table of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I am glad, even at this late hour, to have an opportunity of saying a few words in opposition to the resolution which is in your hands. When this reciprocity measure, or agreement as it is called, was launched in the House of Commons, it was followed by an argument which I confess I did not put much weight in. But it seemed to be the stock in trade of a number of hon. gentlemen in the earlier part of the debate who undertook to discuss this question. It was that we had a reciprocity measure away back from 1854 to 1866, and it was declared by hon. gentlemen supporting this resolution that that reciprocity measure had been a great benefit to Canada; and consequently, if we could get another treaty along similar lines, Canada would be greatly benefited by it. Amongst others who spoke to that effect was the Prime Minister himself who, on the 7th of March, said that:

The treaty which was negotiated by Lord Elgin, with Frances Hinks as his Minister resulted in immediate abundance of prosperity.

Now, the Prime Minister, as well as myself, recollects, no doubt, the occurrences of those years. My memory carries me back to the time of that treaty from 1854 to 1866. But I could not for a moment endorse the statement he has made that that treaty was immediately followed by an abundance of prosperity, if that means that the prosperity was the result of the treaty. I can well recollect when this treaty came into force. I am not going to deny that we had prosperous times during the first three or four years of that treaty; I am quite sure that we had; but I do assert, and I think the older members of the House who remember as well as I do the occurrences of those days, will agree with me, that in no way was that treaty responsible for any prosperity that Canada enjoyed during its operation. It will be in the recollection of members that about the time this treaty came into force the Crimean war broke out, and that Russia, in her own defence, closed her ports against the export of wheat and thus deprived Great Britain from getting her supplies of breadstuffs from that quarter. Great Britain was obliged to look to this continent for her wheat supply, to Canada and the United States. No doubt during the first few years of that treaty, owing to the demand for wheat in Canada, there was what we would call very good times. Wheat advanced in price, to my recollection, to $2 per bushel, and to $2.50 per bushel. This indeed would tend to give very good times in the old province of Canada. But this wheat was not for export to the United States, that price was not paid for wheat to go across the line into the United States, that price was not brought about by reason of the treaty of 1854, but by reason of Britain's necessities, owing to the closing of the ports of Russia against her wheat supply. Now, during the first few years of this treaty, as I recollect, and I know there are other gentlemen here who recollect it as well as I do, land values increased enormously. I can remember men who bought farms during those years when wheat was at a very high price. But, when the war was over and wheat dropped back to its normal price about 1855 or 1856, these men who had bought farms at a high price found themselves stranded. The result was that from about 1856 to 1860 we had all over Canada the severest depression that we have had during the last sixty or seventy years. I believe that will be admitted. I have a recollection of reading a speech by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, delivered in 1879 when the National Policy tariff was under consideration, in which he made reference to that. My recollection of what he said is that the depression from 1855 to 1860 was more severe than the depression that occurred during the years from 1874 to 1878. In 1861 the American war broke out. I want to trace all the way through the condition of Canada during the

existence of this treaty. The American war which broke out in 1861 continued until 1865. During those years Canada was in receipt of good prices for her natural products and manufactured goods. The people of the United States were engaged in a terrible struggle. Their able bodied men were drawn away from the factories and farms to take part in that war. Production in natural products and manufactured goods practically ceased resulting in a good market in the United States for the natural products and manufactured goods of Canada, and we secured good prices during those years for the reason I have stated, there being a large demand for such products.

I think this fully explains why it was that during the time of that treaty we had fairly good times in the provinces of Canada. But, that the good times, when we had these high prices, were not at all in any way due to the fact that we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States, I am sure, is perfectly apparent to those who lived during those years as well as to those who have read the history of that time. During those years Canada largely lost her British trade connection and it was only reasonable that after the treaty was abrogated the people of Canada should look to the United States again for a renewal of the treaty. I believe that during the time the Liberals were in power, from 1874 to 1878, the Hon. George Brown, as has been repeatedly stated here, was sent to Washington to negotiate a treaty. He did so, and I believe that he negotiated a treaty on pretty broad terms but the Senate of the United States failed to approve of it and pigeon-holed it. It was never ratified. I have a brief article here written by Mr. E. B. Biggar, of Toronto, and published in the 'Canadian Century,' which, to my mind, gives the history of those times as briefly and correctly as anything I could say, and I propose to read an extract for the benefit of those whose memories do not carry them back to those days to which I have referred. The extract is this:

> Most of the Canadian farmers ascribed to reciprocity the prosperity really due to the high prices of farm products, brought about by the Crimean war and the American civil war; and, though time has partially corrected this misconception, both political parties in Canada had to reckon with this belief. It is easy, therefore, to misinterpret Sir John Macdonald's offer of limited reciprocity.
>
> We must remember that the prime object of Sir John's negotiations at Washington in 1871 was not reciprocity—though that question was proposed—but the adjustment of the fisheries dispute. Nearly all his private correspondence on this mission related to the fisheries and showed that reciprocity was neither expected nor much considered. Sir John was a statesman, but he was also a politician, and while not wishing to antagonize those who desired a renewal of the treaty, he trusted to time and the development of Canadian nationality to wean the coming generation of Canadians from dependence upon the United States.

It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that from 1876 to 1878 Sir John Macdonald made his famous appeal to the people of Canada to adopt a protective policy, not a reciprocity policy, but to establish manufacturing industries in this country and to build up a home market for the manufacturing and agricultural interests of Canada. He never advocated during those years a renewal of the reciprocity treaty although he did in 1879 place in his tariff a friendly offer to the United States of reciprocity. In discussing the tariff of 1879 Sir John Macdonald did not express any favour for reciprocity with the United States. His whole policy at that time was to build up interprovincial trade and establish a home market in our country. Following the adoption of that policy Sir John Macdonald immediately took up the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway for the purpose of linking together the various provinces of this Dominion with the view of creating a home market and interprovincial trade. So strong was he on that point and so anxious was he that his policy should not be interfered with in reference to the United States, that he actually placed a clause in the charter of the Canadian Pacific railway which prohibited the construction of branch lines from that road to the United States boundary, trusting no doubt in his mind that he was going to be able to build up in this country a home market for the people of Canada, and that he was going to build up interprovincial trade and hence it would not be necessary to appeal to the Americans again for a reciprocity treaty.

Under the tariff of 1879 Canada prospered, went on prospering and is now prospering because practically the policy inaugurated by Sir John Macdonald in 1879 is the same fiscal policy that we have to-day. The policy of the present government is founded on that. I think I can safely say that the entire tariff of to-day on natural products is practically the same tariff as that which was left by the Conservative party when they went out of power in 1896 and that was practically the tariff of Sir John Macdonald. The only two exceptions I can recall are that corn was added to the free list and mutton was raised from 35 per cent to 3 cents per pound. With these exceptions, I believe we have on the statute-books today the entire tariff with regard to natural products that was in force when the Conservative party left power, and very largely the same tariff that was brought into operation in 1879. Now during the years prior to 1896 we had an aggressive policy by the Liberal party; they

were anxious for a change; they proposed various policies with a view to destroying what was known as the National Policy of Canada. But when the Liberal party came into power and were entrenched in office and it was found they were not going to interfere with the old policy but were going to perpetuate it, which they practically did, especially on the natural products of the country, confidence was established, and capital, which is always sensitive, asserted itself. The result was that Canada's prosperity continued and to-day we are enjoying a prosperity of which we are all proud, and which, I repeat, is based on the same policy that was inaugurated in 1879. We are sometimes told that reciprocity was the policy of both political parties for about 40 years. I read in the Toronto 'Globe' that the Minister of Customs made that statement the other day at Paris. I have followed the trend of public events closely since 1878, and I cannot endorse that statement of the Minister of Customs. I contend that reciprocity has not been the policy of the Conservative party for a very considerable time. There was a time, no doubt when we would gladly have sought better markets from the United States, but that time has passed and gone. That also seems to have been the opinion of the Liberal party, because in 1899 the right hon. Prime Minister said in this House—and the words cannot be too often ground into the minds of the people of this country to show what the true policy of the Liberal party is, and how at the present time the Liberals are departing from their policy. Speaking in the House in 1899 the right hon. gentleman said:

> If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians would have given many things to obtain the American market, there was a time not long ago, when the market of the great cities of the Union was the only market we had for any of our products. But thank Heaven, these days are past and over now. We are not dependent upon the American market as we were at one time.

I am sure the right hon. gentleman could just as truthfully make that statement to-day. To my mind the time for making a change in our fiscal policy is inopportune. The country is prosperous and no one is asking for a change. The result of the wise policy of the previous Conservative government, in initiating a splendid fiscal policy and of the present government in continuing it has made the country prosperous. In view of the coming into power of a party in the United States which we all know favours a lower tariff we could reasonably have waited a short time to give that party an opportunity of developing their policy, and possibly we would then have found access to the United States markets if we wanted it, on conditions, perhaps not as favourable as under this treaty, but on satisfactory conditions without sacrificing our own home market in which we consume about 85 per cent of all the products of Canada. What more need we desire? Speaking on the 7th of March here is what the right hon. gentleman said about the home market when replying to the leader of the opposition :

> My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), when he spoke upon this subject, stated that our policy ought to be to favour interprovincial trade. To this, Sir, everybody agrees; we all favour interprovincial trade in preference to trade with other nations, and I am prepared to admit with my hon. friend that the home market is the best for all kinds of products.

Let us analyze that statement: The Prime Minister says the home market is our best market. It is so because it consumes the largest volume of our products and because it pays the best for them. And yet we have before us a resolution which proposes to throw the market open to the entire United States and not only to the United States but to 13 or 14 other food producing countries that they may come in and enjoy this home market that we have been building up for the last 30 years. It seems to me, agreeing as we do with the statement of the Prime Minister which I have cited, that our position is a happy one, we have something we can be proud of; our products are of the best quality; our home market consumes the greater part of these products, and we get in Canada the best price for these products that can be obtained in any part of the world.

Why should we disturb this happy condition of affairs? Why destroy the industries of this country of which we are all so proud? Why overload our home market with like products from the United States or from favoured nation countries who will participate in the benefits that we shall accord to the United States? We are told by the Prime Minister that the excellence of our goods will find a market for them in the United States. It is quite possible that our best products can find a way into the United States, but is it wise for us to ship out of our country everything that is the best? How are we going to retain markets like Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and the great west if we send across the line everything that we have that is best and most acceptable to the people, and how are we going to dispose of that part of our products which is not so good if we are in the first place going to allow the American people to get everything that is best? We surely will destroy our home market by adopting a plan of that kind. I say that we

should retain our best in order to sell as well in our own country that which cannot be classed as best. Our home market, besides affording us the best price and consuming the largest volume of our products, is the best asset Canada has to-day, and I think it a pity that we should trade it away. I believe we are as justified in defending our home market with a reasonable tariff as we are in calling out the militia of the country to defend the soil. Why should we invite others to come in and share our prosperity? If they want to get the advantage of our country, of our excellent markets, we do not object to them coming in, bringing their money, and living in our country. We have a country that we are proud of. We have a great country, rich in soil, rich in minerals, rich in timber. The Americans say to us, with a jealous eye, send us your raw materials and we will send you our manufactured goods. That is very kind, but we do not propose to accept their invitation. They say, send us your hard wheat, and we will send you our soft wheat. They cannot grind their wheat satisfactorily until they get the hard wheat to mix with it. They say, send us your splendid fruits and vegetables, of which the Prime Minister often boasts, and we will send you our cheaper and inferior vegetables. I say without any hesitation that our vegetables are fresher and better, our fruits are finer, than theirs. Listening to the Prime Minister when he replied to the deputation that waited on him a short time ago, no man could mistake what his opinion was of the products of Canada. I say, then, why send them our best products and only get back from them an inferior product? They say, send us your fresh eggs, laid in a cooler climate, and take back something produced in a warm climate, and not at all as good. They say, send us your firm bacon, produced from hogs fed on peas, oats and barley, and we will send you our soft bacon produced on corn. That is the kind of invitation the Americans extend to us. Why all this generosity? What has the United States done for Canada that they should be so favourably treated? What has Russia done, what has Austria-Hungry done, what have Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Spain, Japan, Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, Argentina or even New Zealand and Australia, done for Canada that we should treat them so kindly as to permit them all to come in and enjoy our good market? All these favoured-nation countries, if this agreement ever goes into force, will have the right to send into Canada their natural products, on the same terms as the United States, but we shall have no right to export our natural products to those countries except over their high tariff walls. There might be some justification for admitting the United States when they give us something in return, although we do not value it so highly, but certainly there is no justification for opening up our markets to 12 or 14 different countries who practically close their doors against us and only permit us to enter by climbing over their high tariff walls. Our market has been built up by our farming community largely by patience, by perseverance, and by toil. It is our own market, and we ought to be bound to keep out all invaders. Do any of these countries contribute a dollar a year to the support of our institutions? Which of them has contributed a dollar to the building of our railways, to the construction of our canals, or to the deepening of our waterways? Have any of them contributed a dollar to support our government, or our municipal institutions, or our educational institutions, or our administration of justice, or the building of roads and bridges in our country?

Then, why, I ask again, should we be so liberal as to hand over to these countries the great advantages that we have in our own market? Why should they come in on even terms to deal with us? Why should they come in with their horses, their cattle, their sheep, their swine, their butter, their cheese, their eggs, their fruit, their vegetables, their wheat, barley and oats, on even terms with us, without contributing a single cent to the support of our country or its institutions? Why should they come in with their fresh beef, their lambs, their mutton, their bacon and hams, even at a low rate of duty, when they do not admit us to their markets except on very unfavourable terms?

One very peculiar feature of this debate is the absolute failure to show that any better market can be found in any other country—either the United States or anywhere else to which we could send our products. A short time ago the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) made the statement that from his county a few steers had been sent to Toronto, and thence transhipped to Chicago, and there sold at an advance of one cent per pound. A steer weighing 1,400 pounds had practically brought $14 more to its owner than it would if it had been sold in Toronto for export across the ocean to Great Britian. That struck me as a very peculair statement because I know that the farmers of Ontario are a very intelligent and studious people. I know that they are a very wide awake and careful people, and it seems to me most remarkable that all our farmers throughout westen Ontario and the great west, if they could find a market in Chicago so superior for our beef, would have during the last year exported to the British market 140,424 animals for slaughter. I cannot understand why our people should do this

if they have a better market lying at their own doors. And if that be the case, how comes it that this gentleman, ever since he has had a seat in this House, should have supported a duty of three cents per pound on fresh beef—practically Chicago beef—in order to keep it out of cheap country? If a higher price could be obtained in Chicago, why was it necessary for him to support a tariff of that kind. The same hon. gentleman claimed that his constituents were going to get a better market in the state of New York for their turnips, which they raised in large quantities. That hon. gentleman was willing to turn over the trade of this country to the United States for the sake of getting a little advantage, as he thought, on turnips. I am aware that a large quantity of turnips are sold from his riding, because they are also shipped from my riding which immediately adjoins his; but I do not suppose for one moment that if we had free trade in turnips, the farmers in Wellington or Halton would get one cent per bushel more for them. Our turnips are of superior quality, the people of New York state want them, and are willing to buy them even though they have to pay a duty of 25 per cent. That duty is not paid by the Canadian producer, but by the American buyer who wants to get this superior quality of turnip. He said also that his farmers could sell their potatoes in the United States at a better price. That struck me as very remarkable, indeed, and I fail to see why it was necessary to disturb the whole trade of our country for the sake of shipping a few carloads of potatoes to the United States. We did last year produce in Canada 74,000,000 bushels of potatoes. What would signify an export to the United States of some 678,000 bushels—the amount we exported last year —compared with the 74,000,00 bushels we raise? Why disturb a market which consumes the greater part of this 74,000,000 bushels of potatoes for the sake of sending less than three-quarters of a million bushels of potatoes into the United States. The hon. gentleman also claimed that his farmers were going to get an advantage on barley. There was a time when the Americans wanted our barley. Whether they want it or not to-day is a more doubtful problem. Why, according to the information I have, one-half of the counties in the United States have gone dry. That means that they will not require our barley to make malt or beer. Therefore a demand which existed 40 years ago may not exist to-day. Conditions are very much changed, indeed. Why, the United States sent to Canada 164,532 bushels of barley. That is a very peculiar feature indeed. If they require our barley, why would they ship theirs to this country. Another very peculiar feature is this, that whilst it is claimed that the United States want our barley, and cannot do without it, as a matter of fact last year Canada imported from them 2,185,463 pounds of malt, and that is what we are told the people of the United States want our barley for. Instead, however, of our sending them barley, we are actually importing malt from the United States. They, therefore, cannot be in any need of our barley.

This hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) advanced a very peculiar theory in his speech, in support of which he quoted from 'David Harum.' I persume that nearly every hon. member has read that very interesting book. He quoted 'David Harum' saying that when you make a horse trade it is always well to let the other fellow get something out of it. Well, my opinion is that the hon. member for Wellington, (Mr. Guthrie) was too anxious that the other fellow should get too much out of it, and consequently I do not agree with him; and I would tell him that we are not trading our own horses on this occasion. If we are giving away our home market, we are trading away a horse which does not belong to us individually, but which we hold as trustees, and it is our duty to see that the other fellow does not get the best of the bargain.

Another hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) made a statement which I think is worth repeating. He told us that he was a Liberal, brought up in the Liberal school, that practically he was nursed on the essence of the 'Globe' newspaper. I am rather sorry for him since we have heard so much to night about the essence of that newspaper. However, that hon. gentleman was very candid and outspoken, and made a splendid speech. He did say that for poultry, eggs, butter, and nearly everything the farmer had to sell, he could get a price right in the market of Welland, St. Catharines and Niagara Falls nearly equal to what he could get in Buffalo, and sometimes better. Here was a gentleman, representing a border county, a county alongside the United States, declaring that we should not interfere with present conditions, that these conditions were eminently satisfactory, and that we should reject the pact proposed by the government, and continue the policy we have had for so many years, and in which we have been so successful.

The weak part of this debate has been the failure to show that we can secure better prices in the United States. I have listened to nearly every speech delivered in the House on that question, and I say that no one has succeeded in convincing the House that, on the whole, better prices can be obtained for our products on the other side of the line. Then why should we disturb

present relations? True we have been told that there is a market there of 90,000,000 people, and that we can step in and take possession. But, if there are 90,000,000 people, there are also 90,000,000 producers; that market is fully occupied. Great Britain affords an excellent market. Why? Because Great Britain has a small area and a large population. Great Britain could not support herself, I believe, for more than two or three months of the year and depends entirely on the outside world for what is necessary to carry her over the other nine or ten months. Consequently, we can always make sure of a good market for our products in Great Britain, or the balance of our products that we have to sell there. But this market of 90,000,000 people is not of that character. The people of the United States supply their own country with food products and after having done so, perhaps importing a quantity of some articles, I do not know just how much—the United States exported last year of natural products no less in amount than $903,238,122. Then why should we expect to get a market in the United States for our products, if the United States is able, after supplying largely her own demand, to export such an enormous quantity of natural products. It seems to me absurd. It may be as the Prime Minister said, that our good products, our good fruits, our good vegetables, may find a way into that market, but to say that we are going to get any extended market in the United States, which has such an enormous surplus to export, is, to my mind, perfectly ridiculous. The favoured nation countries with a population of some 307,000,000, do not afford us any benefit; they are permitted to come in and enjoy our markets, but we are not permitted, except over a very high tariff wall, to send a dollar's worth to these countries. Unless we can get all round higher prices in the United States I fail to see that we are going to get any advantage whatever from this, I shall not call it reciprocity measure, from this free trade measure, because I do not think we can properly call it reciprocity, we cannot reciprocate with them, they do not want our products; what they want is our market; they want to come here and sell us their surplus products; they want to get our raw material and manufacture it and send it back manufactured goods, but it would be a misnomer to call it a reciprocity treaty; it is simply a free trade treaty. The policy is free trade into Canada by the United States. We have been told that the time is near at hand when the United States will require our wheat or bread stuffs for their own purposes because the wheat production of the United States is falling off. I have heard that said so often that I have made some investigations, and I find that whilst in 1901 the production of wheat in the United States was 522,229,505 bushels; in 1910 it had reached the enormous total of 773,199,000 bushels. Why, their production is increasing at a greater ratio than their population. Hence I say that the time must be very far distant indeed when we can expect to get into that market by reason of their failure to supply themselves.

I wish to refer to an industry which I shall designate as the mortgage raiser, that is the hog trade. I have here a table of prices prepared with care which has already been placed on 'Hansard' showing the average price for each of five years of hogs in Chicago and Montreal. That table is as follows:

Average price of hogs in Chicago and Montreal for the five years ending December 31, 1910:

	Chicago.	Montreal.
1906	$6.20	$7.77
1907	6.10	7.43
1908	5.70	7.10
1909	7.35	8.64
1910	8.90	9.60

I have been informed that in October, 1907, live hogs sold in Chicago as low as $3.80 per cwt., as against $6.65 in Montreal. There is no doubt that would be a very exceptional case. But there is evidence here to show that the farmers of this country, right at home in their own market, what the Prime Minister calls the best market, the market that consumes the most of our products, the market that pays the best price, right here in our own home market, have the best market for hogs that can be secured. I have a brief statement along the same line which I propose to read. It is a comparison of prices in a similar way between Ingersoll and Chicago. Ingersoll, I may say, is right in the centre of the hog trade of western Ontario. All around that town the hogs are produced. There is no fictitious price added for transportation, the hogs are practically in the middle of the country where they are raised, and nothing has to be added for any long haul to the price of the animal itself.

	Chicago Average delivered Price, at Chicago.	I. P. Co. Average Price, delivered at Ingersoll.	Ingersoll Price above Chicago.	Chicago Price above Ingersoll.
1901	$5 85	$6 70	$0 85	$
1902	6 85	6 68		0 17
1903	6 00	6 07	0 07	
1904	5 15	5 32	0 17	
1905	5 25	6 41	1 16	
1906	6 25	7 17	0 92	
1907	6 10	6 85	0 75	
1908	5 70	6 87	1 17	
1909	7 35	8 04	0 69	
1910	8 90	9 11	0 21	

This statement is prepared by the Ingersoll Packing Company, Limited, and is certified by C. C. L. Wilson, the managing director, who states that the books are open to the inspection of any government official for verification. I take that to be one of the most excellent and fair comparisons that can be obtained with regard to products of this kind. Now I say again, why exchange a market such as we have in Canada for such as they have in Chicago for hog products? A short time ago the pork packers of this country waited on the government and placed their case fairly before them. I want to quote a few extracts from the interview of the pork packers with the government on the 13th of February last. I believe in taking the opinion of practical men, men who are in the business, and who know what they are talking about, I prefer that to newspaper interviews. A short time ago I read in the Toronto 'Globe' a report of a 'Globe' reporter who went into the county of Wellington to attend an auction sale, and he consulted the farmers there as to their views on this reciprocity measure. He gave the opinions of three of them, and they all favoured the compact. They favoured the reciprocity treaty by all means, and what do you think was the reason for it? It was that under it they would be able to get free corn to feed their stock, never thinking, or perhaps not knowing, that for many years corn had been free to come into this country. Therefore I say that I always prefer to take the opinions of practical men who are in the business, on a question of this kind. When the pork packers were assembled in Ottawa to interview the Prime Minister, they said:

The Ontario and Quebec packer has marketed his cured pork products in Canada and in Great Britain. Exports to Great Britain, which, in 1890, were $600,000, thirteen years later aggregated $15,000,000, and at present aggregate between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 annually. During this period of twenty years the domestic trade has steadily enlarged. In recent years large quantities of produce hitherto exported have been consumed at home. This increased domestic demand has come chiefly from the western provinces.

Then they add further:

The continuance of this domestic and export trade we believe to be vital alike to packer and farmer in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Each supplements the other and provides invaluable inflexibility. It is because of this combined trade that during the last twenty years the average price of hogs in Ontario and Quebec each year has exceeded the average price of hogs in the United States.

They add further:

Under the proposed reciprocity agreement the trade of the western provinces, now so important and becoming increasingly so, will be lost to the Ontario and Quebec packer. . . . Deprived of his western business through the lowering of the tariff, deprived of his export business during longer or shorter periods each year, the Ontario and Quebec packer would find his dependable trade confined to his local provincial business. This would be of insufficient volume to pay operating charges. The irregularity in the operating of packing houses under such conditions would introduce labour and other troubles and would so increase the operating charge per pound of product that the continuance of the business would be impossible.

We believe, therefore, that the interference with the regularity of export shipments, the interference with the existing market for domestic products, and the consequent interference with the regularity of operation of the packing houses would follow the adoption of the proposed reciprocity agreement, would result in the destruction of the meat packing industry in Ontario and Quebec. . . . We believe that forced into lower values by the United States feeders, farmers in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec would become discouraged and would ultimately largely go out of the business of hog raising.

That would be one of the most deplorable things that could happen to the farmers of Ontario. Now I want to make a brief reference to another industry which, at any rate in the part of the country where I live, is a very important one; I want to make a reference to the important industry of fruit and vegetables as it is carried on in my county as well as in adjacent counties. I purpose to quote from statements addressed by Messrs Bunting, A. W. Peart, and E. D. Smith, to the Prime Minister and the other members of his cabinet on the 10th February when the most valuable information with regard to the industry that could possibly be given was given. I shall content myself with giving a few extracts from the opinions which they expressed on that occasion, because I prefer, as I said a moment ago, to take my information from men that do know rather than from men who do not know. Those of us who heard Mr. Bunting's address will remember that it was very interesting, well prepared and instructive. Mr. Bunting prefaced his remarks by the following observations:

My apology for appearing before you in this capacity is the emergency of the case and the fact that having been actively engaged in fruit and vegetable growing for over thirty years, having seen these industries grow and develop from comparatively small proportions to considerable magnitude, and having taken some share in many movements that have had for their object the advancement of horticulture in Canada, I may fairly claim to have some slight knowledge of conditions that are likely to advance or retard its development.

No one will dispute that Mr. Bunting was exceptionally well qualified to speak upon this subject and I am sure that those of us who listened to the valuable paper

which he read and were edified perhaps surprised. He said:

After a careful survey of the whole situation I am forced to the conclusion that the proposed agreement in so far as it affects the tender fruit and vegetable industry of this country, is likely to have disastrous, and in some cases fatal, effect.

Then Mr. Bunting presented his appeal. I do not think I ever heard a more pathetic appeal made to a minister of the Crown than that which he presented on that occasion. He no doubt was speaking his sentiments, he was stating what he thought and what he sincerely believed to be in the interest of himself and those with whom he was associated:

Encouraged by what was popularly supposed to be the settled policy of this country, many thousands of happy, contented and industrious people are busily engaged in producing from their gardens, orchards and vineyards, ever increasing quantities of fruits and vegetables of the high quality for which Canada is noted, both at home and in the countries beyond the seas.

Then Mr. Bunting adds the following sentence which is a most pathetic appeal, an appeal that I think this government should not have failed to listen to :

A dark cloud has, however, suddenly appeared in the horizon and the fruit growers are everywhere anxiously asking each other, what does this portend? On every side the fear is expressed by those best qualified to form an opinion that it means disaster and in many cases destruction of the hopes that for years have been cherished, of being able to own a home free from encumbrance in some one of gardens of Canada which abound in so many of her beautiful valleys.

I say the appeal was a pathetic one and I regret very much indeed that it was not listened to with more interest. The Prime Minister and his colleagues may think that this is a small industry. I can assure them that it is not, but that it is an industry of very considerable proportions. I am not going to speak of the extent of it in British Columbia, because I am not familiar with it, but it has been referred to by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), who is so deeply interested in the industry in that province, so fully as not to require any further reference from me. But, of the province of Ontario Mr. Bunting states, and states with knowledge:

There is approximately 200,000 acres of land devoted to the production of tender fruits and vegetables—at least 50,000 persons directly or indirectly engaged in the business, forty millions of capital invested and about 15,000 regular employees—to say nothing of the thousands of extra people employed throughout the busy season from June to October, many of them from the adjacent towns and cities. These figures apply to Ontario alone, and do not include the extensive fruit areas of British Columbia.

Mr. Bunting went on:

This industry has grown up and developed under conditions which have existed for the past twenty-five years and which, as far as the trade policy of this country is concerned, were popularly supposed to be stable and permanent.

That is where the great hardship comes in for these people. They believed they were living under a government which had a stable policy, a stable tariff, and when they retired to bed at night on the 25th of January they little dreamed that their morning newspaper would bring them the word that practically the whole industry had been completely destroyed, or, at any rate so far destroyed that it practically became useless for their purposes. These men say that they are willing to stand up in a fair field under conditions that are fair and equal and work for a livelihood for themselves and their families, but the conditions are not equal and it is unfair that they should be forced into a position of unequal conditions. A very interesting quotation was given by Mr. Bunting and one that shows what the American people think of this free trade treaty:

Under the proposed arrangement this will be largely cut off, and in order to recoup ourselves for this loss, we are pointed to a market already supplied to the full and stated by the productions of our more fortunate neighbours. In such products as melons, tomatoes, potatoes, berries, plums, peaches, grapes and early apples the markets will be loaded weeks before our crops are ripe, and our early fruits will meet a glutted market in the height of the season, while our later fruits will be like an after season bargain sale—if indeed we can dispose of them at all.

Then Mr. Bunting quoted an article from the Boston 'Globe,' in which Mr. Arthur T. Cummings made the following statement :

Arthur T. Cummings, ex-president of the Boston Fruit & Produce Exchange who has laboured a year and a half to bring about reciprocity with Canada, said: Dealers in green things in New England have nothing to fear from Canadian competition. Reciprocity is going to open a great market for all our New England hothouse stuff. Indeed it will provide an outlet for stuff of all sorts, from Miama, Fla., to California. For all sorts of green stuff reciprocity is what we've been working for and praying. It is the best that could have happened to New England, on that line, anyway?

The United States are not anxious that we should gain by this pact; what they are anxious for is that they should find a market for their own products:

In other words, Mr. Cummings believes that notwithstanding the proximity of such great markets as Boston, New York and

Philadelphia and other large cities that might be mentioned—he not only hails with delight the opportunity of exploiting the Canadian market with the surplus New England products, but also the prospect of being relieved to some extent from the keen competition of the Southern States, which will no doubt flood our Canadian markets.

I could read extract after extract to the same effect, and I think it my duty to detain the House while I read a few because I think these statements should go on 'Hansard' where more people will see them than in the blue-book, a comparative few copies of which have only been printed.

As far as the Canadian consumer is concerned, he will not be greatly benefited, for instead of enjoying a regular and rapidly increasing supply of Canadian fruits and vegetables produced in his own country, he will to a large extent be dependent upon the overproduction of southern centres, which cannot be counted upon for a regular and constant supply. It must be admitted that even if our people are obliged to wait for a few days or a week until the Canadian crop is ready, that the satisfaction of obtaining fresh home-grown products will more than compensate for the patience that may be exercised.

One more extract, and it is a very important one because, it goes on to show the great importance and extent of the market that the fruit growers of western Ontario have in the west, and which they believe will be entirely lost to them in the event of this agreement going through. Mr. Bunting said further:

In 1904, a sample car of mixed fruit was sent to Winnipeg from St. Catharines shipping station, under the especial care of the Department of Agriculture, in order to settle some questions that were in doubt. This car proved a success. It was followed in 1905 with 28 cars, 44 in 1906, 62 in 1907, 56 in 1908, 130 in 1909 and 264 in 1910. These, be it remembered, from only one shipping point, and there are nearly a dozen in the district. It is estimated that at least 600 cars of mixed tender fruits were sent out to the west from the section between Hamilton and the Niagara river during the past season. We believe not less than 1,000 cars will be the output for 1911 from this one section alone, if the market is not destroyed, and from present appearances this trade should increase rapidly from year to year as time goes on.

He was obliged to put in the proviso 'if the market is not destroyed.' I read this to show the growing extent of that industry and how much it depends on the present condition being maintained. I shall take the liberty of detaining the House while I read from the statement of Mr. A. W. Peart, of Burlington, who is a well known grower of fruit, who lives in my county and is well known to me. Mr. Peart said:

It has been estimated that in the Burlington district alone; as we consider the great amount of vegetables and fruits shipped and carried to Hamilton and sold on the market there, and sold elsewhere,—if we consider the amount of fruit sent out by the express companies—the Dominion Express and the Canadian Express—and freight, and also delivered to the canning factories,—it has been estimated that if we put it in carlots of ten tons to the car, there are 1,000 carloads of fruit produced around that district. I therefore submit that the Burlington district should be considered from that point of view. I wish to submit that if the proposed schedules come into effect competition will hardly be equal. Everything we have to buy will be bought practically in a protected market; that is to say, we would have to sell in the markets, on their open market, but when we have to buy the probabilities are that our raw supplies, such as ploughs and cultivators, &c., would be higher than what they are in the United States and in that way the growers here may be handicapped. I think there is another point of view we might take. It seems to me if we take the trade figures during the past few years—unfortunately I have not got them here—not only during the past three or four, but during the years 1904, 1905 and 1906, and if we consider the balance in trade in fruit such as we grow, it seems to lay against us in the proportion of 2 to 1, and if we take that and consider the population of the United States, which is about 90 millions, and consider our population of 8 millions, it would seem that while we import double in value from them than what they import from us, that for every dollar per head they spend on our fruit we per head spend $22 on imported fruit. Still they with their great capital invested in the fruit business wish to invade our markets. Another thing is this: I have been trying to find out the amount of capital invested in the fruit districts in the United States, leaving out bananas and other tropical fruits, but taking the varieties of fruits we grow in this country. I find this gives me an estimate of some $400,000,000. I do not know how that is; it seems low. They are farther south than we are. The total investment in Canada at the present time appears to be around $100,000,000, and when we consider the fact that our latitude is north of the States, that their population is ten times ours, they would probably have ten times, or twelve times, the amount of capital invested in their business that we have;—however it is very difficult to get at that. I think we may agree their capital is much larger than ours. Here we have two men engaged in turning out the same line of products; one man has a capital four or five times greater than the other man. In the business world it seems there is no heart, no conscience; the tendency seems to be to crush the poor competitor; and it seems to me that would be the result if the proposed schedules were passed.

Another matter that has been touched upon is that the season is earlier. It seems to me there is a great deal in that. A great quantity of strawberries are grown in this province. Probably half of the small fruits are strawberries. Their season is earlier than ours—perhaps a week or two earlier than ours. When our early berries are ready their main crop is on the market and they will get the cream of the market and we get what is left; and when our strawberries are on the market, their strawberries are on the market;

and it seems to me that our early fruits, in all the varieties would suffer in that way.

I read from the remarks made by Mr. Thomas Rowley, of Leamington:

Does it seem fair, that after our growers have spent millions of dollars in planting orchards, building green-houses and hot-houses and clearing land that we should be asked to stand aside and allow a foreign country to take our markets from us without giving us a material advantage on theirs. I claim it is impossible for us to compete with the United States market when we consider their cheap labour and tropical climate. It seems to me impossible to get in fair on these lines. Even under the existing tariff the Americans are getting the margin on the market because they are dumping the dull end of their market on us, when our fruit is just ready. Owing to their varying climatic conditions they have a continuous crop, and they could flood our market with inferior fruits and vegetables, leaving us at all times to a slump in prices, which will leave our grower in a much worse state than what he is under present circumstances.

That is a very strong appeal from Mr. Rowley. Mr. E. D. Smith, a gentleman well known to many members of this House, also spoke. He was a member here for two parliaments and he retired of his own accord. He was not driven out of parliament, but retired to attend to his own business. Mr. Smith said:

We didn't think that this industry would be singled out and made to bear the burden. Seeking as you naturally would do to make some concession, we feel that the fruit-growing industry are asked to give the whole of what is required for the concession granted. The other concessions are small reductions in certain lines of manufacture. So far as our fruit growers are concerned, we do not wish for them. We are of opinion that all the fruit growers in this country believe implicitly in protection. They no not wish to see any other industry crippled, and so they feel it is taking a step in the wrong direction. They only expected a small concession, whereas the whole of the duty of the fruit and vegetable growers was swept away. When the great delegation came here from the west they asked that duties be taken away from agricultural implements, but we wish to submit candidly that if some great concession had to be given, if some great industry had to be sacrificed, then that great industry is much better able to stand it than the fruit growing industry. The main argument that is advanced in regard to the manufacturing industry is that they must be put in such a position as to meet the cheapened labour of other countries, and the great capital of the other countries. We have not only to meet the great capital of the United States, and the earlier climate of the United States—almost every state in the Union can grow the products that we grow—but we have to meet the conditions that have been submitted to you, that are vastly different from the conditions in our country. Our markets are filled with their products before our products are ready to be put upon it. How long could any industry live if put in that position? Suppose any of our manufacturing industries had to lie idle through certain seasons of the year, and during that time the United States manufacturers were able to put their products on the market, and during the rest of the year we had to compete with them. That is the position of our fruit growers. I have heard it said, and no doubt it is believed by the members of this government, that we have some compensating advantage; no doubt it is urged by you that we will have a compensating advantage in turning our goods into their market. First of all, their markets have been filled with all the products we grow, so that we only get the 10c. basket; when our fruits are on the trees ready to pick, their fruits are ready to pick. While our main crop is on the market—while we are marketing our early crop of peaches they are marketing the later varieties. It is a great mistake to think that we have their market to ship our products to at any time of the year. Their markets are filled at the same time ours are ripe. So that we have no compensating advantage whatever. On the other hand, we are handicapped by the reasons stated that we are compelled to work at a disadvantage. Take our land: In the best fruit sections of Canada land is worth from $175 an acre up even as high as $1,000 per acre. It may be said that that $1,000 per acre land is all through the Niagara district; peach land is as high as $3,000 or $4,000 per acre. The lowest is $150 or $175. We were in the United States this week—for this came upon us so suddenly we were not ready for it before. In the western portion of the State of Michigan there is at least 100 miles, stretching back into the country ten or twenty miles, of excellent peach land. Previous to 1903 there were shipped from that section, 8,000,000 bushels of peaches. They are now shipping 2,000,000 bushels, and yet in spite of that, their product is reduced to one-quarter, they are getting just about one cent a pound less than we are. They are only 100 miles from Chicago and yet the price they get for the best is 2 cents a pound or 1½ cents a pound, but our canning factories have never paid less than 2½ cents per pound. Profits are cut down by those who are dealing in these fruits to as low a point as possible. I asked a gentleman in Minnesota, 'what do you pay for peaches in the cheapest time of the year?' he said, 'we sometimes pay as low as $1.75.' I asked a gentleman from Regina, and he said the highest price he paid was $1.75 per crate. The present competition in the Niagara peninsula keeps the prices lower than they would be on our side of the line.

I would like now to read a few words from the reply made by the Prime Minister when this petition was presented. He said:

As a Canadian I am proud indeed of our garden and of our orchard; and I am proud as a Canadian to say that I speak the truth, which is acknowledged at the present time and which will be more acknowledged as time goes on, that in this particular class of products which you

represent—fruits and vegetables—the Canadian gardens and the Canadian orchards are the finest in the world. The difference is rather, as has been pointed out to us, the climatic differences of our country. The difficulty, that we are on the northern extremity of the zone—but the advantages there are also in those climatic difficulties.

Then he spoke of the Montreal melons, in reply to Mr. McElvoy, saying:

The Montreal melons are to be found on the tables of the first-class restaurants of New York—the Sherry and Delmonico. Even under the present tariff treaty, their excellence is such that the Montreal melon is an article of luxury to be found on the tables of wealth and luxury.

I think I have said enough to appeal to the hon. members of this House not to destroy an industry of this kind, which certainly will be destroyed, if our doors are opened to the free admission of everything the United States sends to us, and we shall practically have no opportunity of sending to them.

Now, I am going to quote a few extracts from the Trade and Navigation Returns of our own government; so they can be relied on. I want to show the terrible disadvantages we are going to be placed in when the favoured-nation countries, apart from the United States, are permitted to send their natural products into this country. What I dread most in connection with this whole matter is the destruction of our home market. I regret very much that many of the people of the country simply look at one side of this question. They look over to the United States, and they say: that is a great country, and they seem to have got the idea that if only they can sell their products in the United States they will get a bigger price for them, and if they can buy in the United States, they will buy cheaper. There is no doubt that is a common opinion, but it is just as erroneous as it is common. The most unfortunate part of this whole agreement is that our home market is going to be destroyed. That is, the market that all parties agree is the best market. It consumes the largest volume of our products and pays us the best price. There is nothing that we can see in the invasion of our markets by the people of the United States that will prove to be an advantage to us. But it seems to be worse when we come to deal with the favoured-nation countries. Twelve countries under treaties with Great Britain, Canada being a consenting party, are entitled to send into our market anything they choose on the same terms as the United States will get under this agreement. I will take a few of these articles as an illustration to show the terribly unfortunate condition in which our people will be placed. I will take the article of butter, and will give the exports of last year of several of these countries, after supplying the demand of their own people:

Argentine..	$ 1,500,000	worth.
Australia..	11,500,000	"
Denmark..	45,000,000	"
New Zealand..	8,000,000	"
Russia..	26,000,000	"
Sweden..	9,000,000	"
Total..	$101,000,000	"

Some of these countries make just as good a quality of butter as we can make in Canada. I think the butter produced in Australia and New Zealand is produced under the most favourable circumstances. Their cows can pasture practically the year round. With no stable taint to milk or butter, I do not see why those countries, and Argentina as well, cannot produce the very highest class of butter that can be produced anywhere in the world. These countries have enormous surpluses, and they will all be permitted, under this agreement, to send some of their surplus into Canada, but not into the United States. The United States are very careful, and do not allow these other countries to invade their market. Canada is the only new country to be invaded by these 12 or 14 countries.

I just want to bring this to the point where the terrible injury can be understood. These six countries alone exported last year in the aggregate $100,000,000 worth of butter. Where they sent it all I do not know but some of it came to Canada. It only came however, in small quantities because we have a duty of 4 cents per pound on imported butter. That duty kept out foreign butter but did not keep it all out. From Australia in 1910, Canada imported 547,149 pounds, so that even under a 4 cents per pound duty Australia was able to force this product into our market. What then may we expect when that duty is removed? Britain of course takes Australian butter free of duty but there are many other countries shipping that product to England. Britain is the only free market now for the world's surplus of butter, but after this compact comes into force if it ever does—I hope it never will and I think that is the hope of the great majority of our people—if it does come into force, these countries, Australia, New Zealand, The Argentine, Denmark, Russia and Sweden, will all be ready to send their butter to Canada and capture part of our free market. Suppose they send in only 3 per cent of their output, where then would be the farmer's wife with her basket of fresh butter? Where would she find a market for it? Three per cent only would swamp the market our people have. I remember a few years ago when the question of the duty of sole leather was under consideration, a tanner in the village where I live was very anxious to have the duty increased, and he said to me: If the American tanners

sent in to Canada 2 per cent of their output, I could not sell a dollar's worth of leather in this country. The whole Canadian market would be flooded by merely 2 per cent of the product of the American tanneries. Now our farmers are asked to submit to an invasion from these favoured nation countries I have mentioned of $100,000,000 of butter over and above what the United States would be willing to send in free of duty. And if 3 per cent of this $100,000,000 worth should find its way into Canada, the farmer's wife, with her basket of fresh butter to sell or trade for a week's groceries, would fail to find a purchaser, as our market would be overloaded; or if she did find a purchaser, she would have to accept a price which would not pay her for her trouble.

With regard to eggs, which is another important product of Canada, Canada sent last year to the United States, 35,732 dozens but the United States in spite of a 3 cents duty per dozen, succeeded in sending to our country 757,316 dozens. What would be the amount of eggs they would send to Canada if the duty were entirely removed. The production of eggs in the United States is enormous. The statement was made in the house the other day—which no doubt was perfectly correct because the gentleman who made it is a very careful student of figures—that corn was the biggest product of the United States and that eggs came next. I confess that was a surprise to me, but I have no doubt he was right. Now out of that enormous surplus of eggs which the United States can produce, if they attempt to force them into Canada or only a small percentage, I do not think that our farmers need bother going into poultry raising because there will be no market for their products. Eggs are now a very important money maker, and it is unfair that an agreement should be come to which would deprive our people of the best market they have. Why should we hand that over either to the United States or any country that has never contributed a dollar to build our railways, to construct our canals, to deepen our waterways, to meet the expenses of government or education or build our roads and bridges? And yet the government are going to allow those other countries to enjoy all these benefits of all our toil and labour. A more unfair proposition was never presented to our people.

In eggs Russia had a surplus last year of $28,000,000, Sweden half a million, Austria-Hungary, $21,000,000, Denmark $6,500,000, or in all $56,000,000. Let 3 per cent of those come into Canada and that would practically wipe out the business of producing eggs in this country.

Take the Argentine with regard to frozen beef, she had a surplus of $21,000,000 worth and Australia had a surplus of $3,500,000 worth. Let them send 3 per cent of that to Canada, and what effect will it have on beef and cattle? As a matter of fact, I question whether it would be so injurious because if we are going to have free trade in cattle, I do not think many cattle will be raised here. Such a policy will almost drive our farmers out of the market. It will take away anything profitable and make it impossible for them to secure anything out of their industry. Australia last year exported $6,000,000 and the Argentine $5,000,000 worth of frozen mutton. Of other frozen meats New Zealand sent out $17,500,000 worth. Of cattle the Argentine sent out $4,000,000 worth. Remember that these cattle will come direct into Canada and pay no duty, the door is open, the way is just as clear as it would be for the cattle raised in our own country. All this is apart from what the United States would send to us. Of cheese New Zealand had an export of $5,000,000 and Switzerland, of $11,500,000, all liable to find their way free into Canada. I do not mean that it will all come into Canada but a small percentage may, and if that percentage was not more than 3 per cent it would have the effect of making our own good market, our best market, entirely unprofitable. What we ought to do and what the government ought to do is to hold on to a good thing when we have it; do not permit the invasion of our market by these other countries that have never done anything to earn it.

Of vegetables, Switzerland had a surplus last year of $1,000,000 and Spain of nearly $6,000,000. We will get our share of these, depend on it; the products of Switzerland and Spain will find their way to Canada and as water rates are very low indeed, the freight question will not be material. We need not be in doubt as to whether Australia can send mutton and lamb and butter into Canada. The long distance is nothing when the produce is carried by water the freight is a mere bagatelle, because you know the Australians can produce mutton and lamb so much cheaper than we can that they are able to pay freight and land the meat in our country at a lower price than our people can possibly produce it at. We all know that in Australia, sheep are not produced for the carcase, but rather for the wool, the carcase is a by-product, it is all profit, their sheep are raised for the wool and consequently, the carcase being all profit, can be sold at a very much lower price than our farmers can afford to sell our mutton at when the mutton is raised for the carcase, the wool being the by-product.

A short time ago the right hon. the Prime Minister sent a telegram to Toronto to be read at a public meeting in order to induce the people of Toronto to go over and support his new-fangled pact. He said:

We have not hurt the manufacturer, and we will not do so.

I would like the Prime Minister to take a flying visit up into the county of Halton and to go to Georgetown and ask the paper manufacturers there whether or not he is hurting them. I think he would get just that kind of a hearty welcome that would prevent him from ever going back again or ever sending anybody else into that county to support his policy. To say that the manufacturers of paper have not been hurt is something that I cannot understand. These people carry on a large business, the firm has been in business since 1837 and this is the worst stroke they have ever received. The firm have been operating, employing labour, doing a large business and I have no doubt a profitable business which it had a perfect right to do, because there is a very large amount of capital invested, and the government that would attack an industry of that kind without a moment's notice is doing something absolutely unfair to honest men.

The duties on print paper range, I believe, from 15 per cent to 25 per cent. To wipe that out, to open the market for free competition from the United States and from other countries that produce paper, is utterly unfair. Why did not the hon. gentlemen give at least one year's notice to enable the men to change their business arrangements in some way so that the blow would not fall so heavily upon them. There is where I think the unfairness comes in. I think that is a sufficient answer to the statement that the government have not hurt the manufacturers and will not do so. It is useless to add the words 'we will not do so,' because if this pact goes through, the people will know they have injured the manufacturers.

We have benefited the farmer and consumer.

If the hon. gentleman can get consolation in the way of benefit out of what I have said, I wish them luck with it. I do not think the farmer will get much out of this pact. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who represents a splendid agricultural county did make a statement a short time ago in this House. He said:

But I hear on the other hand the cry that if this trade arrangement goes into force the cost of living will be increased, and I hear, on the other hand, the cry that the cost of fruit to the grower will be lowered, the cost of vegetables to the grower will be lowered, and that the price of meat and bacon and beef products will be lowered—so the Packers' Association tell the people of Canada.

He says:

I will give my own best judgment.

And what do you think was his best judgment?

The great farming community of this country, representing 60 per cent of our population, is going to be very materially benefited. The farmers are going to make money, they are going to make a lot of money.

That was his best judgment. It is said that that hon. gentleman may very soon find his way to the bench. I would not object to his going on the bench, he is a good lawyer and I think might make a very good judge, but I would mortally hate to think he would give judgments like that from the bench; I do not think the people would have very much confidence in them. He did say something, however, in closing his remarks with which I can agree. He said of the people who lived in villages, towns and cities:

It would be illogical to declare that there would be an increase in the price of farming commodities and no increase in the cost of living.

I quite agree in that.

Not only is the farmer to be helped but the consumer is to be helped. I take the consumer to be the man who does not produce, who is dependent on somebody else for what is necessary to support him. He buys his food stuffs entirely, he does not produce anything. Let us see what is done for him. The Prime Minister says he is going to help him. He is going to help the farmer and the consumer, he says. Wheat is put on the free list. I do not know whom that is to help unless it is to help the American farmer. The farmers of Canada do not eat wheat; if he had wanted to give them something cheap, he should have given them the product of wheat. Wheat is free, but to help the consumer he puts flour at 50 cents a barrel. I don't think they will thank him much for that. Oats are free. The pact tells us that oatmeal is put down at 50 cents per hundred pounds, presumably to help the consumer. I rather think it is intended to help the member for North Wellington, who is an oatmeal miller. Buckwheat is free, but buckwheat meal, which the consumer wants to make his pancakes, is put on the dutiable list at 50 cents per 100 pounds. That seems to be the way the Prime Minister is going to help the consumer. Corn is free, but cornmeal is 12½ cents per 100 pounds duty.

Then we come to another, and one of the most extraordinary cases of helping the consumer that I think is contained in the whole agreement. Wheat, I said, was free, and so long as we grind our Canadian wheat into flour, the flour will be free. Then salt is free. Siberian butter is free, because you can send to Siberia and get all the butter you want to make biscuits;

and then to help the consumer biscuits are put on the dutiable list at 20 to 32½ per cent. That is the way the consumer is to be helped. Here is something that I absolutely fail to comprehend, and I cannot understand how these two gentlemen who went down to Washington ever arrived at such a conclusion. I am not going to refer to this because the Minister of Customs is a shareholder in a biscuit factory, there is nothing personal in the reference, I am simply putting this forward as a fair argument. These two gentlemen went down to Washington and came back with an agreement which had this effect: A man out in the Niagara peninsula, or in my county, can buy land at a high price, cultivate it, manure it, plant on it a peach orchard, wait for eight years before he can get a dollar's worth of return, and he has got to sell his product in a free market, a market which, if they had only let it alone, would have been the best market he could have had. But they have permitted it to be invaded by the United States and other fruit-producing countries. Now, the man that makes biscuits can get his flour practically free, because wheat is free; he can get his salt free, and he gets his Siberian butter free to make the biscuits with, and then he is allowed a protection of from 20 per cent all the way to 32½ per cent. Now if any member of this House can explain that anomaly to me I will be agreeably surprised. I do not believe that even the men who made the pact can give a reason for what they were doing. Wheat is free and corn is free, but the shredded wheat biscuit and the corn flakes for your morning's breakfast are taxed 17½ per cent. I would not have thought so much of 17½ per cent being added on the products if the basis of that product had not been put on the free list; but when you put the basis of the product on the free list and then make a high duty for the product, it does seem to me a monstrosity, something uncalled for and unfair. Barley is free, but pot barley and pearl barley are both charged 50 cents per 100 lbs. duty. The same remark applies, the basis of the article is free, but when the consumer gets hold of it and wants to make use of it for food purposes, he can only get it by paying a high duty. Corn is free, canned corn is put on the dutiable list. Vegetables are free, free as the air. The man who grows vegetables in this country after this pact comes into force, has got to sell his vegetables in an open market, he has got to sell them in competition with all the decayed vegetables from the United States or from any other country that has the entree into Canada. And would you believe that these two gentlemen who negotiated this treaty, combined with the superior wisdom of the Prime Minister, who no doubt knew what they were doing from day to day, actually put pickles at 32½ per cent made from vegetables that were put on the free list. How is any living man going to explain away a thing of that kind? Poultry is free, but canned chicken, which we all like to taste now and again, is dutiable at 20 per cent Milk is free, I am glad it is for the sake of the children, but condensed milk is to be taxed 2 cents a lb. when it is prepared. And yet Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Prime Minister of Canada, goes to the trouble and expense—perhaps there was no expense connected with it—to tell Mr. Robinette in Toronto to tell the people up there that the consumer is going to be helped, and that is the way he helps them. Milk is to be admitted into this country free from the United States or other place, and then the condensed milk that is made from it is taxed 2 cents a lb. Oranges are free, but when the housewife makes her fancy cakes or Christmas cakes she finds that she has to pay 32½ per cent for orange peel. It is a glorious compact, the most extraordinary production in the shape of tariff legislation that we ever had in this country. I do not know how to characterize it. I do not believe it ever got five minutes' consideration beyond what Mr. Taft gave it when he handed it to these gentlemen on their arrival at Washington. Tomatoes are free, but the tomato catsup the consumer uses pays 32½ per cent. The consumer is to be hit every time. It was necessary that Sir Wilfrid Laurier should wire to Toronto, and tell them that the consumer was going to be helped, or I am quite sure the consumers of this country would never have known it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have detained you perhaps too long. But if you did not enjoy it I did. It is not only a delight to talk to the House, but it is a duty which I owe to this House to analyse this tariff and to point out the iniquities of it, the unfairness of it, the absolute destruction it is going to bring upon our country, the hardship it is going to entail upon our people after many days of toil and struggle to build up a market for themselves, and then to find, as the fruit men said, that between Thursday night and Friday morning, their living was actually taken away from them, and their industry largely wiped out of existence.

I feel it my duty to stand here and say what I can to endeavour to get this government to withdraw this measure. Leave it over for another year if you cannot do any better. I believe that if it were left over for another year we would never hear of it again. Once the people got to analyse it and to thoroughly understand it I do not think the government

would ever think of reintroducing it. To my mind they will act wisely in their own interest if they want to retain power, and wisely in the interest of the people of the country if they simply come down to-morrow morning and say to this House that they have decided to withdraw the agreement which it was proposed to enter into between Canada and the United States or rather between the United States and Canada.

Mr. H. E. ALLEN (Shefford). Mr. Chairman, I wish, Sir, with your permission to occupy for a few minutes the time of the House on the subject which is before us to-day. The question of better trade relations between this country and the United States of America is one of such great interest in both countries, and of such great importance, especially to this country that I feel it my duty as a member of this House to express by approval of the principle. I have listened to arguments of hon. gentlemen of the opposition, and I have yet to hear therein anything which, in my humble judgment, has tended to weaken the position taken by this government, on this, the most important measure which has been brought before this House in years, and one which I firmly believe will be of the greatest benefit to this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me explain very briefly some of the statements advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite. One of their chief grievances is that this agreement will be the ruin of our great east and west transportation lines. Nearly all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in opposition have commented very strongly on this theme, of the immense sacrifices this country has made, and is still making to develop these lines of transportation, and to what end? For say they, if this agreement is carried out the great bulk of all our western traffic will go south, and the business of the Canadian Pacific railway, Grand Trunk Pacific railway and Canadian Northern railway will be ruined.

Now, I am sure, Sir, that these hon. gentlemen are not ignorant of the fact that the Canadian Pacific railway already has lines to the international boundary, that J. J. Hill has at least two lines running into our western country, and, they are already carrying south thousands of tons of freight to the great benefit of the west, as well as bringing freight from the south into our country, and they know that as soon as it is possible for them to do so the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and Canadian Northern railway will have lines to the boundary as well.

The hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) told us in his excellent speech on this question that over 20,000,000 bushels of wheat went south from Port Arthur and Fort William alone, in bond for shipment to Europe through United States ports, and while I am speaking of wheat let me ask if when the time had come, when it was imperative for the United States to have our wheat, could we prevent their government from taking off the duty? Manifestly not, and the same condition would have applied in that case, as will apply if this agreement is carried out so far as wheat and our east and west transportation lines are concerned.

Now, Sir, if these predictions of ruin were well founded one would think that the railways which are so vitally interested would be alarmed, but what do we see? Never in the history of this country has there been such great activity in railway building, and the securities and credit of the railways are on a higher plane than ever before. Does this show alarm on the part of the railway companies, or on that of the investing public? I submit that it does not, and that argument of hon. gentlemen opposite falls to the ground. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, wheat, or any other kind of freight, of this country, or any country, has always, and will continue to follow the line of least resistance; it has gone by the route that affords the lowest rates. That, Sir, is what has enabled the port of Montreal to capture the wheat shipments from the great port of New York, and the lowering of the tariff will not affect this business in the slightest.

I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite that were they in power would they follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, (Mr. Ames) and further tax the western farmer by putting an export duty on wheat for the benefit of our railways?

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in his remarks on this question some days ago, gave us some very interesting figures showing the progress of this country since confederation, progress which we, as Canadians, may be justly proud of. But, Mr. Chairman, let me analyse these figures very briefly. The hon the leader of the opposition in making his comparison takes the figures for the years 1868 and 1910, and to be brief I only propose to take the figures relating to the exports of agricultural products. I take this particular branch of our exports because it is the greatest, and of most interest to the large majority of our people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in 1868 the value of our exports of agricultural products was, taking the figures of the hon. the leader of the opposition, $13,000,000. In the year 1896, $14,083,000, an increase of a little over $1,000,000 in 28 years. In 1910, after this government had been in power 14 years, the exports of agricultural products

had increased to the enormous sum of $90,433,000, or an increase in the 14 years of $76,350,000. The increase in the other lines of export during the past 14 years, while not showing such a great expansion, yet are far ahead of the preceeding 28 years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all this has happened since this government made a very material reduction in the tariff by the introduction of the British preference, a measure for which this country is deeply grateful to this government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, if all this great increase in the export business of this country can be accomplished, in a market 3,000 miles away, the possibilities of a market twice the size, and at our very doors are enormous, and I cannot see, Sir, where the danger is in reducing the tariff on natural products between the great republic to the south of us, and this country. It has been said many times in the course of this debate, but it will bear repeating that the Tariff Bill of 1879, brought down by the then Conservative government contained a clause providing for practically the same agreement as is proposed to-day, except that in some instances it went further than this one, and why, Mr. Chairman, is the policy of the Conservative party in all the years from 1879 to 1896 such rank heresy to-day when brought down by this government? It is the same policy that they supported and tried to get, but could not. I fancy I can hear these hon. gentlemen a couple of years from now, when this agreement shall be working to the great advantage of this country say: Oh, you have stolen our policy. I think I remember a similar remark made in regard to the first tariff of this government and granting for the sake of argument that such was the case, I am thankful, Sir, that we have had for the last 15 years, and still have a government able to apply that policy to the great advantage of this country, something the government of hon. gentlemen opposite were unable to do during their long term of office, if the trade returns of those days are correct, and I think they are. But hon. gentlemen opposite say times have changed, we have gone on and developed our country, and our trade relations, and are now able to stand alone. Why throw ourselves into the hands of the United States, for the end will surely be political absorption. Now, Sir, I cannot think that hon. gentlemen opposite really believe that the people of this country who stood the test for so many years,—as was eloquently pointed out by the hon. the Postmaster General in his remarks on this question a few days ago, are going to weaken in their loyalty to the mother land because the privilege of trading with their cousins to the south is extended. It is conceivable Mr. Chairman, that if that right was to be forever denied them, they might in the course of time become discontented and endeavour to gain by political union the markets they could not otherwise enjoy, but with this agreement in force the only possible incentive for promoting such a union is removed, and in place of leading to annexation this agreement will make for the prosperity of the people, and a prosperous and contented people are always loyal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to understand the position taken by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association on this question, and the violent opposition they are making against it. A year ago we saw their representatives here before the Banking and Commerce Committee urging very strongly what was for the large concerns, free trade in insurance, which they obtained. The farmer is obliged to buy his insurance in a protected market. At the present time, under the existing tariff, large quantities of raw materials are admitted free of duty for the benefit of these manufacturers, which I think wise and in the best interest of the country. Why do they object to allowing the farmer the privilege of selling the products of the farm in the great market to the south of us? Increased prosperity for the farmer means greater purchasing power, and must necessarily be to the benefit of the manufacturers as well. They are not hurt by this agreement, their protection has been maintained and it certainly seems to me that the course they are taking, and which will tend to antagonize the great farming population of this country, is a most short-sighted one. Mr. Chairman, the people of the county of Shefford, which I have the honour to represent in this House, are chiefly engaged in Agriculture. Now, Sir, what does this agreement mean to them? It means that the market for their butter, cheese, eggs, cattle, horses, sheep, swine, maple sugar and lumber is greatly increased, it opens a market near at hand, and better prices for their produce will result. But, more than that, Sir, and from my point of view, the greatest advantage that will accrue will be the stimulus which will be given to production. Having an assured market near at hand, our farmers will increase their production 25 or 50 per cent, which will make for their own prosperity and the general prosperity of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are making great efforts to prove that the result of this agreement will cause a reduction in the price of farm products. I contend the reverse to be the case, for the fact that we already ship large quantities of farm produce to the United States in spite of a high tariff, has helped to keep

the price up here. In proof, Mr. Chairman, let me relate an incident which took place at a meeting of the Cowansville Dairy Board, in the county of Missisquoi, a short time ago. The head of the greatest exporting firm in Montreal of butter and cheese was present at that meeting, and during the course of his remarks in opposition to this proposed agreement, inadvertently made this statement: 'Why, gentlemen,' said he, 'had it not been for the export of cream to the United States during the past two seasons, the price of butter would have been two cents per pound lower here.' Too late he realized what he had said, and tried without success to make some other explanation; but it was a statement of plain fact, and known to be such by the large number of butter producers who were present.

There is one item of production, Sir, that will be greatly aided if this agreement is passed, and while not of such great importance as wheat, butter, or cheese, is still quite large and especially of importance to the eastern townships and province of Quebec. I refer to maple sugar and maple syrup. The reduction of the tariff from 4 cents per pound to 1 cent per pound is going to stimulate immensely the production, and will mean a great deal to our farmers. The market in this country is not nearly large enough to absorb all that can be produced, and the present duty of 4 cents per pound is almost prohibitive. The result is that thousands of maple trees are not tapped, and the farmer and the country lose the revenue that might easily be derived from them. And worse still in my opinion, Sir, is the fact that because there is no other revenue to be derived from these maple trees, they are being rapidly cut down and converted into firewood. This is a great economic loss, for besides the loss of the revenue that these trees could produce each year in sugar, there is the greater one of lesser rainfall, rapid evaporation of moisture and injury to our water-powers caused by the denudation of the land. It will thereby tend to preserve one of our natural resources which hon. gentlemen opposite are so worried about all at once, and should commend itself to them for that reason.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion that I have heard no substantial reason advanced why this proposal should not be ratified. It gives us three markets in place of two, and every interest of Canada is guarded. We are free to abrogate it at any time if we see fit. I am convinced that it will be of immense benefit, not only to the farmers, but to all classes in this country. We have made a good bargain, and this government will, I am sure, again have the confidence of the people of this country when the time comes for them to give expression of it by ballot.

On the motion of Mr. Stanfield the committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TUESDAY, April 25, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 180) for the relief of Mary Kathleen Crittenden.—Mr. Rhodes.

Bill (No. 181) for the relief of Pauline Winslow Saunderson.—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 182) for the relief of Nellie Bridgland Morrison.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 183) for the relief of Frances Whittington Truesdell.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

VICTORIA MUSEUM.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to the promise which he made on April 20 with regard to the correspondence in reference to the foundation of the museum. I find in the 'Journal' of April 21:

Mr. PUGSLEY. As this is a matter of some importance, perhaps Col. Hughes will allow his question to stand, and I will make the necessary inquiry.

May I ask, did the contractor, or any one on behalf of the contractor, write to the Department of Public Works drawing their attention to the fact that this foundation was not adequate or that the situation required investigation in any way?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I expected to have the information to-day, but I was very busily engaged this morning otherwise than in my office, and I overlooked it. But, I will get the information for to-morrow.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the minister bring the letters down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will bring down all the information.

RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT—MR. SEALEY'S AMENDMENT.

Mr. SEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I regret that I was unavoidably absent from the sitting of the House yesterday, owing to an engagement before the Railway Commission at Toronto.

where a matter of interest to my constituents was under consideration.

From the proceedings in parliament as reported in 'Hansard,' I notice that I was the innocent cause of considerable, and I regret to say acrimonious discussion, which arose out of a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), who called in question the validity of a report apearing in the Toronto 'Globe' of Monday as to an amendimg resolution of mine relating to the reciprocity agreement, and the discussion which ensued therefrom.

The hon. member for South Simcoe went out of his way to impute motives to me in regard to the proposition, which I had the honour to submit for the consideration of the committee, and I do not feel under any necessity whatever for disabusing the minds of the hon. gentlemen in that regard, being as I am, quite content to leave myself to the judgment of the House, and to that of the electors of Wentworth.

My one concern at the moment is to speak in the interest of truth, and of a clear understanding of the subject under review. I hold in my hand a carbon copy of the original amendment in the possession of the House, and it is exact in every particular with the original. I will read the amendment as I read it on Saturday morning before the Committee of the House, and as the chairman of the committee read it distinctly in the presence and hearing of the committee:

> Mr. Sealey moves in amendment to the resolution 'that it is expedient to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907.' That schedule A thereto be amended by striking out in lines seven and eight thereof the words 'onions, cabbage and all other vegetables in their natural state,' and in lines nine and ten thereof the words 'pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edibles fruits in their natural state,' and in lines eleven and twelve thereof the words 'peaches, pears and apricots, dried, desiccated or evaporated,' and that the resolution as amended be adopted.

'Hansard' omitted the last line in the amendment. That is no affair of mine, the facts are precisely as stted by me at this moment, and I feel in doing as I did, that I voiced the opinions of the electors of Wentworth on the subject under review, and felt I had accomplished something for the cause, when six Conservatives stood up with me, and supported my amendment as read before the committee, in the early hours of Saturday morning——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SEALEY——and which was in the exact terms of the amendment read by the chairman of the committee before the vote was taken.

Mr. SEALEY

WAYS AND MEANS — RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT—MR. SEALEY'S AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House again go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House, since my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) has felt it to be his duty to say something upon the matter, to the subject that was up for discussion last night. I have been making an effort, Mr. Speaker, to find out if it was possible for a member to trace the original documents of this house with any degree of accuracy in the interest of the discussion of public questions. I have here the original resolution sent by the hon. member for Wentworth to the chairman. It is stated that this is the resolution. This resolution was sent by the hon. member for Wentworth to the chairman of the committee, some parts of it were read, other parts were struck out after having been sent back by the chairman to the member for Wentworth, it was then returned to the chairman, a portion of it was read again, it was subsequently put to the committee for the vote, the vote was taken, a number standing up for and a number against, and the motion was declared lost. This resolution passed through all these stages and there is no signature or initial of anybody in charge of this document to be found on the resolution. I have a right, Mr. Speaker, and I propose to put my own construction upon it whether it is the original document or not.

Mr. TALBOT. What signature do you want?

Mr. BLAIN. All I want is fair play when a matter of this kind comes up. Here is a supposed resolution to amend a very important international matter that is up for discussion in this House. This resolution was debated, this resolution was returned to the member who moved it, it was subsequently put to the committee by the chairman, or some portions of it, I say, members on both sides stood up for and against it, it was declared lost by the chairman and not one sign of any initial is put upon that document so that any man in this House can trace it and ascertain if it is the original document. That is a matter that should receive some attention by the government.

Mr. HUGHES. How does it compare with 'Hansard'?

Mr. BLAIN. It does not compare with 'Hansard' at all. The very words which caused an acrimonious discussion in this House were left out altogether from 'Hansard' who took the motion down as it was read. The hon. member for Wentworth has

his own rights here, he has made his statement; I make mine, and again I say it without any fear of successful contradiction that the words which my hon. friend has read out this afternoon were never read by any man during the discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say that if the words that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) read out were in the resolution it would be the duty of the chairman to rule the resolution out of order because it would not be a regular resolution. The resolution has been moved by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the member for Wentworth had no right to move such a resolution. Only a member of the government had that right, it was moved by the Minister of Finance and any motion proposed by any member of this House must be an amendment to that resolution. The question put is whether that amendment shall be adopted, and not whether the original resolution as amended shall be adopted. If the amendment is carried in the affirmative, the following question is, shall the resolution as amended be adopted? That is the proper procedure, and it would have been the duty of the chairman, if the motion had contained those words, to have ruled it out of order or to draw the hon. member's attention to it before it was put. I was here listening attentively to the discussion all the time, and I say most positively that those words were never read out by the chairman or by the hon. member for Wentworth either.

Mr. FISHER. I was not here last evening when this discussion arose, and unfortunately I did not hear what the hon. member for Wentworth said. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is perfectly sincere in what he says now; but I was sitting here at the same time that he was sitting there, and I went forward and took notice of the motion with the Deputy Speaker when he was trying to make out its exact wording, and my positive recollection is that the hon. member for Wentworth did read those words, and that the Deputy Speaker did read those words, and I noticed the way in which the words were in the document. It was a typewritten document. The first part of it was left as written, then there was an erasure of four or five lines, then the words in question were left, and not erased, and below them there was another erasure; but certainly I saw those words in the document, and my recollection is just as positive as that of the hon. member for East Grey that they were read by both the hon. member for Wentworth, and the chairman.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me ask the hon. gentleman one question. As the minister of the Crown whose duty it was to see that the work of the House was carried on regularly, would he not have called attention to the fact that no private member could make that motion? He was on his feet to debate the question whether the motion proposed a tax on the people or not. That was the question engaging his attention at the time he looked over the resolution. But with regard to the other question, I want to ask him, as a member of the cabinet, and an old member of parliament, would he be doing his duty, as the leader of the government side of the House at the time, to allow that resolution to be put in the form in which it was?

Mr. FISHER. I consider that an open question. I am not prepared to give an opinion off-hand whether that motion, with those words in, was in order or not. I left that matter in the hands of the Deputy Speaker, who was perfectly competent to deal with it.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister say that any private member could make a motion of that kind?

Mr. FISHER. The question is not whether those words were in the motion or not, and other things point to the fact that the words were read, and were in the motion voted on by the committee. I do not myself consider that it is of very great consequence whether they were there or not. Hon. gentlemen are taking to heart a matter which is not of very great consequence; but, of course, it is their privilege to do so if they wish.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a much more important question than that of whether the words were read or not read. The question is: Is it possible to have a resolution pass this House without the signature of the chairman, or the officer in charge being endorsed on it. I have a proper recollection of history, one of the main clauses of the Bill of Rights was to the effect that no resolution or Bill should be passed or amended in any way without having therein the endorsation of the chairman. I want to know why that was not done in this case, or is this thing trumped up to get some of our friends on the other side out of a little difficulty? I would like to ask the chairman of committees, why his endorsation was not on that resolution?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will very willingly answer the hon. gentleman. When a resolution or a Bill is carried, the chairman signs the resolution or the Bill with his full name. As a Bill passes in committee, he initials each section of the Bill as it passes; but an amendment submitted in writing on a piece of paper handed to the chairman, and declared lost after a debate and division, has never been, as far as I know, initialled or marked in any

way. I do not know what the custom was previous to my time. I have never initialled or put my name upon an amendment that was defeated. In this case I left the amendment after it was defeated, with the deputy clerk of the House. As I stated before, I never saw it again until I saw it in the hands of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. LENNOX. We had a very full discussion of this matter last night, and I do not propose to discuss it again at this time. I stated last night exactly what I knew to be true. I have since had time to consider, and I wish to be understood as repeating what I said last night, that those words were never read in this House either by the Deputy Speaker, by the hon. gentleman who proposed the motion, or by anybody else, and that is about as much as I have to say in reference to it. But while on my feet I wish to reply to the Minister of Agriculture when he says that everything points in the way of his contention. If he will take the trouble to read 'Hansard' not only will they find that the resolution as recorded by 'Hansard', and which is supposed prima facie to be true, is contrary to what he says is the way in which it points; but he will find also that the hon. member for Wentworth distinctly stated after he had moved the resolution, and after he had handed it in, and after he amended it, that he proposed at a subsequent time to move a resolution in the line of restoring meat products to the same position that they were in before. And the Minister of Agriculture, I suppose, will appreciate that if he were adopting the Fielding resolution in all particulars except as regards the amendment then presented to the House, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sealey) would have an opportunity at a latter stage of moving any other amendment as he indicated he would.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It seems to me that it is now time we ought to put an end to what I think is an unseemly incident. The question is whether or not the motion moved on Saturday morning was put in a certain way or in a certain other way. Men of honour in this House have a different version of it. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), whose honour I would trust in anything—except in politics—says that the words in question were not read, and my friend, the Deputy Speaker, says he read them, and there it is. The instance is related of Sir Walter Raleigh, that when in the zenith of his power, he had undertaken to write a history of the world by way of amusement, and something happened in the yard outside his window, and he and two of his friends went to see what was going on, but when they returned not one of them could give the same version of what had taken place before their very eyes. It seems to me this is a somewhat similar case. It is evident it was two o'clock in the morning; people were tired, perhaps a little angry; their memory is confused about what took place. Let us understand that the members on the other side of the House did not want to vote for reciprocity in any way or shape. I am sorry I cannot pay them the compliment that they voted for it even in error. They did not vote for it, and that is all there is about it, and it does not matter what actually passed. We have their testimony that they did not want to vote in any way, shape or form, for reciprocity, and that ought to be sufficient.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I had not the advantage of being present when the incident took place last night, nor was I present when the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) made his motion. If the hon. gentleman made the motion in the shape contended for by hon. gentlemen opposite he must have made it with the express object of its being defeated; there is no doubt about that. I may say that I have had the advantage of being present in this House, I think, for sixteen sessions, and I never before saw a motion of that kind made—a motion that the resolution should be amended, and coupled with that in the same motion, that the resolution, as amended, should be adopted. I cannot remember that such a motion was ever proposed in this House, unless it was proposed on this ocassion by the hon. member for Wentworth. And if he proposed it in that way, he proposed it with the object of cutting out his further amendment, because that is the effect it would have had. And what would have been the result if that motion as said to have been proposed by him had been carried? It would have prevented every other hon. member in this House from moving any amendment whatever, and if it carried it would also have the effect of shutting off any further debate in committee, because the whole debate would have been at an end, the chairman would have reported the resolution, and the House would have proceeded to another stage. I would suppose it would be perfectly obvious that the hon. member for Wentworth did not intend that. If he did intend that, then he intended a certain kind of a game which would not place him in a very high position before his constituents. The motion alleged to have been made was out of order, for two reasons: In the first place, you could not combine these two motions in one, and in the second place, the motion that the resolution as amended should carry, could only be proposed by a minister of the Crown. Therefore, so far as the

question of order is concerned, I think it is perfectly plain that if the resolution was put in that way, the Deputy Speaker had not sufficiently regarded the rules of the House in that respect when he accepted it. But, as the Prime Minister says, it is perfectly clear that hon. gentlemen on this side who voted on that motion voted in the belief that no such proposal was included in it. There can be no doubt about that. I am not going into any discussion of the facts. The 'Hansard' reporter understood the motion in the same way that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House understood it, and it has been so recorded. At the same time, I am willing to admit that gentlemen in the Press Gallery, and gentlemen on the other side of the House, are perfectly sincere in their statements with regard to the matter. I agree entirely with what the Prime Minister said as to the difficulty of obtaining two similar accounts of the same incident from half a dozen people within half an hour after they have witnessed that incident.

Mr. SEALEY. As to the genuineness of the original document, I have it here as handed to me by Mr. Blain, and I recognize it as genuine by reason of the erasures, and further by reason of its being an exact copy of this carbon that I hold in my hand and that has not been out of my possession yet, and especially by reason of an error in spelling. As to the reference that I could not have intended the resolution to be adopted as amended, because I could not have proposed my further amendment, I wish to say that I did not intend to make a further amendment to the resolution. I intended to deal with the hog question later ; I intended to deal with it on the lines of quarantine and more rigid inspection and exclusion, and I was prompted to that course by a statement which appeared in a newspaper dated from Ottawa, August 19, and which says :

A disease suspiciously like cholera has been discovered around Ottawa. Forty-three animals have been destroyed by order of Dr. Rutherford, Chief Dominion Veterinarian, and five other herds are under quarantine. Dr. Rutherford attributes the outbreak to the practice of feeding hogs about Ottawa on garbage gathered in the city, and thinks the disease may have originated from Ottawa hogs being fed on scraps of American pork.

I proposed, through the health authorities to cut out American pork to a very considerable extent and improve the situation in this way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite agree with the Prime Minister, and also with the leader of the opposition, that so far as the House is concerned this incident may very well be regarded as closed, but it does seem to me that we have still a duty to perform to a gentleman who occupies a position in the press gallery, and who has been attacked in the severest possible manner by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and also by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). The hon. member for East Grey stated that that reporter had been guilty of uttering a libel and he said that he was both a liar and a libeller.

Mr. SPROULE. And I repeat it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree with me that if the amendment was actually moved by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey), with the words in it which he says were in it, and if it was read by the Deputy Speaker with the words in it which he says were in it when he read the amendment, and if the reporter of the 'Globe' heard these words and he honestly sent his report to the newspaper which he represents, I think my hon. friend upon reflection will agree that that young man was simply discharging his duty. He could not and he would not be supposed to consider as to whether or not the members of the opposition knew or did not know what they were voting for. He would have been guilty of great impropriety if he had placed an interpretation upon their vote.

Mr. LENNOX. He did put an interpretation upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was his duty to report the amendment as he understood it. It seems to me that if it were possible that there could be an investigation held or that this young man would have an opportunity of appearing before a committee and giving evidence and calling other gentlemen who were in the press gallery, representatives of Liberal and Conservative newspapers alike, it would be only fair to that gentleman. The matter is a serious one to this young gentleman. I realize it very strongly because early in life I had the advantage of occupying a seat in the press gallery myself, and I know how very great an injury may be done to a young man by a member of this House speaking with all the responsibility attaching to the position of a member of parliament. I would ask whether my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), or my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), might not consider that it would be possible to afford this young man the opportunity of having the matter investigated under oath.

While on my feet, let me call attention to a statement made by an hon. gentleman opposite who said that the 'Hansard' reporter did not understand the amendment to have in it the words which the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey), said were in it.

Mr. LENNOX. Nobody on this side said that. No one here said how the 'Hansard' reporter understood the amendment, but simply said what was contained in 'Hansard' and nothing else.

Mr PUGSLEY. In order to show how 'Hansard' did understand it and correct any wrong impression which hon. gentlemen opposite are labouring under, let me read a letter sent by the chief reporter and addressed to the Deputy Speaker :

Dear Mr. McIntyre,—The whole explanation of the omission from 'Hansard' of the words, 'And that the resolution as amended be adopted,' at the end of Mr. Sealey's amendment is that though they appeared in the copy as sent from this office to the Printing Bureau, the printers, evidently by inadvertence, omitter them.

The copy as sent to the Printing Bureau is in this office, and will bear out this statement. So the error was one, not of the reporters, but of the printers.

Yours very truly,
ALBERT HORTON,
Chief Reporter.

Will you permit me to read also a letter written by the young gentleman who sent this report to the 'Globe':

Press Gallery, April 25, 1911.

Dear Sir,—From the shelter of parliamentary privilege, certain members of the House last night attacked me from their places, charging that I had made a distorted and wilfully dishonest report of the proceedings at the close of Friday's sitting.

With the political consistency or inconsistency of the gentlemen concerned, or with their understanding of the amendment, I have nothing to do. But I am concerned as to the accuracy of the report, and the recriminations made upon my honour as a newspaper man. Dr. Sproule stated concerning the clause reported by me as having been read to the House prior to the taking of the vote: 'I say positively that they—the words of the clause in question—were not read out, and the man——

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. Has any member any right to bring from the outside a letter or an article reflecting upon or calling into question any statement made in this House? I ask the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is a well known practice that no member can be contradicted by a statement from the outside.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This letter will be found entirely within the rules.

Mr. SPROULE. I object entirely to the reading of that letter as improper.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are older members in the House than myself and they will bear me out when I say that the custom of parliament, is that the statement of a member cannot be contradicted by anything coming from the outside.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I read the letter, Sir, you will see——

Mr. SPROULE. No member has the right to bring from the outside a letter or an article impugning a statement made in this House. I would refer to Erskine, May, Bourinot's Parliamentary Companion, and Todd's Parliamentary Practice.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You cannot, Mr. Speaker, determine whether this letter contains any reflection on any statement made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) until you hear it read. These are the words quoted——

Mr. SPROULE. I object to the quotation. I am within my rights and am borne out by the best parliamentary authorities, and I ask the decision of the Chair before the hon. minister is allowed to read that letter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume that a mere statement without allusion to what has been said in the House might be allowed, but it cannot be allowed in contradiction of any hon. member.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I propose to show——

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order. The minister has already in that letter impugned correctness of a statement made by an hon. member and, therefore, under the rules of parliament, and your ruling, Mr. Speaker, he is obliged to withdraw the whole letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me say that I had not got to any part of the letter which disputes the statement of any hon. member. I was simply reading from the letter what had occurred. Let me read it again.

Mr. SPROULE. I stand on my rights as a member of parliament, and object to the reading of that letter. Until the rule of parliament is altered, it cannot be read.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the letter is read I cannot tell whether it reflects on any statement made in this House or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not agree with your Honour. When a document of this kind is presented to the House, the right hon. the Prime Minister ought to have some control over his colleague the Minister of Public Works and prevent procedure which will convert the House into a very disorderly body. If this letter is proper to be read, it should be read. If it is not, the minister should not read it. What is done in the British parliament is this. The letter is submitted to the Speaker, and he comes to a conclusion about it, and thus they avoid scenes of disorder such as this promoted by a minister of the Crown. The way to decide whether this is a letter the reading of which is allowed by parliamentary procedure is to hand it to the Speaker,

and let him read it, and then give his decision. But the way to do is to submit the letter to the Speaker, and not read it out piecemeal as the Minister of Public Works is trying to do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was endeavouring to read it right along, but the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), backed up by gentlemen who tried to howl me down, prevented me from doing so. Perhaps I should withdraw the words 'howl down,' and I would substitute 'prevent me from reading the letter.'

Mr. NORTHRUP. I rise to a point of order. Sitting in my place in this House, I heard the Minister of Public Works read from a document which he said was a letter from an outsider, and, in that document, the writer referred to a member of this House as speaking under the shelter of his privilege as a member. I find that the following is laid down in Bourinot as to what the rights of a member are in regard to such documents. I refer to page 460:

> Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member, or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that when this letter is read you will say it is a reflection——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) was listened to with great respect when he spoke. Why should not the same courtesy be accorded to me? Why, as the hon. leader of the opposition has said, convert this parliament into a bear garden?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I was going to say is that, when the letter is read, you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that it does not reflect upon any member of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. Hand it to the Speaker

Mr. PUGSLEY. It states what the young man heard from his place in the gallery; that is all.

Mr. BLAIN. That won't do. What was the letter written for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To put this young man's position fairly——

Mr. BLAIN. It was to contradict a member of this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This young man had been called a liar and a libeller and surely he has a right to state his reasons why——

Mr. HUGHES. Won't the 'Globe' publish his letter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is better it should be read here.

Mr. HUGHES. No, let the 'Globe' publish it.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to say a word on the point of order. You, Mr. Speaker, have already given a ruling on what you have heard of the letter read. The quotation which my hon. friend from East Hastings read is clear and inclusive. It certainly includes that letter—I will leave that to the Prime Minister himself; I do not see how there can be the least doubt about it. What protection will a member have under the rules of the House if the member who wishes to make an attack upon him is to be the judge of whether a letter is to be read or not, and shall read it all before the Speaker gives his decision as to the letter? That is the whole point of view. If my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works wishes to relieve himself from the odium of seeking to introduce disorder into this House, he will not insist on reading that letter, but will send it to the Speaker and let the Speaker decide. I do not think there is any other way of doing it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will take my hon. friend's (Mr. Foster's) suggestion, and send the letter to the Speaker. If Mr. Speaker decides against the admissibility of the letter, well and good.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The rule is well known to be as stated by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) a moment ago, that whatever is said by a member of the House cannot be contradicted from outside, even if it is not true. But one would expect that when an hon. member has made a charge against a man outside the House and finds afterwards that charge is unfounded, or at all events that there is cause to believe that it was not exactly accurate, he would think it his duty —that would be for him to consider—to withdraw the offensive words.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Prime Minister, it seems to me, entirely misapprehended this matter; he has got it upside down. The charge is made by the 'Globe'—'Conservatives vote for reciprocity.'——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why, here is the statement in this paper that I hold up, And the members are named in the article.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question of order had better be settled——

Mr. LANCASTER. I am only answering the Prime Minister, who misapprehends

the case, and thinks that the charge is made against this gentleman instead of against members of this House by the 'Globe.'

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the House will allow me to read Bourinot on this point——

Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

During a debate on the tariff in the session of 1877, Mr. Mills referred to the opinions of Sir Alexander Galt, formerly a member and Minister of Finance, subsequently one of the Canadian papers published a letter from Sir Alexander in answer to some of Mr. Mills' remarks; and the latter rose and proposed reading from the paper in question; but the Speaker interrupted him and questioned the propriety of his course—a decision entirely in accordance with the English rules of debate.

Therefore, this letter cannot be read.

Mr. TURRIFF. I was in the House on Friday night, and distinctly heard the resolution read as the Deputy Speaker states he read it, and within two or three minutes after it was read I was discussing it with the hon. the Minister of Agriculture and pointing out that all the members on the other side of the House who were present, except the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), had voted for reciprocity except in vegetables and fruit.

Mr. BLAIN. How did my hon. friend vote?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order. Question.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask my hon. friend what his position was. If the hon. gentlemen on this side voted for it, did the hon. member himself vote against it?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Against reciprocity?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HENDERSON. Come over with us.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is not a large enough proportion of members on the other side of the House who size up with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), to allow any one from this side of the House to go over with them. My hon. friend opposite asks what was my position. I voted against the resolution of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey), simply because I am in favour of reciprocity in everything, including vegetables and fruit. That was the reason why I voted against the amendment.

Mr. LANCASTER. Since the Minister of Public Works and the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), will not take the advice of the Prime Minister and let this matter drop, one or two of us who did not happen to be in the House at that early hour on Saturday morning, had perhaps say how we view this matter from a fair and independent standpoint. It is manifest from what the hon. member said just now that he himself does not know how he voted on that occasion. It is also evident that if the Prime Minister is to be overruled,in the wise suggestion he made half an hour ago, by his supporters, led by the Minister of Public Works, then on every resolution coming up in this House, hon. members opposite are going to differ with each other just as the hon. member who has just spoken and the member for Wentworth differ as to the effect of the resolution for and against which they voted. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works have this matter entirely upside down. They are undertaking to defend a newspaper man who, under the privilege of sitting in the gallery, misrepresented entirely a vote given by hon. members on this side and they are seeking to continue that misrepresentation by saying that hon. members who put him right are to be attacked in this House and their veracity inpugned. I am quite impartial, I was not in the House, and I am more fair than the Minister of Public Works has been in attempting to read an article which he knew in his heart the Speaker would not allow him to read if he saw it first, in attempting to get a letter on 'Hansard' which he knew, and the Prime Minister knew, as soon as it was shown to him, should not be read and which you, Mr. Speaker, declared should not be read. The Minister of Public Works, with his usual astuteness, must have known that it was improper to read the letter.

What are the merits of the case? I am interested in upholding the honour of every man in the press gallery as well as in the House. I am not going to say that because a gentleman in the press gallery has no rights on the floor of the House he should be ill-treated, and there is no member who will go further to protect a person who is not able to protect himself than I; I would go further than the Minister of Public Works would go; but when an hon. gentleman sitting in the press gallery under the privilege of this House, and by virtue of that privilege only, undertakes to say upon the front page of a newspaper what has been proved here by the hon. members referred to, to be absolutely untrue——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, proved here, by the hon. members whose words go here in this House, I repeat, whose words go in this House, as the Prime Minister said they must go——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LANCASTER—who voted upon that resolution as read by the chairman. These matters are not in dispute. I have listened to what has been said pro and con. I have thought it all over and I am in the position of an absolutely impartial judge in the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not like the Minister of Public Works who voted against reciprocity, according to his own argument in the House to-day, when he says that these hon. gentlemen voted for reciprocity, who tries to assist a gentleman in the press gallery who made a mistake, who for the most contemptible kind of party capital—

Mr. PUGSLEY. He made no mistake.

Mr. LANCASTER. —as the 'Globe' has been doing since it has found how the people look on this matter, trying to find some way to say that the Conservative party is not a unit on this subject—that newspaper man printed on the front page: Conservatives vote for reciprocity. These members say they voted for nothing of the kind. The record of 'Hansard' is behind these hon. gentlemen, it gives the resolution as these hon. members say it was read, but the Minister of Public Works has, I do not say the audacity—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Say it?

Mr. LANCASTER. —it would not be in order, but the extreme assurance, under the pretext of trying to do justice to a gentleman in the press gallery, to permit that gentleman to reiterate what has been proved upon the floor of this House to be absolutely untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the position the matter is in to-day. I do not think the Prime Minister can expect that there is going to be very good order in this House when the Minister of Public Works and those behind him will not obey him when he gives an order as to the time when a discussion should cease. The Prime Minister tried to be fair, and if he had control of his party he would have succeeded in being fair. But evidently in anything that relates to reciprocity there is trouble among hon. gentlemen opposite. The Prime Minister, if he had not been impotent, would have succeeded in being fair and his party behind him would have realized the sense and wisdom of what he was saying, and would have let the matter rest with the statement of the hon. members, who ought to know what they voted for better than the Minister of Public Works or the member for Assiniboia. The Prime Minister pointed out that the statements of these hon. gentlemen must be taken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. What was read is what they voted upon. It is quite unfair of the Minister of Public Works to pretend that these hon. gentlemen should have known exactly what was in the resolution, except from the chairman reading it. How many copies of the resolution were there? Only one copy in the hands of the chairman, no man in the House is able to know what he is voting for except from the lips of the chairman. Whose duty was it to record that? The gentleman reporting for 'Hansard' who recorded the words as these hon. gentlemen say. The evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the statements of the members for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), East Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that the Conservative members who voted for this amendment know what it contained. What I said was that the reporter of the 'Globe' knew what it contained, and sent a correct report.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Public Works, knowing that the statement made by the 'Globe,' by all parliamentary usage and by overwhelming weight of evidence also, is untrue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is not.

Mr. LANCASTER. Absolutely untrue. A motion is put before the chairman, the chairman reads it, no one else has a word or a letter of it before him. The chairman read it and, as hon. gentlemen opposite did, the hon. gentlemen on this side voted. I am not going to make any suggestions that I know nothing about, but I am going to say that there is just as much reason for saying that that motion now produced is not the one which was before the Chair as for saying that it is. There is no ear mark on it. There is not a single item of identification, and there is no way of telling whether it should be accepted as the one which was before the Chair. The 'Hansard' report indicates that it is not the resolution. The statement of the hon. gentleman who voted in regard to it indicates that it is not, and the speech of the hon. member for Wentworth shows that in his opinion it is not. In addition to that we have the fact that the hon. gentleman went on to say that later on he would move in regard to hog products. If the Minister of Public

Works or anybody else in this House undertakes at any time during this session or any other session to say that the Conservative party voted for reciprocity, and if any newspaper maligns or misrepresents members of this House in that regard, I am going to produce the evidence to show that the statement is overwhelmingly proved to be untrue. The minister does not care anything about the rights of these hon. gentlemen who are sitting around me here, and he has endeavoured to prove what the evidence overwhelmingly shows is not correct. He has argued that a member of the press gallery had a right to make the statement that he did in regard to this matter. How does a member of the press gallery know what was before the chairman? Has there been collusion or connivance here? How does a member of the press gallery know better than I do what was before the chairman? Will the minister tell me?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A member of the press gallery is attending here all through the sitting, he is immediately over the Deputy Speaker and he can hear——

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. HUGHES. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Minister of Public Works has spoken at least seventeen times on this question already.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not a point of order.

Mr. HUGHES. That is not a point of order? I say the Minister of Public Works is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) has the floor, if he wishes to continue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara is asking me a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the House is anxious that its dignity should be maintained it will allow the discussion to proceed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara asked me a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. HUGHES. No he did not.

Mr. LANCASTER. I was proceeding to say, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara asked me a question.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is quite manifest that I am anxious to have the House keep order as well as I can, and it is also quite manifest that the Minister of Public Works stands in such a position that the House does not want to hear him answer questions or say anything more. Personally, I would not care, but I am anxious to see that proper order is maintained in the House. I was proceeding to say the Minister of Public Works is outside of the facts entirely when he announces that a member of the press gallery could tell what was in the chairman's hands. A member of the press gallery would have to have a telescope and a pretty long one before he would be able to read a resolution that lay on the desk of the chairman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But he could hear the chairman read it.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is the unfairness again of the Minister of Public Works. He could hear! Did not the hon. member for Peel hear, did not the hon. member for South Simcoe hear, did not the hon. member for East Grey hear, and did not every hon. member who voted upon this question hear? Does the Minister of Public Works mean to tell me again, notwithstanding the lecture that he received from the Prime Minister with regard to this——

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. LANCASTER. I am talking to people who believe in British institutions, who think that the parliament of Great Britain and the members of the parliament of Great Britain amount to something. I am not talking to gentlemen who say: What has Great Britain done for us? I have too much respect for the mother of parliaments to listen to the interruptions of gentlemen who say: What has Great Britain done for us? I am proceeding to show how this strikes me. I was not in the House on that occasion, but I have gathered the information on which to form a judgment from the undisputed facts. That resolution is read and the Minister of Public Works is not ashamed to intimate that the word of a member of the press gallery should be taken about what he heard read rather than the word of any of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who voted upon the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about hon. gentlemen on this side?

Mr. LANCASTER. An hon. gentleman on that side of the House says that he does not know how he voted, he says that he voted for reciprocity, and afterwards that he voted against reciprocity. I do not know what happened after that. I do say that there is some reason for supposing, according to the argument of the hon. Minister of Public Works, that there has been an undue interference with the document that is before the House on this occasion. I have a great deal more right for saying

that than the minister has for saying that the hon. gentleman who voted upon this question did not vote exactly as they say they did. How is a vote taken either in this House or in the Railway Committee when the motion has not been previously printed and distributed? We simply vote on the resolution as we hear the chairman read it. Supposing that these hon. gentlemen did not hear these words read—I do not believe they were in there—but supposing they were in there, and were not read, or were read in such a tone of voice that hon. gentlemen did not hear them, would the Minister of Public Works think he was justified in saying that he did vote for them because he did not hear them? Does the Minister of Public Works vote for something that he does not hear?

Mr. PUGSLEY. How would the reporter in the press gallery know if he did not hear them?

Mr. LANCASTER. Does he vote for things that somebody else hears in the press gallery, or does he vote for what he hears himself? Let him put himself in the same position, and we can prove by half a dozen members of the press gallery that something has been said in the House that the minister did not hear. The hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) never hears anything in this House, and is the Minister of Justice to be bound by anything that he does not hear? The Minister of Public Works has shown a desire to make as much trouble as he can over this matter, although he knows that he is wrong upon it. He must know that he is wrong when he says that the Conservative members can be accused of voting for such an outrageous proposition as reciprocity, that every one of them, in able and convincing speeches, has spoken and argued against. The hon. gentleman knows that the country is behind them, and he knows that the 'Globe' newspaper has its emissaries in almost every county in Canada trying to get the members of the party to agree to support this agreement which has been opposed by three prominent members of the party. We have heard the statement of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that he is both for and against reciprocity, and that he does not know which way he has voted.

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has no right to state in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. TURRIFF—that I did not know which way I was voting, or how I was voting. I know just as well as my hon. friend knows.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TURRIFF—and I say that I voted against that resolution because I was in favour of the whole.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the House will follow the usual custom of allowing a member to speak to a point of order.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara has misrepresented me all through, and I object to being misrepresented. I am in favour of reciprocity, and I voted against that resolution because it was not fully in favour of the reciprocity agreement that is before the House. I object to being misrepresented.

Mr. LANCASTER. I will try once more to help the hon. gentleman understand what he is voting for.

Mr. TURRIFF. You do not need to; help yourself.

Mr. LANCASTER. The 'Globe' newspaper——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) must accept the statement of the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not know which way he voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. A member's statement is generally accepted.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the statement shows which way he voted I am bound to accept it. Will the hon. gentleman now state which way he voted?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on; go on.

Mr. LANCASTER. I cannot accept both because they are absolutely contradictory. I am pointing out that this 'Globe' newspaper undertakes to say that the hon. gentleman who voted for that resolution voted for reciprocity. I am going to leave this with the Minister of Public Works, and the rest of them to find out amongst themselves how they can say, if that 'Globe' newspaper statement is right, that those who voted against the resolution did not vote against reciprocity. You would think that the 'Globe' should know enough to know that when a man votes against such a motion he votes against reciprocity, if, when he votes for the motion he votes for reciprocity. Therefore, 22 of the gentlemen on the other side of the House must have voted against reciprocity, or else they have to agree with me, and disagree with the Minister of Public Works, that the man in the press gallery who wrote that statement ought to be called before the bar of the House and punished, instead of being defended by the Minister of Public Works. That is the way I leave it with the hon. gentlemen opposite.

ST. GEORGE'S DAY—FLYING THE FLAG.

Mr. HUGHES. If I can get the attention of the Minister of Public Works, I desire to ask what steps he had taken, in accordance with his promise made yesterday, to ascertain why St. George's flag was not flying on St. George's day? Also, what steps does the hon. gentleman intend to take to see to it that the officials of his department look after this matter of flying the flag which was neglected both on St. David's day and on St. George's day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was the flag not flying from the post office?

Mr. HUGHES. I am speaking of the parliament buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not had an opportunity of inquiring. If the flag did not fly from the parliament buildings on Sunday, I should think it right, because the flag is supposed to fly when parliament is in session. I think that is the rule that would guide the caretaker, and unless he had special orders he would not fly the flag from the parliament buildings except when parliament is sitting, because the flying of the flag is the sign to all the world that parliament is then in session.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to ask, then, why the Minister of Public Works did not issue special orders to have the flag flying from the buildings on Sunday? I did not see the flag floating from the post office, nor do I find any of the members near me who saw it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It should have flown.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister promised——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. HUGHES. But the minister promised——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has a right to ask a question, but there is the regular way to do that, as he knows.

Mr. HUGHES. I am asking why the Minister of Public Works has not carried out his promise and furnished an answer to the question I asked yesterday?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not promise to give an answer to-day. I cannot do everything at once. I will get the information as soon as possible.

PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Before you leave the chair , Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few observations about the management, or rather mismanagement, of the Printing Bureau, and I shall conclude my remarks with a motion. I must confess some embarrassment in bringing this matter before the House, for two reasons. The first reason is that I feel that no one can read the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee and the evidence taken in the trifling, abortive inquiry made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy), without, as a Canadian, feeling deeply humiliated that such an augean stable as the Printing Bureau can be found among the departments of the government of Canada in this twentieth century. And, Sir, bad as it is to have such an augean stable as that Printing Bureau has been proved to be, amongst the departments, it is still worse to think that the other departments seem to have been combined in attacking that building, not for the sake of mending it, but in the hope of carrying off some of the malodorous stuff to be found there. I feel too, embarrassment on this account. That it is not only humiliating, but it is exasperating to ask this House to allow an inquiry into any branch of the public service unless we have some reason to think that the right hon. gentleman who leads the House will, under any circumstances, allow an inquiry to be made. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman before I begin my remarks, if the policy of the government is so fixed and determined that in no circumstances whatever, no matter what evidence can be laid before the House as to the propriety of the investigation, will the government allow a commission to be appointed to investigate a department? I think, Sir, that is a fair question to ask the right hon. gentleman and I wait for a reply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the question?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I asked the right hon. gentleman if the policy of the government was so fixed and determined. that in no circumstances, no matter what evidence is laid before the House as to the propriety of the investigation, will the government allow an investigation into any department?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no; we have already under such circumstances, allowed a Royal Commission to investigate. There was a Royal Commission of investigation two years ago for example.

Mr. NORTHRUP. If the right hon. gentleman is prepared to allow an investigation in case sufficient evidence is shown, I would like to ask him if, assuming I prove the following facts, he will allow an investigation by Royal Commission into the conduct of the Printing Bureau? Assuming I can

prove the incompetency of the officials in connection with the Printing Bureau; also the lack of frankness on their part towards their superiors; also the lack of a spirit of loyalty and co-operation, destroying their efficiency; also that the employees have become to a certain extent agents of the house of Shylock and have spent their time lending money to one another at rates simply fabulous; also that the employees have become lazy and insubordinate; also that the employees were addicted to excessive drunkenness; also that contracts in connection with that Bureau were made without writing and also without competition; also that there was defective bookkeeping, making it impossible to tell the state of affairs existing in the Bureau; also that there was dissipation; also that there was conspiracy; also, that there was dishonesty; also that there was forgery; and also that there was perjury; the result thereof being tremendous financial loss to the country. I would ask the right hon. gentleman, if I can prove beyond demonstration to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State, that such was the condition of affairs in the Bureau, will he grant the Royal Commission for which I propose to ask?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend can prove all that, I do not see what reason there is for further evidence and further investigation. I think the Secretary of State has done it already.

Mr. NORTHRUP. That is what I was afraid would be the difficulty. After I have proved that all that did exist and shown that practically nothing has been done to remedy it, I feared the right hon. gentleman would still say—although no heads have fallen, although the procedure is to be in the future as in the past; I was afraid he would say: I see no reason why there should be further investigation. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman that also, I can prove and will show to the satisfaction—no, perhaps I should not say to the satisfaction—but, at all events, to the conviction of the Secretary of State, before I resume my seat—that every one of these charges is true. They are proven, let me tell the right hon. gentleman, not by an investigation, not even by an inquiry, not by a ploughing of the soil, not even by a scratching of the soil, but by a mere desultory walking about the department on the part of the Secretary of State and one or two of his officials—no examination under oath, no attempt to probe any of the matters that fairly oozed to the surface, and yet even under these circumstances what charges I have made are proven, and I make my case by simply producing the report of the Secretary of State himself. I will read a few choice selections from that report for the benefit of the House. On page 2 of the Blue-book published by the Secretary of State, the right hon. gentleman will find that the Secretary of State himself has found in the department every one of these evils to exist, which I have charged. And, if one goes further and takes the evidence of the Public Accounts Committee with regard to that Bureau, you will find that what the Secretary of State has admitted has been more than ten-fold proven. Take for example such a passage as this from the report of the Secretary of State:

> The incompetence of some officials, the dishonesty of others, and a complete lack of frankness on the part of those whose duty it was to keep their superiors informed as to the actual working of the Printing Bureau, were the chief causes that combined to unduly prolong the inquiry.
>
> If the parliamentary investigation into the Printing Bureau scandals of 1891 had been followed by the application of vigorous measures to correct the abuses that were then shown to exist, it is probable that the present inquiry would not have been necessary. There can be little doubt that if a thorough overhauling had been made at that time the radical defects in the organization and management of the Printing Bureau would have been discovered and corrected, and that such action would have led to a more faithful discharge of their duties by the officials and employees. But, with the exception of a few dismissals, nothing was done. As a consequence, the evils that were left untouched spread and flourished to the serious impairment of the Bureau's efficiency and the gradual destruction of that spirit of loyalty and co-operation which ought to prevail in an establishment of its size and public importance.
>
> The condition of affairs above alluded to is very fully dealt with in the annexed sub-reports numbered from 1 to 8, inclusive. As these sub-reports also contain a mass of detail in connection with both the Printing and the Stationery Branches there remain to be considered only those matters with which the undersigned had to deal personally.
>
> Lax management had favoured the growth of many abuses that told against discipline. Among the employees money-lending in small sums at excessive rates of interest was extensively practised. In several instances the borrowers were sued and the Division Court bailiffs usually effected service on the debtors at the Bureau during business hours. This had a demoralizing effect, not only on the parties concerned, but also on many of their fellow-workmen as well. Then it was found that private business was transacted at the Bureau during business hours. In other cases there were certain employees who made a practice of coming late to work, and these, as well as a number who occasionally drank to excess, set a bad example to the more punctual and sober workmen. Some of the late-comers added to their offence by making false entries of their hours of arrival in the attendance books. It was discovered that another kind of falsification was also indulged in. An examination of a large number of orders issued for goods in the Printing Branch

revealed the fact that after the signature of the undersigned had been obtained to such orders, additional goods had been entered on many of the orders without his knowledge. And this was done despite the fact that specific instructions had repeatedly been issued that no purchase were to be made or orders given unless the approval of the undersigned had first been obtained.

Again:

In sub-report No. 1 the divided authority that existed at the Bureau is discussed at length. Owing partly to such divided authority, and partly to the lack of business methods, contracts, as a rule, were entered into without securing competitive prices and without complete written records of the transactions being made. In fact written contracts appear to have been unknown at the Bureau until they were introduced less than two years ago. Prior to that the details of each contract could be secured only by collecting and reading the correspondence on file in different offices and by getting verbal statements from the different individuals who might have had something to do with it at various stages. Notwithstanding the frequent instructions issued in this regard, orders were placed without inviting competition, and in every instance without the approval of the undersigned.

Then there is a long account of what took place under the management of the late Superintendent of Stationery. Now, without going any further, the admissions here made by the Secretary of State are enough to show a deplorable state of affairs existing in the department. But there were other matters even worse, in my humble judgment, than those to which he referred, if we look at the practical results on the service in general, and on the country. There seems to have been a carnival in all the departments in their desire to break the law in regard to printing. The Secretary of State has pointed out in his report, very properly, that the law of the land requires all the printing to be done at the Printing Bureau through his department; but whether because the profits in connection with printing contracts are so great or because the lust for patronage was so irrepressible that the other departments found it impossible to forego it in the matter of printing, the fact remains that other departments, who had no right to do their own printing, arrogated to themselves that right instead of handing it over to the Printing Department. It is a striking fact that in one case, to which I shall refer presently, where apparently most exorbitant prices were paid, and two firms were enabled to make great profits, the justification offered was that those were the prices paid by the Department of the Interior. Then it was pointed out in the report that in many minor matters large losses were incurred by the country. Take, for example, the matter of the voters' lists. The law of the land requires that the voters' lists shall be printed at the Printing Bureau, and that they shall be left in type so that, if required in an emergency, new lists could be obtained. I do not think myself that it is a very wise provision, and I think the Secretary of State might very well have directed his attention to having the law amended, seeing that with the new mode of printing it is rather an extravagant and useless procedure to require the type to be kept standing. But still that is the law, and as long as it is, it should be observed. But instead of the law being observed and the printing being done in the Printing Bureau, and the type being kept standing, I find that prior to the last election, the lists for forty-one constituencies in the province of Ontario were printed outside of the Printing Bureau, and no type kept standing, in Quebec fourteen, in Nova Scotia three, in New Brunswick one, and in British Columbia six, making altogether sixty-five constituencies out of 221 with regard to which the law was wilfully and deliberately broken. Then, as to requisitions. One great reason for the tremendous loss in the Department of the Secretary of State is the recklessness with which requisitions are made by other departments, and the heedlessness with which they are honoured by his department. He has pointed out in his report that the statute and the regulations passed in Council require that the requisitions from the various departments shall go to the Department of the Secretary of State under the hand of the deputy head of the department from which they come; but, instead of that, a custom has grown up that any Tom, Dick or Harry, who happens to be in the Civil Service and who desires any article of any kind, from a law book to a library of books, has merely to send in his requisition, and it is honoured as readily and fully as if it came from the head of the government himself. In this way a double loss naturally occurs. More goods are purchased than should be, and goods of a kind that never should be purchased at all are purchased; and it is possible that the unfortunate man Gouldthrite, who came to such a sad end, may have been led astray by the recklessness of other departments, he thinking that he too might break the law when the opportunity was afforded for his own benefit. Another way in which the department have been breaking the law and causing the country great expense is in the utter recklessness with which they send in their proofs to the Printing Bureau. In asking for an investigation into the Department of State, I wish to be fair and just to the Printing Bureau, and I think it would be only just, in investigating what is wrong there, to investigate also what is done wrong in other de-

partments in connection with dealings with the Printing Bureau. It appears in the evidence that among the offenders the Department of Militia is perhaps the worst. They seem to have an idea there that the proper way to edit their reports is while they are being printed. The evidence is given again and again that the cost of printing in the Militia Department is double what it should be by virtue of the recklessness with which improper proofs are sent in and the work is edited while being printed. In the Department of the Interior, in connection with the printing of maps, the same recklessness exists. But in the Department of Militia there is not the same hurry as in many other departments, and when we find a work like the King's Regulations sent down to the Printing Bureau at a time when the department is overworked and when consequently increased expense is incurred, it would be well for the head of that department to consider whether or not it would not be well to suspend for a few months the printing of such a work if the expense is to be so much increased by hurrying it up at a particular time. Then, many works, such as the Civil Service List, are printed both in English and in French. Now, one would have thought that the most elementary idea of business principles would have prompted the department to recognize that in a work like the Civil Service List there is very little difference between the English and the French edition. The names and the figures are the same; the only difference is in the change of a few words. Therefore, as is pointed out in the evidence, the French edition could be printed from the English at a very trifling expense, for only a few changes in the names of the months or days would have to be made. Yet, as a matter of fact, an English edition is printed in this printing house and a French edition in that, utterly regardless of the fact that they are practically the same, and a double expense is thus imposed on the country. Then there are illustrations of the way contracts were let that were rather startling. In looking through the evidence I found a case that occurred when one Cook was in the department. He has since been dismissed, but his dismissal does not alter the fact as to how the work was done in the department at that time, and gives us no guarantee that any better system will be adopted in the future. I found this taking place during his incumbency of an office. A certain book was required—if I remember rightly, a book on weeds for the Department of Agriculture. The contract was let by this young man in Toronto—let without the knowledge of his superiors. Later on the Secretary of State wished to look into the matter, and did look into it, and it appeared likely that he would repudiate that contract. So an official of the department went around the country—to Toronto, to Buffalo, to New York—and got tenders from other firms at the very time the work was being done by a Toronto firm, that he might have something to lay before the minister. I am not going to waste time on that, because that is merely preliminary to the point I wish to make. The minister's attention was called in some way to what was going on, and he insisted on seeing the files, and knowing how the matter had been handled, and what tenders had been put in. In consequence of the inquiries made by the minister, I find the following letter, on page 297 of the report of the Secretary of State, which fully explains itself and shows how business is carried on in the Printing Department even under the present Secretary of State.

Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Referring to our letter of April 22 last, addressed to the King's Printer, and containing prices for an edition of Farm Grasses, we beg to say that the circumstances under which Mr. R. E. Cook obtained the letter mentioned are as follows:

At an interview in the Printing Bureau in April last, Mr. Cook stated to our Mr. Wm. Mortimer that you had given a contract for the edition of Farm Grasses to the Toronto Lithographing Company, and that as the contract amounted to more than $5,000 you desired to have on file correspondence showing that you had invited tenders for the work, and that the Toronto Lithographing Company was the lowest tenderer. Mr. Cook added that this correspondence was required in case a question was asked about the matter. Mr. Cook asked Mr. Mortimer to put in a tender slightly higher than that of the Toronto Lithographing Company, and as the tender of the latter company had been placed on Mr. Cook's desk where Mr. Mortimer could see it, the latter copied the figures, and returning to our office made up a tender as requested by Mr. Cook. We assumed that Mr. Cook's statements were correct and did not make any inquiry from you. We were aware, however, when we wrote the letter of April 22 that the contract had previously been given to the Toronto Lithographing Company, and that our figures were not in the nature of a tender, but were to be used merely for the purpose of justifying the giving of the contract to the Toronto Lithographing Company, as explained to our Mr. Mortimer by Mr. R. E. Cook.

Yours truly,
THE MORTIMER CO., LTD.,
A. E. Mortimer,
Managing Director.

Would one think it possible that in Canada the head of one of our largest firms would put the name of his firm to such a letter addressed to the Secretary of State, frankly admitting that he had deliberately and wilfully taken part in a fraud, by sending in a bogus tender to deceive and

rob the public, and said he believed he was doing this at the request of the Secretary of State. That would be enough to startle any one, but one possibly finds some explanation of it when he takes the trouble to look into the Auditor General's Report and finds the following interesting items paid to Mortimer & Company. In order that there may be no question as to the accuracy of my figures, I shall give the pages. Mortimer & Company seem to have had dealings with every department in the public service. This firm, which put its name to this letter, that I have just read, fared as follows at the hands of the government last year, according to the Auditor General's Report:

T--24..	$ 8,419 54
25..	509 65
25..	1,969 57
25..	480 00
25..	563 55
26..	1,193 85
27..	10,857 85
28..	988 45
29..	2,493 00
29..	200 19
30..	1,608 31
30..	2,108 55
30..	15,707 64
31..	464 76
31..	81 20
32..	681 77
32..	3,371 61
32..	18 21
32..	3,747 48
33..	178 40
33..	102 20
33..	3,371 67
33..	62 20

I may have overlooked some items, but the sum total of those I have read is $67,075.25 paid by the various departments to this firm whose mode of doing business is proved over their own signature to the Secretary of State which I have read.

In going through the report of the Secretary of State, another striking feature is presented. His report starts off as follows:

Shortly after assuming office in the month of October, 1908, the undersigned addressed the following letter to the then acting King's Printer:

Ottawa, Nov. 27, 1908.

Dear Sir,—Please do not make any purchases or give orders for outside printing without first consulting me. Also be good enough to furnish me with a list of all persons receiving patronage from the Printing Bureau, so that any who are not principals may be struck from the list.

Yours very truly,
CHARLES MURPHY.

So that as early as November 29, 1908, a letter was written, and the first sentence of the report is a letter marking the date on which the inquiry was to begin and which was to continue at such times and under such circumstances as the other duties of the undersigned would permit.

Mr. NORTHRUP.

The first time any evidence was taken was on June 20, 1910, so that we have one of the two results. Either the Secretary of State failed entirely to do anything from November, 1908, until June 20, 1910, or has entirely suppressed in his report to the House the result of his inquiries during that interval. And during that interval it was that the mischief was done. The evidence of witness after witness is clear and positive that this wrong-doing was all committed during the last two or three years. I have read the evidence carefully and there is no evidence of any fraud or robbery of the public until within the last two or three years. Apparently the Secretary of State had a hint in November, 1908, that something was wrong. If he had not a hint then, he had one a year before he did anything. Evidently one of his officials named Patenaude happened to be a man with a conscience, even in that department, and was so worried over the transactions which were going on that, after he had reported them to a minor official above him and nothing had been done, he spoke to Mr. Boudreau, a man outside of the office altogether, and left the matter in his hands. Mr. Boudreau was a man of honour, and reported the matter to the Secretary of State, so that in 1909 the Secretary of State was warned and yet apparently nothing was done until the climax was reached and Gouldthrite disappeared and, it is said, was found drowned a few days after. When we find this laxness in the beginning, when we find that there was a shortage in the stock and that apparently no effort was taken to ascertain how it arose and who was the guilty party, when there is nothing to show that any head fell because of it, I think we have ample reason for asking that a Royal Commission be appointed which will investigate without fear or favour, and tell us who is responsible for the shortage and possibly find some way of recouping the government for the money lost.

As an illustration of the utter recklessness with which the public money was handled, let me point out that at one time toilet paper was bought at some $3 or $4 a roll. But a happy inspiration no doubt struck some official that here there might be a chance for graft, so the price was worked up to $13.75 and $14 per roll. It seems that the officials were a little afraid to send this paper, so they judiciously sent one lot to the penitentiaries. There was not much danger of any one there being brought into contact with any member of the opposition, and therefore these extravagant purchases of toilet paper were got rid of by sending large quantities to the penitentiaries. They sent some to the Department of the Interior. I suppose that was for the use of the Indians. The rest was sent to

the Department of Militia and Defence. I do not know what could have been the object in that, unless it was to furnish armour plate for the Canadian navy, something stronger and safer than we had; at all events, that is the department to which it was sent. The Secretary of State found out by simple calculation that over $1,400 a year was taken out of this country on that item alone by ruinous extravagance which, apparently, it was nobody's business to watch or check.

Then, it was shown that it was a very common thing for workmen in the department to bring in books from outside to be bound. One case was investigated, and it turned out that the loss to the department on one book alone was about $10—leather, gold leaf and other material used and time employed. Many workmen were engaged in the same occupation—bringing in outside books, binding them with materials belonging to the department and using time that was paid for by the department. The country footed the bill, and apparently all was well.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the binding was done for outside parties?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For the general public?

Mr. NORTHRUP. One man was connected with a theatrical company and bound books for them. Another man bound them for his friends. Others bound books for people outside the department, using the department's time, leather, and gold leaf. That went on with the knowledge or the foremen, and seems to have been regarded as a reasonable and proper practice;—as long as the men were there at all, apparently that is all that was required. Evidence is given by some men—it is only just to say that it is denied by others—that the men at the department were in the habit of staying there after hours, sometimes all night, to do extra work, and the next day they would sit round idle because there was nothing for them to do. It is true, as I have said, that that is contradicted by the men themselves. But there is nothing in the report to show that investigation was made into the matter. There must be some way of finding out whether the statement is true or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it stated on oath?

Mr. NORTHRUP. No, no inquiry was made on oath. And that is another point worthy of attention. This inquiry of the Secretary of State was not even under oath. And, when we find that, even with no penalty for twisting the truth, the statements of these parties reveal such a horrible state of affairs, surely, we who represent the people whose money has been squandered, have the right to ask for a royal commission, that we may see how deep these sores extended of which only the surface is revealed to us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How could it happen that the officials in the Printing Bureau could be doing this general contract work in binding for outsiders and apart altogether from the country's needs?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Simply because the foreman thought it a small matter and allowed it to go on. The evidence is clear that in several cases the foremen were aware what was done. One man said he did this work in the hour between twelve and one, but others did not even pretend to say that. I have already referred to the case of one book concerning which an investigation was made, and $10 was the amount it was thought right to charge as a fair return to the country for the time expended and the materials used in the binding of this one book.

Then, the pleasing practice grew up in the department of lending money at 'reasonable' rates. At first, apparently, the parties were not so utterly unreasonable. A man who had a little money was willing to make on that fifty or seventy-five per cent and his fellow employees, apparently, were willing to pay it. But, I suppose emboldened by success, and with appetites whetted the money-lenders demanded more. I suppose a dozen or fifteen witnesses were examined on that question, the question of the usurious rates charged in a regular money-lending business done within the department. Five cents on the dollar for a fortnight was the charge made in the first place by those who were willing to lend at 'reasonable' rates. But that was hardly a living rate, apparently, so they asked as high as ten cents on the dollar for a fortnight. There were eight or ten money-lenders apparently doing a brisk if not cheerful, business in the department, lending money right and left to their less successful employees at rates of five to ten cents on the dollar for a fortnight's interest.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it, these were outside money-lenders who came in and made loans to the people in the department?

Mr. NORTHRUP. No, that would be bad enough. But I speak of the operations of men whose time was paid for out of the public treasury, and who spent their time, some as Shylocks in lending, and some as victims in borrowing. Both lender and borrower were workmen on the pay-roll, and in these transactions they spent time that was paid for by the country, and the

minister reports that, as one result of these proceedings, bailiffs came down occasionally to serve summons, and violent altercations took place, which had a bad effect, of course not only on the discipline of the men involved, but on the discipline of all those working with them. But the very fact that such practices could be carried on to such an extent openly and unblushingly must have had an extremely bad effect upon discipline.

Another small matter—it may be hardly worth mentioning in connection with these other things, but it illustrates the want of discipline in the department—is referred to at pages 235 and 242 of the Secretary of State's report. The point referred to is the waste of material, and the taking away from the Bureau. A notice was put up by the King's Printer with relation to this matter. One of the men, called Charbonneau, had his attention directed to it. He admitted that he had seen it, but he said that it did not make any difference to him, it was not put up in French, and it would have to be put up in French before he would take any notice of it. When we take that statement of this gentleman, who explains these matters, we get some idea of why affairs at the Bureau were as they were. At page 237, the minister inquired:

Mr. Walsh has expressed the opinion that the lack of discipline which has prevailed in the bindery for years, and which now prevails, is due to some extent at present to three individuals in particular—Parrington, Harry Allan and Johnson. What is your opinion with reference to Mr. Walsh's view upon that point?

And the man replied:

I think he is pretty nearly right, these men presuming a good deal upon their political pull.

I think no one can read this report of the Secretary of State himself without seeing revealed on every page of it the secret of the state of affairs that existed in the Bureau, and it is to be found in those words, that some were 'presuming a good deal upon their political pull.'

At page 148 of this blue-book is a very interesting sub-report, made by Mr. O'Connor, who was appointed by the minister to investigate the mode of carrying on the business in the department. The blame is placed on a man named Cook, a subordinate official, and I am not prepared to say that blame should not be placed on him, but there is something monstrous in saying that a department can be carried on in a scandalous way for years, and no one be blamed except such a man as Cook, a subordinate.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is O'Connor?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. O'Connor is an experienced practical printer from Montreal, formerly on the 'Star' and 'Herald,' brought in to assist in this investigation.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. O'Connor is a suitable and proper man to make the report. At page 149 Mr. O'Connor says:

This price list provided for arbitrary prices for lithographic press work, and for cheques, with no regard for the relative value of the work to be done. For type work, which the Bureau knew something about, different prices were made for different sized forms, but for litho work, in which there is a wide range of value, the price was $5 per thousand impressions, without any regard to the size of the sheet or the character of the work to be done. Moreover, these impressions were counted in the lithographic room by the unit without any apparent knowledge of the fact that in many cases several units were repeated on the same sheet, printed with one impression, and cut up, after printing, into units before delivery to the Bureau. But in the case of cheques and kindred forms, such as certificates and receipts, the evidence of the duplication of units in the printing was constantly being thrust upon Mr. Cook's attention, apparently without raising the slightest dissent. The price list above referred to read: 'Cheques $5 per thousand up to 4,000, and $4 per thousand for quantities above 4,000,' and cheques were paid for at $5 or $4 per thousand, irrespective of the fact that in many cases the price was nearly ten times the commercial value of the work. In lithographing cheques, for instance, one plate only is engraved. From this ten transfers may be made on the lithographic stone from which the printing is done, and ten cheques are printed in one sheet at each impression. In considering an account for lithographic work the number of units printed from each impression should be considered. Thus I have an account before me for the printing of 100,000 grain certificates at $4 per thousand certificates, equalling $400. Now this work was done on government paper furnished large enough to print ten certificates at one time on one sheet, and it was so done. The charge then should have been for 10,000 impressions at $4 per thousand sheets, and $4 for making the necessary transfer, in all $44, which is a fair price in these days of close margins, as against the price of $400 charged according to the absurd interpretation of the scale. These absurd prices appear to have been paid for years without protest by Mr. Cook or any other official until I called attention to it during my inquiry, and, by your authority, had it stopped.

That is along the same line as the printing of the Civil Service list, a more grievous case, but in principle much the same. A little common sense in the conduct of the Bureau would have taught them at once that in order to have a French edition of the Civil Service list they had merely to make a few changes in the dates and have it reprinted instead of having the English version printed here and the French there, at double the cost, without any attempt to save anything to the country. When I find items like grain certificates and cheques

printed in that way I wonder if the same rule is not applied to post office orders, customs blanks and these innumerable public documents which might be printed with comparative cheapness, but which would cost an enormous amount if printed in the same way as the documents to which I have referred.

An immense amount of stock is, of course, purchased by the printing department. I have already said that a Royal Commission might well inquire into the conduct of other departments in sending their requisitions into the printing department. If clerks were employed, they could do what I certainly decline to do, go through the thousands of requisitions and trace out the individuals who had been sending in these reckless requisitions for absurd articles. How were tenders obtained? After the requisitions came in what goods were bought by tender and what without? Everything was bought without tender except paper and envelopes (pages 7, 21 and 22 of the report). Everything bought in the United States or Great Britain was bought without tender, as one of the employees told us under oath in the Public Accounts Committee, about $200,000 a year would be bought under contract and between $300,000 and $400,000 not under contract. Then when that department came to purchase by tender, how was that done? There was no list, they are all very clear about that; there was no advertising as a rule, but the head of the branch had in his mind certain houses suitable to do that kind of work and so he inquired of them for tenders and they got the work. That is all the check the country had, as to the expenditure of this money in that department, no pretense of competition, and if we may judge from the one case, namely that proved by Mr. Mortimer, which I read to the House, the public would not be necessarily any better off if the tenders could be produced here to show that there had been even keen, excessive competition. A Royal Commission might shed a light into these tenders, by going deeper than has so far been done.

There is another incident that would justify further inquiry in which the Deputy Minister is involved. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) moved for a return showing the cost of printing and lithographing done in certain years. An employee was instructed to prepare a return showing the cost of printing and lithographing. He prepared his return and handed it to Mr. Mulvey, the under Secretary of State, and Mr. Mulvey's evidence, given under oath, without a blush, is that he honestly believed he was obeying the order of this House and doing his duty when, in answer to a return for the cost of printing and lithographing, he subtracted the cost, as he estimated it, of the paper on which that printing and lithographing was done, thinking that if the House asked the cost of printing it meant literally printing. Here was not a case in which the paper was supplied; they were pamphlets printed by an outside printing office, and although the Auditor General's Report gave the cost including the printing, the amount paid to the firm, this astute official, in his anxiety to do something, I do not know what, deliberately sent in a report to this House giving cost of printing and lithographing when he knew he had subtracted the cost of paper on which the printing and lithographing had been done. If the man had been both honest and intelligent and right in what he was doing, should he not also have subtracted the profits that the printer had made? If it was only the cost of printing that this House wanted to know, what had profits to do with that cost? If the cost of the paper which was used be subtracted surely the profits could be subtracted too.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there nothing in the return to show that?

Mr. NORTHRUP. No, but the return should show the cost of the printing. The figures of the Auditor General's Report show that so much was paid for printing, and this return shows so much less, and the explanation is that the paper was subtracted. I do not wish to say anything against the deputy minister, whom I do not know, but it seems to me that if I were a royal commissioner and I had one case of that kind brought to my notice, I would look very closely into the management of that office by that deputy minister.

There is another case of contracting which shows how things have been done. This young man Cook, who has since been removed, probably on his own motion, gave a contract to the Gananoque 'Reporter' for the printing of a certain number of pamphlets. He informed the King's Printer that he had done so, and it might be a perfectly justifiable thing, as it was pointed out that the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter' had been a candidate for parliament in the interest of the Reform party, that he was unsuccessful and was hard up. In the face of such meritorious claims as this, of course, the contract was given. It is true that the gentleman never had been a candidate for parliament; it was his brother who had been a candidate for parliament, away back in 1887, but still there were as good reasons for giving that contract as for some others which were given in connection with this department. The contract was given to this man, the statement being made that he was particularly well supplied with the necessary amount of plant to do printing of this

kind. When the proofs came in to be corrected it was seen that the work was being done by the Ottawa 'Free Press.' The work was done by the Ottawa 'Free Press' and the Ottawa 'Free Press' was paid for it. I do not know what profit it made, but I do know that the Gananoque 'Reporter,' that had nothing to do with it at all, got $200 profit. We find that they got $200 profit for doing nothing, and that the other printing company got its profit. When taken to task about the high price which was paid for this work, the convincing answer came back at once: You can find no fault with the price, because it is the price paid by the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has no more authority to spend public money on printing than I have. It is a piece of impertinent presumption, because the statute says that all this printing shall be done in the Printing Bureau, and my hon. friend, the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy), has very properly sent circulars to all his colleagues, asking them to observe that provision of the law. But here we see the Printing Bureau, which should have been an exemplar to all others, is led astray by the reckless extravagance of the Minister of Agriculture, who has been paying such fancy prices for printing and who has improperly permitted this paper to receive $200 for doing nothing, while another company is making a living profit out of the work.

Now, I do not intend to occupy very much of the time of the House further, but I would like to give a few figures to show the absurd way in which this department has been honouring requisitions and the iniquitous way in which these requisitions have been sent in. I think that the right hon. Prime Minister, when he hears my figures, will be inclined to have a Royal Commission to probe, not merely into the public Printing Bureau, but into other departments in so far as they have dealt with the Printing Bureau, and to see who is to blame for these outrageous expenditures. When one looks at the Auditor General's Report—for the present 'T' is the page with which we are most concerned—he will find a great deal of evidence bearing on this subject. There are so many items that I do not pretend to have fished out all under the different heads to which I intend to refer, and although the figures I give may not be complete, they are, at all events, accurate, as far as they go. The only exception that might be taken to them is that probably, if I had had more time and gone more fully into the Auditor General's Report, I would have found more items of this kind than I have. I was struck with the frequency with which the word 'dictionaries' appeared in that book, so I made this little note:

T—6, Beauchemin, Librairie, 34 dictionaries, cost..	$164 00
T—6, Beauchemin, 3 dozen at $5.. ..	15 00
T—8, Can. Law Book Co., 5 law dictionaries..	50 40
T—9, Duffill Standard Dictionary of Facts, 27 at $6.75..	181 75
T—10, Hope, 7 dictionaries..	13 90
T—17, Baker & Taylor, N.Y., 19.. ..	137 15
T—20, Dawson & Sons, Imperial Dictionary, 16 vols..	62 29
	$624 89

The department spent $624.89 for dictionaries alone. It is not as if we were starting departments in Canada. These departments have been doing business at the old stand for years, and inasmuch as in one year they have bought over $600 worth of dictionaries, I think there is good ground for inquiry.

Take the question of law bags. What earthly right has a civil servant to purchase law bags at the expense of the country? I have nothing like the full list of law bags purchased, because there are a great many entered as leather bags, which I fancy, from the places where they were bought, were really meant for brief bags. But I do not include these. These are merely described as brief bags:

T—8, H. Carson, Ottawa, brief bags, 2 at $10, 2 at $8, 12 at $7.50, 1 at $6..	$132 00
T—13, Ottawa Trunk Store, brief bag. Fibre case, $8; special strap, $2.50..	15 00 10 50
T—16, Western Leather Goods Co., brief bags, 6 at $12.50, $75; 6 at $11 50, $69; 6 at $8.50, $51..	195 00
	$352 50

They paid out $352.50 for brief bags. Again I think that a little investigation into such an expenditure as that would not do any harm. Then, let us take almanacs. There seems to be a craving for almanacs. I find that the following purchases were made:

T—6, Beauchemin, 24½ doz. at $1.80..	$ 44 10
T—6, Beauchemin, 225 at 15 cents.. ..	33 75
T—15, Thorburn, 538..	276 62
T—10, Hope & Sons, 86⅞ doz. at $6.30, 4¾ doz. at $4 20; sundry, $3.71.. ..	569 25
	$923 72

Then we have the directories, and I am sorry that the right hon. Prime Minister is leaving the room.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will come back in a minute.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I will suspend my remarks with regard to directories until the right hon. gentleman returns. Then there are law books. I have no objection to the government providing all the law books that are required, but it seems to me that

it is impudent extravagance, when there is a good law library in the Supreme Court, a fair law library in the Library of parliament, and a fair law library in the Department of Justice, that we should have every tu'penny ha'penny law clerk in a department thinking that he is entitled to set up a law library for himself at the expense of the country. I find that the following amounts were expended for law books:

T—6, Code Civil du Bas Canada, 3 vols..	$ 54 00
T—8, Canadian Law Book Co.. ..	2,387 61
T—8, Carswell..	299 00
T—11, J. Lovell & Son..	386 71
T—13, Poole & Co..	113 43
T—14, Richardson & Bishop..	7 50
T—17, American Law Book Company, 33 vols..	120 00
T—19, Thompson, Edward, Co., 42 vols..	209 85
T—19, E. G. Allen & Son, 45 vols. commercial treaties..	114 00
T—16, Wilson & Lafleur..	169 08
	$3,861 78

That was the expenditure for miscellaneous law books around among the various departments. It seems high. Then I would like to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that while typewriters are very proper articles to have, when it comes to an expenditure of $60,000 or $70,000 for typewriters and typewriter supplies it is a little high. One cannot help suspecting that an intelligent investigation by an outside party would discover some means of conducting the affairs of the country at a less expense for typewriters. I have only taken a few samples among the expenditures to show how grossly absurd they are. Let me mention the item of subscriptions to directories. There are subscriptions of all sorts, and I do not see why the civil servants should be entitled to subscribe so liberally to all sorts of periodicals and magazines and newspapers, Canadian and American. The subscription list for magazines and periodicals which amounts to $2,214.89 are to be found at page T—6, T—8, T—10, T—16, T—20 and T—19. I submit to the right hon. gentleman whether this extensive subscription list is not superfluous at best and extravagant at worst. Then we come to directories and they are perhaps one of the best illustrations of the way the departments have helped themselves. The Canadian Gazeteer Publishing Company sold 37 at $10 each; the Canadian Legal Publishing Company got $196; Henderson Directories, Limited, $315; Henderson Publishing Company, $140; Hope, of Ottawa, 19 at $4.50 each, and 3 at $3 each; the International Railway Publishing Company sold to the extent of $1,728; J. Lovell & Son, Montreal, 4 directories at $12 each, 10 at $7.50, and 90 at $6, amounting to $573 and $265; the McAlpin Publishing Company of Halifax, $97.50; the Might Directories, $1,536; The Union Publishing Company, Ingersoll, $55; Vernon of Hamilton, $300; Baker & Taylor, of New York, $30—heaven only knows what they wanted American directories for—the Kelly Publishing Company of New York, $77; Boulanger & Marcotte, Quebec, $150; the Provincial Publishing Company of Victoria, $25; Guild & Hewson, Kingston city directory, $95.45. That all comes to considerably over $5,000 paid for directories last year. Take 43 directories of Quebec and Point Levis, and if there was any proper system of requisition I venture to say no deputy head would dare to put his name at the foot of a requisition for 43 directories of Quebec and Levis, and so on from Halifax and Moncton and St. John right through to Vancouver and Victoria, in some cases dozens, and in other cases hundreds bought to the extent of altogether $5,000 for directories last year. I submit that also to the right hon. gentleman as an illustration of matters that do not appear to have been touched on in the investigation so far. Without occupying the time of the House, I will say that if under any circumstances a Royal Commission would be justifiable to look into the affairs of a department, it has been shown that it would be proper in the case of the Printing Bureau: First, as the investigation which has been made was not under oath, it may be said in one sense that no investigation has been held at all; and the investigation not being under oath it would be such an investigation as would give the accused parties every possible hope of escaping from the charges that might be made against them. And yet even under those circumstances what I have already stated has been disclosed. I move:

That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor:

A Royal Commission be appointed to make inquiry into the management of the Printing Bureau for such time past as the commissioners may consider in the public interest with instructions to inquire fully into the causes of the want of system therein and to report who is to blame therefor and what safeguards be provided to protect the country for the future.

And that said commissioners be further instructed to investigate how far other departments have violated that law by usurping the powers of the Printing Bureau in the matter of printing or by sending in requisitions for supplies in contravention of the statute and regulations in that behalf.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). Mr. Speaker, although spring has arrived for the rest of the world the winter

of his discontent seems still to hang heavy upon the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). If I may be permitted to coin a phrase that would describe that hon. gentleman's recent political condition I would say that it has been one of progressive disappointment. A few weeks ago the reports in certain newspapers credited the hon. gentleman with being sorely disappointed at that time on account of the fact that a certain agitation which was then said to be on foot had not focused in his immediate vicinity and did not result in an exchange of positions between himself and the hon. the leader of the opposition. A short time later the hon. gentleman's reputation as a parliamentary wit was rudely shattered by a little 7 x 9 story which was told at his expense by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), and now, Sir, it falls to my lot to further increase his disappointment by declining to accept the motion which he has just presented to the House.

In passing, I might say that the ordinary courtesy extended to a minister whose department is to be placed under review was not, it appears to me, extended on this occasion, because I was not furnished with a copy of the hon. gentleman's motion until late this morning. However, I am willing to treat that as an oversight and I found no complaint upon it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Then why mention it? Did I understand the minister to say that he was not informed?

Mr. MURPHY. I say that I did not get a copy of the hon. gentleman's motion until late this morning.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It was not drawn until this morning.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand it the rule is that such a motion is generally sent on the morning of the day it is to be moved.

Mr. MURPHY. I merely mentioned the incident because I have seen on other occasions that the motion was forwarded earlier.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I notified the chief whip of the opposition several days ago and told him such a question was to be brought up and that is the usual custom.

Mr. MURPHY. I am not raising any objection to the notice; I merely mentioned that the copy of the motion was not sent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The practice is to give notice that a motion is intended to be made and to send a copy of the motion some time in the forenoon of the day on which the motion is moved. I never heard any complaint about that practice before.

Mr. MURPHY. The motion, as it reached me, is somewhat wider in its terms than the notice given by the hon. member to a gentleman on this side of the House who transmitted it to me. But, be that as it may, let us look at the motion of the hon. gentleman and consider it for a few moments. In the first paragraph the hon. gentleman proposes 'that a Royal Commission be appointed to make inquiry into the management of the Printing Bureau for such time past as the commissioners may consider in the public interest.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, the inquiry which has been conducted into the management of the Printing Bureau covers about twenty-five years, and the motion made by my hon. friend, as well as his speech in support of it, totally ignore both the period of time covered by that investigation and the report made as a result of it, so far as the findings of that report are directed to correct the abuses that were discovered during the course of the investigation. The first paragraph of this motion proceeds: 'With instructions to inquire fully into the causes of the want of system therein.' Why, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what has been done; that is precisely the work I and the experts whom I engaged to assist me put in a great many months at doing; and the result of that work is spread upon the pages of this report which has been before parliament and the country since last November. Then, this paragraph further proceeds: 'And to report who is to blame therefore, and what safeguards are to be provided to protect the country for the future.' Mr. Speaker, all of that has been done in the most minute detail. A great deal of that detail is set forth in the report which was presented to parliament in November last; and for his own purposes my hon. friend chooses to ignore that report and the work which it indicates was done before the report was in shape to present to parliament. In fact, the motion of the hon. gentleman, and the speech which he has made in support of it, go to the extent of treating the report and the investigation as two things that never happened. Now, it is taxing the credulity of this House and carrying absurdity to its extremest length to ask the House to accept any such proposition as that which the hon. gentleman lays before it in this motion.

The second paragraph of the motion begins in these terms: 'And that said commissioners be further instructed to investigate how far other departments have violated the law by usurping the powers of the Printing Bureau in the matter of printing.' Now, Mr. Speaker,

as a matter of fact, the powers of the Printing Bureau were not usurped by other departments; but when printing was done through other departments, the reason for that printing having been done under the direction of another department rather than under that of the Printing Bureau was elicited in the course of the investigation, and appropriate remedies were applied to prevent that being done in the future. So that, as in the case of the first paragraph, this clause in the second is absolutely unnecessary, because it deals with matters which have been thoroughly investigated. This paragraph proceeds further: 'Or by sending in requisitions for supplies in contravention of the statute and regulations in that behalf.' Here again, a full investigation has been made, and where any irregularity has been found to exist with regard to these requisitions, that irregularity has been promptly stopped. Now, Sir, let me point out to you and to the House that this second paragraph of the hon. gentleman's motion covers the most ordinary matters of every-day departmental routine. To adopt this paragraph, I submit, would be to establish a precedent whereby parliament would be substituted for all the departments. Governmental responsibility would cease——

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). And time it did.

Mr. MURPHY. My hon. friend from Leeds says it is time it did. I would just say that the country has a different opinion, and that is the reason my hon. friend is on that side of the House and we are on this side. I was proceeding to say that governmental responsibility would cease and legislation would be rendered impossible by the mass of detail which is now looked after by the several departments, and which would inevitably be transferred to parliament if the principle laid down in this second paragraph of the hon. gentleman's motion were once adopted. Briefly—and I desire in this respect to follow the example set by the hon. gentleman, as far as it is possible for me to do so—let me say that in my judgment this motion should be rejected for the very simple reason that the affairs of the Printing Bureau have been investigated, not once, but twice—first, by the responsible minister who is charged with that duty, and, secondly, by our hon. friends opposite in the Public Accounts Committee. It is true, that the investigation conducted by our hon. friends in the Public Accounts Committee was abandoned. Of late hon. gentlemen opposite have manifested a strange desire to abandon in the committee investigations for which they have pressed in this House; but in this particular instance the fact that they did choose to abandon the investigation in the Public Accounts Committee is not my fault, and certainly is not the fault of the government. Whatever blame or disadvantage may attach to hon. gentlemen opposite for having adopted that course, is a matter which concerns them and with which I am not called upon to deal. Now, Mr. Speaker, all the facts relating to the management and the conduct of the business affairs of the Printing Bureau were given to parliament and the country in November last. I assert now, from my place in this House, that so far as the Printing Bureau is concerned, there is nothing left to investigate, and I further express my belief that that is the opinion of the country as a whole. To admit that there is at the present time any ground for the motion made by the hon. gentleman would be to admit his contention that the investigation conducted at intervals during the last two years and a half was partial and incomplete. Mr. Speaker, I do not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Did not the hon. gentleman himself promise to refer this report of his to a committee?

Mr. MURPHY. No. What I did promise, and what I still intend to do, was to refer those portions of the report which relate to certain phases of the printing of parliament to a special committee, and to ask that committee to deal with the recommendations in the report, which suggest means for improving the facilities for parliamentary printing and for the smoother running of business generally between parliament and the Bureau. I was observing that the investigation which was held was a complete and a searching investigation. I think I may say without egotism that no more thorough or searching investigation was ever held into any department of any government. During my first session in this House I heard the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) describe, in the course of a debate in which he took part, how closely he had applied himself to the business of the Department of Marine and Fisheries when he was first appointed to take charge of it. I listened to the hon. gentleman with a good deal of attention on that occasion, because it happened that just at that particular time I was very busily engaged with the Printing Bureau. Again I hope I am not open to the charge of egotism if I say that I have never worked harder in my life than I have worked during the last two years in endeavouring to bring about reforms in this department, and to make it all that it should be, all that its importance calls for, because the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, or, as it is commonly called, the Printing Bureau, occupies a very

unique and important relation towards the other departments of the government and towards parliament itself. Parliament and all the departments have to do with the Printing Bureau. If the Printing Bureau is not run properly, if its work is not turned out as it should be, if the purchases are not made and goods supplied to the several departments as they ought to be, then not the Printing Bureau alone, but every other department of the government suffers. For that reason it struck me that I could not do any more useful service than devote my time and energy towards bringing about reform in that establishment. That I attempted to do and that I maintain I have done, and I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that the Printing Bureau is as well managed as any department of government in this country, Dominion or provincial.

When an hon. gentleman proposes at this stage that a third investigation should be undertaken, and when he chooses to ignore all that has been done, he reminds me of the Irishman who rushed breathlessly into a railway station too late to catch his train. A bystander said to him: You did not run fast engouh. Oh, yes, he said, I ran fast enough, but I did not start soon enough. That is the trouble with the hon. gentleman. He started about two and a half years too late. As I have pointed out, the investigation I conducted was begun in November, 1908. If the hon. gentleman had before that date moved the resolution which he has presented to-day, or some other such resolution, there would be some justification for his action, but there is absolutely none now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say that I did move a resolution including these several departments, and the right hon. the Prime Minister refused it, and his followers voted it down.

Mr. MURPHY. I am referring particularly to my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup). No doubt my hon. friend the leader of the opposition moved the resolution to which he refers, but he must have moved it previous to the time I had the honour of taking my seat in this House, because no such resolution has been moved since I have been a member.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend is mistaken. The resolution I refer to was moved before he came into the House in 1908, but a similar resolution was also moved by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) after the Secretary of State had occupied his seat in this House. It was not confined to any one department.

Mr. MURPHY. I must take issue with my hon. friend when he says that a resolution calling for an investigation into the Printing Bureau was moved by the hon. member for St. Anne since I have had a seat in this House. The hon. member for St. Anne did move a resolution calling for a general inquiry into the affairs of the departments generally.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The spending departments.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, the spending departments, but the terms of that resolution did not particularly apply to the Printing Bureau. In fact, a reference to 'Hansard' shows that the members who supported that resolution had in their minds the spending departments, as the leader of the opposition has just said. But the fact still remains that when my hon. friend from St. Anne's division moved that resolution on the 1st April, 1909, I had already begun an investigation into the Printing Bureau. I had begun it on November 27, 1908, four months prior to the introduction of the resolution in question. It would therefore, have been absurd for me to have handed over the Printing Bureau to any committee, or commission that might then be appointed after an investigation into the Bureau had already been begun, and was considerably advanced by the minister in charge, who was responsible to parliament, and the country.

Mr. PORTER. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that he began that investigation in October, 1908?

Mr. MURPHY. In November, 1908.

Mr. PORTER. And continued it until Gouldthrite ran away. How is it in those two years Gouldthrite's defalcations were not discovered?

Mr. MURPHY. I began the inquiry in 1908, and continued it at such intervals as my other duties would permit me to carry it on. That inquiry extended over two years, and why Gouldthrite's dishonesty was not sooner discovered is also set out in the report. I could amplify and go into details, but I do not think it is necessary on the present occasion.

Mr. NORTHRUP. How is it that when the work was begun in 1908, the hon. minister has suppressed in his report every word of the inquiry between 1908 and 1910?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not know what political company the hon. member for Hastings has been in the habit of keeping, but I have only to say to him that I have suppressed nothing which ought to appear in this report. The hon. gentleman has never been charged with such a duty as that which, I may say unluckily, fell to my lot in connection with this department. If by any unlikely accident of political fortune, such a duty should be cast on him, he would

realize that, in the multitude of details with which a minister is called on to deal, in the hurry of business transacted from day to day, it would be impossible for him to collect and note down everything he does, or to summarize every inquiry he has to make and keep a record of the thousand and one things that go to make up the daily routine of his duties. For that reason thousands of things done in connection with this inquiry do not appear in the report. No record was made of them, and it was impossible that any record could be made. But let me turn to the subject I was pursuing when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition interrupted me a few moments ago. I was referring to the motion introduced by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) on April 1, 1909, and debated in this House on that day, and the day following. I refer to that again for the reason that the duty of the government and of its individual members in regard to just such matters as we are now discussing was very clearly set out by the right hon. the Prime Minister in the course of that debate. Let me quote his words. They will be found in 'Hansard' of 1909, pages 3861 and 3862 :

It is our duty to administer the affairs of Canada, it is our duty to manage the departments of the government. Our intention is to discharge that duty efficiently. If we do discharge that duty efficiently, well and good; if we do not, we are open to censure.

Further on the right hon. gentleman added:

I deny that it is the right of the parliament of Canada to look into the administration, that is a thing which is the duty of those charged with the administration, and for the proper discharge of that duty they are responsible to the people.

The position taken by my right hon leader on that occasion is sustained by all constitutional writers, and more particularly by Todd in his work on parliamentary government in England. In volume 1, page 418 of that work Todd says:

In fact the ministry of the day are responsible for everything that is done in any department of the state. While it is true that the House of Commons ought to have control and supervision of every such department, its functions are those of control and not of administration.

The House can interfere with great advantage in prescribing the principle on which the executive government should be carried on. But beyond that it is impossible for the legislature to interfere with advantage in the details of the administration of the country.

And the same author, in the same volume, at page 419, says:

The intrusion of parliamentary committees into matters which pertain to the jurisdiction of the executive government is equally to be deprecated as it tends inevitably to overthrow all genuine responsibility.

Now, the principle laid down by the right hon. Prime Minister, sustained by the author whom I have just quoted and approved by this House, has been applied by me to the Printing Bureau. And still, it seems, our friends opposite are not satisfied. However, that is not to be wondered at. Hon. gentlemen opposite will be found to be consistent chiefly in their inconsistency. Speaking in the debate in 1909, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers), referring to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, said:

It would be unreasonable to find fault with the minister or the government if the minister, on ascertaining the wrong-doing, or at the time when he should have ascertained it with ordinary vigilance, had dismissed the wrong-doer and punished him as the law provides.

And yet, in the present instance, for having done the very thing that the hon. member for West Elgin indicated, the government is now brought to book by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who I have no doubt will expect his political friends and associates to support him in presenting this motion. I do not know whether it is too much to expect, but, having regard to consistency I might be pardoned for saying that the hon. member for West Elgin at least should oppose the motion of the hon. member for East Hastings, and vote with this side of the House because, in the present case, I have followed precisely the line he laid down in 1909 when discussing the affairs of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Let me run over some of the citations made by the hon. member for East Hastings in support of this motion, and deal briefly with certain arguments that he advanced in presenting them to the House. Let me premise by pointing out that everything the hon. gentleman has mentioned in support of his motion has been taken from the report which is before parliament or from the evidence adduced before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Quite incorrect.

Mr. MURPHY. The hon. gentleman has announced nothing new. I made very full notes of what he said. He did not mention a single thing with which I was not perfectly familiar by reason of the facts elicited in the inquiry into the Department of Printing and Stationery. And, so far as that department is concerned, he did not cite a single case requiring attention that had not been attended to as a result of the inquiry I conducted, beginning nearly two

years and a half ago, into the affairs of that department. At the outset, the hon. gentleman propounded a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. He cited a number of deeds of commission and omission on the part of officials in the Printing Bureau, and asked the Prime Minister whether, if he could prove these things, the Prime Minister would grant an inquiry. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman merely made a summary of what I had brought out in that investigation. Every word uttered was taken bodily from the report which has been before parliament since November last. I challenge him or any other hon. gentleman on that side to dispute my statement.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murphy) ever heard of the Auditor General's Report? I quoted very fully from that.

Mr. MURPHY. I will come to the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman should not make the statement he is making.

Mr. MURPHY. In making that statement, I am supported by the facts. I am confining myself to the list of deeds of commission and omission which was cited by the hon. member at the beginning of his speech, when he propounded a question to the Prime Minister, and asked him to say whether, if these things were proven, he, the Prime Minister, would grant an inquiry. That is what I am dealing with, and I repeat, in regard to that, that every word uttered by the hon. member was found in the report which has been before parliament since November last. Therefore, how ridiculous it is on the part of the hon. member to cite matters which are now ancient history, to rise in this House and propound such a question to the Prime Minister as if what he proposed to cite was the result of labours of his own and to ask whether, in the event of his being able to prove these things an inquiry would be granted. Why, all these things were proven in the course of my investigation. That is the only way the hon. gentleman knew about them. Never by any industry or assiduity of his own could he have found them out. He comes here and poses before you and the House, and gravely asks if an inquiry will be granted on these things being proven. Why, Sir, not only have these things been discovered, but the people guilty of them have been punished, and the wrong practices that prevailed in connection with them have been stopped. There is absolutely no support for the position taken by the hon. member this afternoon except that indicated by the newspapers that support him namely, the disappointment which they have shown ever since the facts were made public, because of what might have happened to help their political fortunes if they had been alert enough to get the conduct of this inquiry.

The hon. gentleman did me the honour to quote somewhat fully from my report as it appears from page 1 to page 8 in the volume that was presented to parliament in November last. He made these quotations for the purpose, as his after remarks proved, of showing that certain other departments had arrogated to themselves the right to get their own printing done, and from that he argued that they had invaded the territory of the Printing Bureau, and he, forsooth, assumes the attitude of the friend and champion of the Printing Bureau. We appreciate his interest, but we are not in need of his championship. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that after all the months that he has put in upon this work he would have been better advised if he had paid less attention to the information that was given him by the gentleman whose name he quoted a number of times during his speech and to whom I will refer a little later on. In connection with the matter now being immediately dealt with, the reason that the other departments were from time to time forced to get their printing done otherwise than through the Printing Bureau was due to the ineffective methods pursued, principally by the gentlemen on whom my hon. friend places so much reliance to make a case in the present instance against the management of the Printing Bureau. Take, for instance, the Interior Department in connection with its immigration work. Immigration literature is required in a great hurry; if it is not turned out within the time specified by that department, that literature is practically of no value. When the Interior Department found in years past that their requests in that regard were not attended to at the Printing Bureau, they were of necessity forced to notify the Bureau that they would get their own printing done and supervise its speedy issue themselves. That is not a matter for which they could be blamed. True, it is contrary to the Act, but the immigration work is so important that the printing of this literature would not wait. I point out to my hon. friend that the man who was responsible for the giving out of that work and for the delay, is the man with whom my hon. friend and some other hon. gentlemen opposite have been incubating since that man was dismissed last fall for incompetence, dishonesty and falsehood.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MONTREAL PARK AND ISLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. ECREMENT moved the third reading of Bill (No. 45) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.

Mr. MONK. I have a motion to recommit the Bill to the Committee of the Whole. I do not know if the promoter of the Bill, the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Ecrement), has any objection to its recommittal. If not it might be recommitted and I will explain in committee the nature of the amendment I desire to propose. If my hon. friend has any objection to the recommittal of the Bill I will explain it now. It would save time if it were recommitted and then we could discuss the amendment in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ECREMENT. I have no objection at all.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think it would meet the wishes of the people and our people if he would just amend the Bill a little more and say that the company cannot operate in any city or town without first obtaining the permission of the authorities.

Mr. MONK. That is what I was intending to propose. I think that is satisfactory if it is satisfactory to you.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think it will be satisfactory to everybody and then my hon. friend (Mr. Ecrement), can get his Bill through to-night.

Mr. MONK. I will move in committee in order to make that change. There is no objection to the motion. Then, I beg to move, Mr. Speaker:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the main motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

That said Bill be not now read the third time but be referred back for further consideration to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to (a) erase the word 'sixteen' in the fourth line of section 1 and in lieu thereof to substitute the word 'fourteen'; (b) add the following clause: 'The company will not construct upon any road or public highway in any municipality without first obtaining from the municipality having jurisdiction on said road or highway its consent expressed by by-law.'

Mr. SPROULE. If the Bill is recommitted I think the standard amendment should be inserted that we put in all these Bills providing that the company shall only build and operate with the consent of the municipality by by-law and upon such terms as the municipality may agree to. We put that into two Bills in the Railway Committee to-day and we put it into all Bills of this character. If we insert it in this instance we shall have a standard clause in this Bill the same as we have in the others.

Mr. MONK. I think this is the clause generally added in the Railway Committee. This is what is given to me by the clerk of the Railway Committee as the general clause. Of course that the consent will be on the conditions which the municipality may impose goes without saying.

Mr. BRODEUR. In view of the fact that there is some divergence of opinion as to the nature of the amendment which should be proposed in the committee, I think that if my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), instead of moving that the Bill be referred to the committee with instructions to do this and to do that, simply moved that the Bill should be referred to the committee to consider further the said Bill, without any instructions, we would be able better to deal with the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Monk moves:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House went again into committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do the committee desire that it be taken up section by section?

Mr. MONK. I think it would help the committee to understand more easily the purport of this legislation if I just briefly refer to the history of this Park and Island Railway Company, to indicate the course of legislation. The company has a provincial origin. It was incorporated in 1885 by chapter 74 of 48 Victoria, Quebec. By section 2 the company was prohibited from building within an acre of the Turnpike Trust roads on the island of Montreal or on any highway within the city of Montreal without the consent of the Turnpike Trust in the one case and of the city in the other. I may say that the object of the company was to extend electric lines outside the city of Montreal and over the island of Montreal in the counties of Laval and Jacques Cartier. By chapter 85 of 49-50 Victoria, Quebec, sanctioned on the 21st June, 1886, the Act of 1885 was amended, but the restrictions that I have just indicated about building on the Turnpike Trust roads or within the city were renewed. Furthermore, it was decreed that the works contemplated upon the island of Montreal were to be begun within five years of 1886. In 1893, by chapter 65 of 56 Victoria, Quebec, assented to on the 27th of February, section 3, provision was

made that the works contemplated by the Act of incorporation were to be executed within five years of the coming into force of the Act. On the 27th February, 1893, five years were granted for the execution of the work. But in the following year the company came under the jurisdiction of the federal parliament by chapter 24 of 57-58 Victoria, sanctioned on the 23rd of July, 1894. It was provided, in section 2 of the Act, that the company, as organized and constituted by the provincial legislature of Quebec, was to become subject to the parliament of Canada and the Railway Act of Canada without decreeing that the enterprise is in the general interest of Canada. By section 8, certain restrictions already referred to in favour of the Turnpike Trust and the city of Montreal were renewed. In 1896 the parliament of Canada again amended the Act of 1894, but this amendment only concerned the internal administration of the company. In 1906, finally, by chapter 129 of 6 Edward VII, assented to on the 26th June of that year, it was decreed that the company's works were to be finished before the 1st July, 1911, to which date the termination of the works contemplated by the company was extended. But in section 6 of the Act of 1906, it was enacted that:

Notwithstanding in this Act or in the company's charter, the company shall not construct any part of its railway or tramway along the streets of any municipality without the consent being first obtained by by-law from the municipality.

The object of the amendments I desire to propose is twofold. In the first place I would like parliament to put a shorter limit on the execution of these works. I have stated that in 1886 the provincial legislature, which then had jurisdiction over this company, fixed the extreme limit of five years for the beginning of the work. By the statute of 1893 of Quebec the limit was fixed at five years from the date of the sanction of that statute and that delay expired on the 27th of February, 1898. The company had come under the jurisdiction of the federal parliament by Act of 1906, and it was provided that the undertaking should be finally terminated on or before the 1st of July, 1911, next coming. I remember the discussion in the House at that time, and I pleaded for a shorter delay, but parliament extended the delay to the 1st of July, 1911. On the island of Montreal, where the works of this company are contemplated, we require immediate transportation facilities. The city is extending in every direction, the facilities to reach the city are insufficient, and there is no reason why we should at this late hour renew the delay which we considered satisfactory five years ago, and which ought to be final. I, therefore, submit that the delay be limited to three years, and that it shall expire in 1914 instead of 1916. At the inception of this company there was difficulty in financing it, but the company is now practically under control of the Montreal Street Railway Company, and a complete merger has been sanctioned in the case of the Montreal Street Railway by a statute passed at the last session of the Quebec legislature. This company will therefore have behind it or with it all the resources of the Montreal street railway, and there is no reason for granting such an extension of time as is asked for by the Bill now before us. I therefore move:

That the word 'sixteen' in the fourth line of section 1 of the Bill be erased and that the word 'fourteen' be substituted in lieu thereof.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have a compromise to suggest. As our hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) says, the company cannot operate in any city or town without having the permission of the municipality, but I do not know that that would apply out in country places.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not apply out in country places.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would suggest, if my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will accept it, and I think it would be satisfactory to the promoters, that the company shall not operate its railway in any city or town without first obtaining the consent by by-law of the proper authorities, and then we could split the difference by making the delay expire in 1815. I think that would be satisfactory to the parties interested, and it would protect the cities and towns which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and I are both interested in.

Mr. MONK. I intended making the question of municipal control the subject of another amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. In the case of a certain railway passing through the city of Toronto, the original Bill—and I think it passed exactly as I have it here—contained this clause:

The company shall not construct its railway or any extension thereof along, under, above or across any highway or public place within the limits of the city of Toronto without first obtaining the consent expressed by by-law of the city of Toronto, and upon such terms to be agreed upon by the said city.

I draw special attention to the fact that not only was it provided that it must be by by-law of the municipality, but it must be upon such terms as the municipality agrees to. It has been held by the courts that when a railway is chartered, although there is a provision that the municipality

must consent, still the municipality must consent upon terms that will enable the railway company to carry out the undertaking. That was not considered a sufficient guarantee for the protection of municipal interests, and this amendment was, therefore, proposed and has since been incorporated in more than one Bill.

Mr. MONK. You must suppose that the municipality will only consent on terms acceptable to the ratepayers of the municipality, and, therefore, I deem that provision surplusage. The amendment I have proposed was given to me by the clerk of the Railway Committee as being the one that was generally adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. I drew attention to this question many years ago in the case of the Bell Telephone Company. Its charter read that it must have the consent of the municipalities to go through them, but a municipal corporation restricted it in the matter of cutting shade trees, and the courts finally decided that the municipalities could not put on any restrictions which would make the charter of the company unworkable. It seems to me that the special reasons which actuated the insertion of this clause in the Toronto Railway Bill would apply equally to Montreal, because it is a large city which must have a defined plan for its electric railways and highway traffic. It seems to me that such a clause as this would better protect the city.

Mr. MONK. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is aware of the local conditions in Montreal. A railway authorized by charter to go from one place to another cannot be prevented by unreasonable restrictions from carrying out its charter, but in this case we are dealing with a tramway company which is establishing a network of tramways over the island of Montreal, and not so much going through the municipalities as serving these municipalities in the execution of its own charter. The case is, therefore, somewhat different. As to the suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike), does he think we are justified in making a distinction between a town municipality and a village municipality? The principle is the same for a small municipality as for a large one, particularly with respect to tramways. In a case of this kind it is more important that the tramway company should have the consent of a small municipality, because the company will be disposed to give as small and insufficient a service as possible to a small municipality, where the traffic is not very great, in return for the permission to extend its franchise into that municipality. In the island of Montreal there are municipalities which are not town municipalities, and laying down this principle, I do not think we should make any distinction between small municipalities and large.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MONK. This is the amendment which I wish to suggest in regard to the other point:

To add to the Bill now under consideration the following clause: The company will not construct upon any road or public highway in any municipality, without first obtaining from the municipality having jurisdiction on such road or highway, its consent expressed by by-law.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think our hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is not asking for as good protection for the municipalities as I am in my amendment, which reads:

A company shall not construct or operate its railway in any city, town, or village (if the hon. gentleman wishes to add the word) without obtaining consent expressed by by-law from the proper parties.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will put in the words ' any municipality,' I am satisfied.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think that would perhaps be going a little too far, as some small municipalities might prevent the railway going through. I think the words ' any city, town or village,' fairly cover the case, and I think such an amendment would be satisfactory to the promoters of the Bill and to the railway company itself.

Mr. MONK. I would be quite prepared to accept my hon. friend's amendment, but I do not see that it fully meets the case. A parish, which is not included, has very often interests to protect which are larger than those of a small municipality. My hon. friend knows that situated as we are on the island of Montreal, no municipality of any kind would vexatiously obstruct the progress of the company. I think it is more prudent to leave in the word referring to municipal authorities generally, and not confine the provision simply to towns.

Mr. FIELDING. I noticed when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was referring to the early history of this enterprise, that he mentioned that there was a provision that the company should not construct a line across or along the roads of the Montreal Turnpike Trust without their permission. I would like to ask him if that condition remains unchanged or is affected by this Bill?

Mr. MONK. I think the provision disappears now from the legislation, and I will tell you why. The Bill now before the committee says that the company will continue its work subject to section 1 of chap-

ter 129 of 1906; that is the last statute passed. In that statute there is only one restriction imposed on the company; it shall not build within the Mount Royal Park of Montreal. It is true, in previous statutes there is the restriction referred to by the Finance Minister as regards the rights of the Turnpike Trust; but that does not reappear in this Act, and, as a matter of fact, to-day the Turnpike Trust is ceding its rights to the municipalities on conditions made in each separate case. I presume it is for that reason that in this Bill the consent of the Montreal Turnpike Trust is not provided for.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree that it is desirable that the Turnpike Trust should carry out the policy which my hon. friend has indicated, so that the roads should become public roads; but if it was desirable to have that clause in at an earlier stage, it seems to me that it would have been only reasonable that the Turnpike Trust should have been notified of the proposed change. It seems hardly reasonable to legislate it out of all control without being made aware of the fact.

Mr. MONK. That restriction exists in the previous Act.

Mr. BRODEUR. If there is any doubt about the rights of the Turnpike Trust being preserved, would it not be advisable to insert in the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, after the word 'municipalities' in the last line but one the words 'or the Montreal Turnpike Trust having jurisdiction over the said highways or other public place.' I think that would meet the objection which has been raised.

Mr. MONK. I do not ask for it, but I have no objection.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I move in amendment to the amendment that:

The company shall not construct or operate a railway in any city, town, or village without first obtaining the consent, expressed by by-law of the proper authorities.

Mr. NESBITT. Why does my hon. friend object to the word 'municipality.' Surely they all have the same rights.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I quite agree with my hon. friend, but there are some little municipalities that might object and prevent a road going around the island of Montreal, and I do not want any parish to stop the road.

Mr. SPROULE. Safeguard against that by saying 'city, town or village.'

Mr. MONK. I think that the words 'proper authorities' would cover the case mentioned by the Minister of Finance because the proper authority to build on a turnpike trust road is the Turnpike Trust. But where I cannot accept the amendment is that it does not include a parish municipality, but limits it to town or village, and leaves out the parish which covers a much greater area.

Mr. SPROULE. Just use the word 'municipality,' and you cover the whole of it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment is that the company shall not construct or operate a railway in any city, town or village without first obtaining the consent expressed by by-law of the proper authorities.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am afraid this amendment goes further than the committee would be disposed to go. It proposes that a railway shall not be built in any municipality without its consent. That would mean that if there be any objection on the part of one small municipality, the work would have to be stopped. Take the case of St. Anne's. St. Anne's desires some day to have a railway going there, but some intervening municipality might block that railway should this amendment be adopted. I think that the consent of the municipality should be exacted only where the railway companies build along the streets or public roadways.

Mr. NESBITT. Why not adopt the regular standard clause, which we put in all railway Bills the last two or three years, namely, that the railway shall not go along any highway without the consent of the municipality.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am entirely in accord with that suggestion.

Mr. MONK. The amendment of the hon. member for St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) would apply in the case where a tramway does not touch the road at all but goes through the expropriated lands of private individuals.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I do not want to place any awkward restrictions on the company, but the municipality ought to have something to say as to when a railway should cross and and how it should cross. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries suggests that this restriction should apply only to streets. I have no objection if it applies to crossing the streets as well as going along the streets.

Mr. MONK. I think we had better adopt the usual enactment and not compel the tramway company, if it does not touch a public road, to deal with the municipalities.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Perhaps we had better simply adopt the standard clause.

Mr. MONK. That is the best.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment before the Chair now is as follows:

The company shall not construct or operate its railway along any highway, street or any other public place without first obtaining the consent, expressed by by-law, of the municipality having jurisdiction over such highway or other public place and upon terms to be agreed upon with such municipality.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The only objection I have to that is that we do not bind them to get consent for their crossing. There is just as much danger at the crossings as along the streets.

Mr. NESBITT. We might as well say that they shall not build without the consent of the municipality at all. For my part, I could not consent to that, and—it is not uniform, it is not usual. We have fought this clause out dozens of times in the Railway Committee, and it has been in all railway charters for the last three years.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. But, I appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt), does he know any case where a tramway runs in Ontario without the permission of the municipality? This is not a steam railway, but a tramway, a street railway. Not only should the municipality have the right to say where it shall go, but they should have the right to fix the rates they should charge.

Mr. NESBITT. This is what has been quarrelled over by the city of Toronto in the Railway Committee for three years past. And we insisted that they should not have the whole say as to what they should charge, and where they should go.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the provision was made in the case of Toronto that no road should be constructed except with the consent of the municipality expressed by by-law, and upon such plans as were agreed upon. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) says he sees no reason why they should prohibit the crossing. In going into the city of Montreal from the west you cross 15 or 20 streets on a high level crossing. The streets are below, and the people pass along them free from danger. But if you allow this tramway to cross the same streets, would you not give the municipality power to say, if desired, that they must cross either above or below the street level so as not to interfere with the use of the streets or increase the danger to those using them. In cities whose thoroughfares are crowded this is very important. Municipalities are responsible for the highways, and if people were injured, in many cases, the corporation might be mulcted in damages. There is every reason why, in a great city like Montreal there should be power in the municipality to make the railways run in a way to avoid as far as possible interfering with the thoroughfare?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Is not that the general clause now?

Mr. NESBITT. There was a special clause drawn for Toronto.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that all amendments have been dropped except the one of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike)—and, perhaps I should ask the 'Hansard' reporter to report the exact words I shall speak. Shall this proposed clause carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I did not catch whether the word 'across' is in that amendment or not?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will read it:

The company shall not construct or operate its railway along any highway, street or other public place without first obtaining the consent, expressed by by-law, of the municipality having jurisdiction over such highway or other public place and upon terms to be agreed upon by such municipality.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think the word 'across' should be there.

Mr. MONK. Does not my hon. friend think that is covered?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. No, 'across' is not mentioned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. No, I will have to vote against that if I have to vote alone. I do not see why this company should have any advantage over any other company. If the regulation states 'across or along' or 'along or across', why is the word 'across' left out in this particular case. I cannot understand why my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) objects.

Mr. MONK. I have no objection whatever. I thought it was covered.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand this is a clause that has been put in several Bills of the same character, and I ask why in this case we should change the phraseology which has been considered very seriously by the committee. I think that perhaps in this case as in all the others we should have a uniform clause.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. It is a uniform clause.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I do not think 'across' is in the other, and the hon. member for

Jacques Cartier has just stated that this is the standard clause.

Mr. MONK. It is the clause given me by the clerk of the committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. In that case I have reason to suppose that this clause has been drafted according to the usual terms which are used. We had better, perhaps, confine ourselves to that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member moved——

Mr. SPROULE. This is the standard clause put in some Bills, but we made exception in regard to the city of Toronto, and, in my judgment, the same exceptions to that are applicable to the city of Montreal. I have before me the clause placed in a Bill that was considered to-day. It refers to a railway far back in rural Ontario and Quebec. It provides that the company shall not construct and operate its railway along any highway, street, or other public place without first obtaining the consent by by-law of the municipality having jurisdiction over such street, highway or other public place, and upon terms to be agreed upon with such municipality. When we came to the cities of Toronto and Hamilton, we made a further description and put in the word 'across' as well

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I move that 'across' be added.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved that after the word 'along' be added the words——

Mr. BICKERDIKE. 'Or across'.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. 'Or across'. Shall this proposed amendment carry? Carried.

Mr. BRODEUR. I move the following:

The company shall not construct or operate its railway along any highway under the control of the Montreal Turnpike Trust without first obtaining the consent of the said corporation.

Mr. FIELDING. Better make it uniform—add 'across'.

Mr. MONK. Here is the difficulty I see in that clause. In many cases, the Montreal Turnpike Trust has handed over in perpetuity its road to the municipality. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will remember that that applies in the case of Westmount, it applies also in the case of Cote St. Paul. And parts of the Turnpike Trust road have been handed over to the municipality of Montreal. These roads are not any longer under the control of the Turnpike Trust, though that corporation remains the owner of the land.

Mr. BRODEUR,

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend think they would not come under the preceding clause, that they would be held now to be municipal roads?

Mr. MONK. It is upon that question that I have some doubt, and I think there is room for a great deal of litigation. I do not know if you could maintain in a case of that kind that it would be necessary to obtain the consent of the Montreal Turnpike Trust. They would still have an interest in the road, they would still own it but would have transferred the road subject to certain conditions to the municipalities, and it seems unjust to compel the railway to obtain their consent when they do not control the road.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not desire that, I was referring to roads still under their control. I quite agree that in a case of Westmount, these roads having passed now to the control of the municipalities, should be dealt with as municipal roads.

Mr. MONK. It might be well to add a word to that effect.

Mr. FIELDING. It might read: which remain under the control. This would show that there was a distinction.

Mr. MONK. I think that would be satisfactory.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. ECREMENT moved that the following section be inserted:

16a. The company may enter into an agreement with the Montreal Street Railway Company, the Montreal Terminal Railway Company, the Public Service Corporation and Montreal Tramways Company for conveying or leasing to such companies or to either of them, in whole or in part, its undertaking, including its charter, contracts, franchises, powers, privileges, exemptions and also the lands, railways, tramways, right-of-way, surveys, plans, works, plant, machinery and other property to it belonging, or for a consolidation with either of such companies, on such terms and conditions as are agreed upon, and subject to such restrictions as the directors see fit; provided that such agreement has been first sanctioned by the majority of the holders of the shares issued by the company, present or represented by proxy at a special general meeting of the shareholders of the company duly called to consider the same.

Mr. MONK. I do not want to open up a discussion of that question, but I would call the attention of the government to the fact that this contemplates a merger of all the electric companies on the Island of Montreal. If that merger is carried out under the conditions which generally accompany mergers of this kind, it will result in a very large over-capitalization of the new company, and necessitate

heavier burdens or charges upon those who will use those railways.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. This legislation has been passed by the legislature of Quebec, and, as my hon. friend knows, water is now so scarce that they do not use it at all in those mergers.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE PRINTING BUREAU.

House resumed on motion for Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock I was dealing with certain reasons adduced by the hon. member for East Hastings in support of the motion which he presented to the House this afternoon, and that branch of my remarks I now desire to resume. In the course of his observations the hon. gentleman cited as one of the reasons why his motion should be adopted that requisitions for supplies had in the past been sent to the Printing Bureau which had not been signed by the proper officials. It is true that to some extent that did prevail, and having regard to the number of these requisitions and the magnitude of the business done between the departments and the Printing Bureau, it would be surprising if at some time or other some irregularity of that kind did not arise. But what my hon. friend failed to inform the House was that this also was a matter which was dealt with in the report, not in one place but in several places, and I am now in a position to assure you and the House that the practice has been completely stopped. Precautions have been taken not only in the departments themselves, but also in the Printing Bureau to prevent a recurrence of that practice. It did not prevail to any great extent at any time, but it has now been completely stopped.

Another trouble mentioned by the hon. member for East Hastings was that of, as he styled it, sending in proof improperly. He referred, no doubt, to what is technically known among printers as bad copy. That subject also is dealt with in several parts of the report before parliament, and one of the most important recommendations made by the experts who assisted in the investigation at the Printing Bureau deals with that very matter. The recommendation in question is, in my opinion, such an important one, that I would ask the indulgence of the House for a moment while I read a very brief extract from the report upon it. At page 40 of the joint report of Messrs. Hyde and O'Connor, there will be found recommendation No. 3 under the heading of 'Improved Copy.' There they say:

> Bad copy, editing in the proof and the revise, and revision of French translation are not defects in the management of the Printing Bureau, but are evidences of slipshod work on the part of the officers of parliament and of the departments of the government where the material to be printed originates. Nevertheless, it appears to us that a recommendation upon the subject is pertinent to our report.

Then, after considering what has been done in this regard by other countries and mentioning particularly what has been done by the Imperial Sessional Committee at Westminster, the two experts, to whom I have just referred, proceed in their recommendations as set out on page 41 of the report:

> Hence a different remedy must be applied, and in our opinion it is advisable, in the interests not only of the proper management of the Printing Bureau, but of the conduct of the printing business of parliament and of all the departments of the government, that there should be some body, bureau, committee, or commission charged with the following duties:—
>
> 1. Supervision of the material to be included in departmental reports.
> 2. Supervision of copy for reports and other publications.
> 3. Supervision of the translation of all reports and publications.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as you will observe, this matter mentioned by the hon. member in support of his motion, is one that is very particularly dealt with in this report. The remedy that is here prescribed for the evil is one which is deserving of the serious consideration of this House. Briefly, what is here proposed is that there should be established, between the Printing Bureau, on the one hand, and parliament and the departments on the other hand, a clearing house to which all copy from parliament, and the different departments should be sent. In that bureau, committee, or, for the sake of more apt illustration, clearing house, as I prefer to call it, there would be a corps of officials especially skilled in dealing with work of that class. If copy was not in proper condition to be sent to the Bureau it would be sent back to the department from which it came in order to have the necessary corrections made. Such a bureau or clearing house would also perform another very necessary function, if properly manned, and there would be no trouble in having it properly manned. If the officials now doing work of this character in the different departments and in the offices of parliament were all assembled in such a bureau they would perform another necessary work namely that of supervising translations from one official language to another. If that were done the

work of these departments and parliament would, in my opinion, not only be very much simplified, but there would also be a very great saving to the country and the standard of our official publications would be materially raised.

That, Sir, is one of the matters which I shall ask the special joint committee, that I hope this parliament will later appoint, to deal with particularly. In this regard might I also point out that the experts whom I have mentioned make another recommendation dealing with this very evil and, as a remedy within the Bureau itself, they suggest the appointment of an officer who would have charge of composition—the comptroller of composition, I believe, he is called. I may say, Sir, that such an officer has been appointed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who is it?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. P. M. Draper.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was he an official of the department?

Mr. MURPHY. An official of the department and one of the most capable officials employed therein. He has been appointed comptroller of composition so that there also another recommendation of the experts has been acted upon and effect given to it. My hon. friend quoted some material sent from the Department of Militia and Defence and founded some argument upon the condition of the copy as a further reason why his motion should be adopted. If my memory serves me correctly, the copy to which he referred was copy furnished for the publication known as the King's Regulations. Regarding the printing of that volume a difference of opinion arose during the inquiry between the former Superintendent of Printing, Mr. McMahon, and the gentleman who had charge of this outside work—Mr. Cook. It appeared from the evidence that Mr. Cook had sent this work to be done at an outside office, and a great many of the difficulties encountered in connection with the printing of the volume were due to the work having been sent outside. The former Superintendent of Printing contended that it could have been done just as well in the Bureau, and cited in support of his contention the fact that the French edition of the book was being printed in the Bureau at the time that work was given out.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who sent it out?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Cook, so that, if there is any fault to be found in that regard it is a matter for which Mr. Cook was responsible. The bad copy that afterwards was mentioned, the changes that were made in connection with the work and the resulting increase in the cost were explained by the Department of Militia and Defence and it was simply one of those occurrences that are bound to happen in connection with a publication of that character.

Now, my hon. friend made a reference to the letting of a contract for a publication called Farm Weeds by Mr. Cook, and said that after the contract had been made another official went around the different offices in the United States and Canada, and got prices to lay before the minister. Inadvertently my hon. friend quoted the wrong publication. It was not Farm Weeds, but another publication called Farm Grasses. In connection with that transaction it might be well for me to give the House somewhat full details, so that hon. members may appreciate exactly what kind of a gentleman Mr. Cook is, and what trouble such a gentleman can make for the officials at the head of a department. It will also be of some interest to the House to get these details in view of the fact that the hon. member for East Hastings, and possibly one or two of his associates, have pinned their political faith to Mr. Cook now that the bottom has dropped out of the anti-reciprocity league.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who are the associates?

Mr. MURPHY. I presume the course of this debate will reveal who they are. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a publication called Farm Weeds issued by the Department of Agriculture and supposed to be printed at the Printing Bureau; at least, the work was sent to the Bureau to be excuted. The arrangement in connection with that publication was that the lithographing was to be done by the Toronto Lithographing Company, and the printing and binding by the Printing Bureau. When the book was issued an early copy was sent to my office, and in looking through it I noticed that the imprint of the King's Printer, which is supposed to appear on the first page of all official publications, was absent. I made inquiry about that and was told that it was an oversight and that care would be taken to see that it did not occur again. So that at the time the book was issued I was again given the impression that the work had been done partly by the Toronto Lithographing Company, in so far as the lithographing was concerned, and partly by the Printing Bureau, in so far as the printing and binding were concerned. Later on, in answer to a question by some hon. member opposite, I heard my colleague the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) state that the Mortimer Company, I think it was, had been paid a certain amount for doing some work in connection with this publication.

That started me making further inquiries and eventually I found that the book had not been printed or bound in the Printing

Bureau at all as had been originally arranged, but that the printing and binding had been done by the Mortimer Company. There was a still further inquiry and I discovered that this change in the arrangement had been made by Mr. Cook without my knowledge and approval, and, as I believe, without the knowledge or approval of the King's Printer at the time the book was presented to me. Having had that experience with Mr. Cook, when this new publication called 'Farm Grasses' was proposed, I was naturally somewhat careful to see that at the beginning the work was started properly. I insisted that tenders be asked for, notwithstanding the assurances that were given me over and over again that there was only one firm in this country that could do that work. Without my knowledge or approval Mr. Cook went to Toronto, and, on February 28th, 1910, he gave the contract for that work to the Toronto Lithographing Company. On the 26th March, 1910, I made inquiry as to the obtaining of competitive prices for which I had asked, and to that inquiry I received no reply. Two weeks later I inquired again, and then Mr. Cook, accompanied by the King's Printer came to my office. Cook had some figures which he said had been supplied by the Toronto Lithographing Company and which I declined to consider as there were no other prices produced. He said something on that occasion about paper having been ordered and as that excited my suspicion. I made inquiry later on and heard at the Bureau that Mr. Cook had been in Toronto and that some arrangement had been made with the Toronto Lithographing Company, but just exactly what, no person seemed to know. To protect the department and myself, I then wrote to the Toronto Lithographing Company stating I had heard in an indefinite way that an official had gone to their place of business and had made some arrangement with them regarding the paper, and that as he had done so without any authority the department and its head would not recognize any transaction that might have been entered into by him. Some weeks later Mr. Cook again made his appearance in my office and produced a typewritten sheet on which he had placed a list of alleged tenders that he had received for this work. I demanded that I would be shown the invitations to tender and the replies. He did not have either invitations or replies. I then inquired how he got these prices, and he said he had gone around and got them verbally. Not to make the narrative too long, the fact is that Mr. Cook had given that contract to the Toronto Lithographing Company on the 28th of February, 1910, that he had paid these visits to my office and had misled me in the way I have described, knowing perfectly well that the Toronto Lithographing Company had been engaged on that work all during the month of March and part of the month of April. I have here the official file with the letters that passed back and forth from the Toronto Lithographing Company to the Printing Bureau; those from the Printing Bureau being either signed or dictated for signature by Mr. Cook, and notwithstanding that fact up to the end of April he continued to act towards me as if nothing at all had been done in connection with that contract, and as if he had bona fide got these tenders a summary of which he produced in my office. As I was still in doubt as to the strange proceeding that was being carried on, I made further inquiry, and later on I found that a number of the firms whose names appeared on Cook's list had not only not submitted tenders but had not been asked to tender. Finally to get a record of the transaction I wrote to all the firms asking them to let me know just what had transpired between them and Mr. Cook. One of the firms to which I wrote, and the name of which appeared on the summary of tenders, was the Mortimer Company, of Ottawa. When the firm received my letter, Mr. William Mortimer went to the Printing Bureau and there saw Mr. Cook and produced my letter of inquiry. Mr. Cook told him that was all right, and said he would go into the King's Printer with him, but later he said that Mr. Mortimer should not come in but should wait for his return. Mr. Cook went into the office of the King's Printer alone, and later returned with two letters which he had presented to the King's Printer for signature. Although both of these letters were written in the middle of June, both were dated back to the 22nd of April, the day on which Cook had obtained the alleged tender from the Mortimer Company. These letters he handed Mr. Mortimer, the one asking the firm to submit a tender for the lithographing work in connection with 'Farm Grasses,' and the other asking them to submit a price per pound at which they would be prepared to supply the paper. Now, the circumstances under which the firm did hand in the alleged tender are set out in the letter which was read this afternoon by the hon. member for Hastings, and at this stage I need not further refer to it. Then Cook carried out a similar performance with the Toronto Lithographing Company. Mr. Speaker, what will you and this House think of a man, who, having given a contract to the Toronto Lithographing Company on the 28th of February, 1910, wrote that company on the 11th of June, 1910, dating the letter back to the 28th of February, and going through the solemn farce of asking the company which

he knew had been doing the work through the month of March and part of the month of April to submit a tender for the lithographing and for the paper. With the letter that he sent that company on the 11th of June, he, without the knowledge of the King's Printer, sent the following letter as well:

Ottawa, June 11, 1910.

Gentlemen,—The enclosed letter is purely formal, being simply to place on file the facts concerning my submission of the 'Farm Grass' drawing and the specifications for printing and paper for same. The matter is now being taken up by our minister, and I hope in the course of a few days to be able to inform you as to whether you are the successful tenderer or not.

Yours truly,

R. E. COOK,

For Supt. Printing.

Imagine a man writing such a letter as that on the 11th of June, 1910, when he had given the firm a contract for the work on the 28th of February, 1910; when he had received letter after letter throughout the month of March from that firm showing the progress that they had made on the work; when he had gone to that firm and taken the copy away from them, and made an arrangement with them to return it so that they might proceed with the work.

I leave you, Sir, and this House, to characterize conduct of that kind as it ought to be characterized. But it will probably be illuminating if I direct the attention of the House to one or two other letters written by the same gentleman to other firms with whom he had the same kind of dealings. One of the firms from whom he got a price was the firm of Stahl & Jaeger, of New York. It appears that when he visited them, they gave him certain specimens of their work, and on the 24th of May they wrote to him this letter:

Dear Sir,—We gave you our estimate April 20 for furnishing your coloured plate, will you kindly advise us if the contract has been given out. We gave you a sheet of Vases, specimen of our printing, will you kindly return same to us and oblige,

Yours very truly,

STAHL & JAEGER.

To that letter Mr. Cook sent this reply:

Ottawa, May 25, 1910.

Gentlemen,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday re coloured plates, for which I have your estimate.

In reply, I have to say that owing to the death of King Edward, which has caused a lot of extra work, and the absence from the city of our minister, the Secretary of State, the contract has not yet been awarded. As soon as the successful tenderer is known you will be advised of the fact. Regarding your specimens, I will have to ask you to let them remain with me until the matter of the contract is settled, when they will be returned to you.

Yours very truly,

R. E. COOK,

For Supt. of Printing.

On the 11th of June, 1910, he also wrote Stahl & Jaeger one of the stock letters which he sent to the other firms from whom he had received the prices which he set out in the summary, produced to me as a set of tenders which he had received for this work. All the prices were received in practically the same way, and they were all of the character of that described in the letter from the Mortimer Company which the hon. member for Hastings read this afternoon. Now, Sir, when the hon. member read that letter, he asked, in a burst of simulated indignation, 'Is it possible to think that a firm would sign such a letter?' Certainly it is. There was nothing strange about that firm signing a letter of that kind. When the members of the firm and I got together and compared notes, and each found how the other had been deceived, there was nothing remarkable about it at all. It had been represented to the firm by Mr. Cook, in his great solicitude to protect the minister—and here I should tell the House that the statement made to the different firms was that the minister was having trouble with his colleagues about this contract—and some of my colleagues who are listening to me now are hearing about it for the first time—that as the contract was over $5,000, the minister might be asked a question about it, and he wanted to fix up the file. And this gentleman, in order to assist his minister if you please, to carry out a dishonest transaction, extracted these prices from these different firms, and got the alleged tender from the Mortimer Company. What more natural than that the Mortimer Company, when they found out all the facts in their interview with me, were willing to write that letter, and gave it to me to place on file as I did in connection with the evidence given by Mr. Wm. Mortimer, and as it appears in the volume presented to the House in November last.

The hon. member for Hastings, in the course of his further observations, read my letter of the 27th of November, 1908, as it appears in this published report, and then drew attention to the fact that what he called the evidence as reported here was first taken in June, 1910, and from these two circumstances he deduced this argument, that either the minister failed to do anything between November, 1908, and June, 1910, or if he had done anything, then he had suppressed what had been done. Well, Mr. Speaker, that deduction was just as unfounded as all the rest of my hon. friend's speech. It suited my hon. friend's purpose to deal with this

report as though it were something that was available to his hands for the purpose in which he was engaged to-day, but that it was not to serve any other purpose whatever. He would treat it as existent or non-existent just as it suited his purpose. Well, Sir, I object to that use of this report; I put too much time upon it, I spent too many days and nights in its preparation, to allow it to be used in any such way; and while it may suit the purpose of my hon. friend to use a part of the report and ignore the great bulk of it, I do not intend to let him escape with tactics of that kind. If he had taken the trouble to read this report, he would have found that on page 6 I had said this:

> The measures adopted at different times within the last two years to effect reforms in the organization and methods of the Printing Bureau, to improve its relations with the other departments, and to secure the earlier publication of the annual reports for parliament, are indicated in the correspondence forming appendix 1 to this report.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister just there, if the part he is reading has any reference to any wrong-doing in the way of commissions, and so on, previous to his taking charge of the department; in other words, was there any evidence of wrong-doing during the time the Hon. Mr. Scott was minister of the department and Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department?

Mr. MURPHY. I can only say that the practices of which the late Superintendent of Stationery was without doubt guilty, had extended back for a period of at least a year or a year and a half prior to my entering the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). By that do I understand that the wrong-doing extended back only a year or a year and a half prior to the hon. minister taking charge of the department, and that it did not really take place during the time that Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department?

Mr. MURPHY. I regret that I cannot give my hon. friend definite information so far as dates are concerned. The only way in which we could arrive at a knowledge as to when these practices started was to trace back the beginnings of the dealings with those firms in New York which undoubtedly had dishonest relations with the late Superintendent of Stationery, and those dealings began about a year or a year and a half prior to my entering the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know if the minister, in the investigation he made, had any facts to prove that during the time Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department there was any commission paid or any crookedness of any kind.

Mr. MURPHY. Dr. Dawson was undoubtedly in charge during the year or the year and a half that those dishonest relations existed between the late Superintendent of Stationery and certain New York firms.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There was nothing prior to the one-and-a-half year.

Mr. MURPHY. I am not prepared to say that there was not prior to the year and a half

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did the minister not go back as far as necessary to find out?

Mr. MURPHY. I went back for 25 years and further, and the only date I am in a position to give my hon. friend and the House with regard to the dishonest dealings that undoubtedly took place, is the date I have mentioned—about a year and a half prior to my entering the department. Just when my hon. friend last interrupted I was drawing attention to the fact that in my report and the appendix attached to it, covering some ten and one-third pages, are to be found in a general way the indications of what was going on from time to time in connection with this investigation. I have under my hand the reports from the late Superintendent of Stationery, furnished me at different times within the same period, in reply to inquiries I made as to his dealings with these firms. These would also indicate what was going on, so that it was a very unfounded assumption on the part of the hon. member for hastings (Mr. Northrup) when he said that either nothing was done between these dates, or that if anything was done, it had been suppressed.

Then he made a much more remarkable statement. He said that my investigation had revealed that there was a shortage, but that there was nothing to show that a single head had fallen on account of it. Now, I take it that an hon. gentleman occupying a seat in this House does not make a statement of that kind unless he is prepared to substantiate it; and if he does make it without being able to substantiate it, then I submit he has done something which no hon. gentleman ought to do. That is precisely the position in which the hon. gentleman put himself this afternoon. What are the facts? There were shortages and heads did fall. It might be alleged that it would be impossible for members of this House to know what has been done in the way of disciplining the staff down there if there was no information outside of what might have been furnished within the Printing Bureau itself. In such a case, an hon. gentleman might very easily be mistaken, and

I would understand his making a statement in good faith such as was made by the hon. member for Hastings this afternoon. But unfortunately my hon. friend has no such excuse, because the facts appear in a document which is a document of record in this House. No later than the 12th of this month, a return was brought down in response to an order secured by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), showing the number of dismissals made from the Printing Bureau. That document was available to the hon. member for Hastings just as it is to any other hon. member. Yet in face of the fact that this document, on record in this parliament, reveals, not that one, but that a dozen or more heads fell, the hon. gentleman has the hardihood to get up and make the statement that not one head fell as a stricture on my conduct in connection with this investigation. What does this return show? It shows, first of all, that the late Superintendent of Printing had to retire.

An hon. MEMBER. What was his name?

Mr. MURPHY. I may tell my hon. friend from Grenville that his name was Mr. McMahon.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not ask his name.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He was superannuated; his head did not fall.

Mr. MURPHY. He had to retire. He resigned and was superannuated.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If that gentleman did wrong, why did the minister superannuate him?

Mr. MURPHY. In reply, I would say that if my hon. friend means that he did wrong in the sense of being dishonest, I say no.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then he should not have been superannuated.

Mr. MURPHY. He was superannuated because it was proved that he was not competent for the office, and it was in the interest of the public service that he should be superannuated. But there were the following dismissals: Edward Auger, J. G. A. Harwood———

Mr. REID (Grenville). What were their positions?

Mr. MURPHY. That does not appear in the return. It was not called for. Only the name and date of dismissal was asked. J. G. A. Harwood, falsifying entries; John E. Bailey, loss of time, usury; Arthur Simard, intemperance; Charles Lacroix, intemperance; Alex. Baker, jr., intemperance; John Gooden, incompetence, untruthfulness, neglect of duty and responsibility for shortage of goods in his charge. The very matter mentioned by the hon. member for Hastings this afternoon.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have you the dates of their appointments?

Mr. MURPHY. No, the order did not call for that. The other names are: Thomas Murphy, intemperance; Walter Kane, intemperance; R. E. Cook, disobeying instructions, waste of public moneys, placing of orders outside of Bureau without securing competitive prices, and for untruthfulness and incompetence; Greg. Burns, intemperance; Aristide Parent, intemperance.

There is the list of these dismissals, furnished this House in response to an order of this House, and yet the hon. member for Hastings this afternoon asserted that while all these things had been found out not a head had fallen. I leave you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, to characterize the conduct of an hon. gentleman who would make a statement of that kind in the face of evidence to the contrary, which was available if he chose to seek it.

The hon. gentleman further commented on certain purchases at excessive prices of toilet paper, bought in the United States. That also was exposed during the investigation, but my hon. friend thought proper to make this facetious observation with regard to it, that this paper had been sent to the penitentiaries because no one there was likely to be brought in contact with members of the opposition. Well, my hon. friend's humour is of a character that sometimes it is difficult to appreciate; and I must confess that while I did not appreciate it this afternoon, I thought it was incumbent upon me to explain to the House that the sending of this paper to places remote from Ottawa was part of the system of fraud carried on by the late Superintendent of Stationery. Had this paper been sent to any of the offices in this city or vicinity, the prices paid for it and the surrounding circumstances would have been detected very soon; but in order to prevent detection, the late superintendent of stationery was careful to see that this expensive paper was sent to the penitentiaries and some of it to the distant N. W. M. police barracks, where an investigation could not be made and where no questions were likely to be asked.

The hon. gentleman proceeded to deal with certain other matters set out in the report. He referred to the binding which was done by certain officials for themselves; and judging by the question which was asked by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I think that the hon. member for Hastings unintentionally gave him, and possibly the House as well, a wrong impres-

sion as to the extent to which this binding was carried on. Let me say that there was very little of it done. There was on the part of certain employees a good deal of loose talk and extravagant statements in that connection, but upon investigation these proved to be in the main incorrect. There was the case of one book, the binding of which cost $10. The hon. gentleman mentioned that incident, but he failed to inform the House at the same time that the man who did the binding was obliged to pay for it. He only mentioned that incident a little later on when the leader of the opposition asked the question. But the question put by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) was a very pertinent one, and the hon. member for East Hastings did not answer it. I am not surprised at that, because the things the hon. member for East Hastings does not know about the Printing Bureau would fill a very much larger volume than the one which has been presented to the House. Now, let me answer the questions asked by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). That hon. gentleman inquired: How could these men do this contract binding? There was nothing of that kind. The binding that was done was usually small books. The evidence disclosed that the material used was not obtained at the bindery and there was only a portion of the work done and that usually at the noon hour or when the men had some leisure, apart from their usual work. But in every case the employee who did anything of this kind was reproved or punished as the circumstances of the case warranted, and I have the assurance of the officials there that nothing of the kind has been done since the facts were brought to light. The hon. gentleman also dealt with another matter which is very fully exposed in the Report —the money lending. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) inquired if this money lending was done by persons outside the Bureau, and it was explained by the hon. member for East Hastings that the lending was done by employees of the Bureau themselves. And here again I may remark that if the hon. gentleman had wanted to be fair he should have mentioned that the chief usurer, Mr. Bailey, had been dismissed for his practices in that connection.

The hon. gentleman referred to a question which is such an unimportant one that I can only conceive that he brought it to the notice of the House in order that it might be used for home consumption in the county which he represents. I cannot conceive that it would serve any other purpose than to be used along the side lines and on the back concessions at election time. He referred to a notice posted in the Bureau warning the officials and employees regarding waste, and quoted the evidence given by one of the employees who was examined during the investigation, and said that another employee, who happened to be a French Canadian, was referred to the notice and said that it did not concern him because it was not in French. If the hon. gentleman wanted to be fair he should have gone further and quoted the evidence given by this French Canadian employee who explained fully the incidents referred to. He stated that the other employee who questioned him about it was a man he did not like who was making himself officious in and about the Bureau, and he answered as he did simply because he did not recognize the right of this man to question him; and added unreservedly, that, of course, the notice applied to him as to others, and he felt himself bound by it. And I may say for the benefit of the hon. member from East Hastings and of any other hon. gentleman who might be disposed to raise such a question that the French Canadian employees in the Printing Bureau will compare very favourably indeed with any other class who work in that institution.

The hon. gentleman also quoted some evidence given in the report tending to show that political pull existed in the Printing Bureau. He referred to a question and answer appearing at page 237 in which the names of three employees are given and an expression of opinion is given by the witness that these men presumed a good deal upon political pull. That was a mere expression of opinion, because as a matter of fact, there is no such thing as political pull in vogue in the Printing Bureau.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MURPHY. I make that assertion with the knowledge that, not one but several of my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House know that it is perfectly true, they having had personal experience in that regard since I assumed charge of the Printing Bureau. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to read the report of Mr. E. G. O'Connor regarding the lithographic room and Mr. Cook's connection with it, and said that if Mr. Cook was to blame some one above was responsible, and no one had been punished. There again he is incorrect. The man above Mr. Cook was responsible, and he was punished. I gave his name a few minutes ago, the late Superintendent of Printing, Mr. McMahon. But there is this to be said in this connection—that Mr. Cook, on his own admission repeated, not once but several times in the evidence, ignored the Superintendent of Printing and professed to deal with the King's Printer direct, although the

Superintendent of Printing was, by Mr. Cook's own acknowledgment, his superior officer. When that sort of a relation existed in an establishment of this kind, it is not surprising that irregularities happened, and that Mr. Cook did some of the things that have been already communicated to the House and others of which I will tell the House before I take my seat. But, Sir, in this connection my hon. friend should have read further, and he should have had the fairness to tell the House that in the same report from which he quoted, that of Mr. E. G. O'Connor appearing at pages 147-8-9-50 of the report, it is stated by Mr. O'Connor that the practices therein disclosed for which Mr. Cook above all other officials in the Bureau was chiefly responsible, had been stopped, as reported at the top of page 150:

These absurd prices appear to have been paid for years without protest by Mr. Cook or any other official until I called attention to it during my inquiry, and, by your authority, had it stopped.

Then my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) dilated at considerable length upon the list of purchases to be found in the Auditor General's Report and referred to the evidence given in the Public Accounts Committee in connection with several of these purchases. It is true these purchases are extensive, but they are not Bureau purchases—that is, not in the sense that these goods are intended for the Bureau. The Bureau, as is well known, makes purchases for all the departments of government and for parliament as well. My hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) did not allege that anything wrong was shown in connection with these purchases. He rather dwelt upon the number of them and expressed the view that all these goods could not have been required. No evidence was given to that effect, so I fail to see in what regard the citation of these purchases assists in any particular the position taken by my hon. friend.

The hon. gentleman also referred to a return that has been more or less discussed, which was prepared in response to an order passed at the instance of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). In connection with that return he chose to animadvert somewhat severely upon the bona fides of the present under Secretary of State, Mr. Mulvey, and having given his version of how that return had been prepared stated that if Mr. Mulvey had been honest and intelligent he would not have prepared it in the manner described by my hon. friend. I hold no brief for Mr. Mulvey. Mr. Mulvey's character is such that it is not necessary for any hon. gentleman to hold a brief for him, but I may say that there is no man more honest and there are few men as intelligent and zealous in the service of Canada as Mr. Mulvey. That is a reputation which he did not need to come to Ottawa to make; he enjoyed it while in the service of the Ontario government, both under the Ross administration and under the present Whitney administration. Having said that much in reference to Mr. Mulvey, let me say further that this return was asked for in the Public Accounts Committee. When it was asked for, I informed the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and I think one other hon. gentleman who was there present, possibly the member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), that the return had been brought down. Certain papers were produced and it will be within the recollection of hon. gentlemen who had these papers in hand on the morning of the meeting referred to, that I pointed out the fact that the papers produced were not the return of which we were speaking. As the return could not be found, certain drafts were produced from the department and these drafts were used in place of the original return for the purpose of examining the witnesses. In that way these drafts became exhibits in that committee. It has since transpired that what we thought were drafts were in reality the original return, and they have, in consequence, been a matter of record in the Public Accounts committee since January 20 last. What the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) complained of was that while the order of the House asked for a return showing the printing, advertising and lithographing done outside the Bureau, Mr. Mulvey in having the return made up excluded the cost of paper, that being a matter which in his judgment did not enter into the return, having regard to the terms of the order. That was discussed in the Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Mulvey's view regarding it was fully and frankly stated and it is not necessary to go further into it now. But as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) inquired this afternoon whether the return on its face showed that the cost of paper had been excluded, and he was informed in reply by the hon. member for East Hastings that it did not, let me correct that statement by informing you, Sir, and the House, that while one of the two documents now on file in the Public Accounts Committee, neither of which it so happens was ever brought down to the House, although I was under that impression when we met in the Public Accounts Committee, and so stated, would show only the cost of printing lithographing and advertising; another shows specifically the cost of the paper as well. Thus all the information that was asked for may be obtained by any hon. gentleman who desires to have recourse to

these two documents. My hon. friend referred also to a transaction in connection with which Mr. Cook obtained considerable prominence and I desire to give the particulars which my hon. friend did not have in his possession; possibly if he had had them he would not have referred to the question at all. He spoke of an order given to the Gananoque 'Recorder' and told the House what had been done in that regard, practically in the same terms as Mr. Cook, on a certain occasion, explained it. As this is a matter of some importance and as it illustrates even better than any other example I can give what kind of methods were pursued by Mr. Cook in connection with the office he held in the Printing Bureau, I will ask your indulgence and that of the House while I read Mr. Cook's evidence on the subject as given at pages 266 and 267 of the Report:

Q. There has also been some evidence given regarding an order for 100,000 pamphlets which you placed with the Gananoque 'Reporter' for the Interior Department, and in his evidence the King's Printer has said that when he got an explanation of the matter from you, he was told that you had stopped off in Gananoque and had inspected the plant in the office of the 'Reporter,' had satisfied yourself that they were equipped to do the work, and gave that as one reason why the order was placed; and an additional reason stated by the King's Printer, as given to him by you, was that Mr. Britton, the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter,' had been at one time a Liberal candidate. What have you to say as to the placing of that order?—A. I asked the King's Printer, as he had several of those immigration pamphlets, and as I thought that Mr. Britton had been a good friend to me, and had never had anything which I felt he was in a position to do, even when all that work was placed under my distribution by Dr. Dawson. This afforded a good opportunity to put something in his way and show him that I appreciated what he had done for me. I may say that I served part of my apprenticeship in that office. Naturally I had a warm spot in my heart for it, and I asked the King's Printer, who consented, seeing that the price was a reasonable one, and the work was executed in good time.

Q. But I understand from the King's Printer that he did not know anything about the work being placed until after you had gone there?—A. No, he understood it before I went there.

Q. That is not what he stated?—A. That is the fact all the same. I may say that it has been my unfailing practice to consult Mr. Parmelee in regard to everything that has been sent out.

Mr. Murphy.—When there is a very serious conflict of opinion as to fact between you and Mr. Parmelee, I would like to get at the bottom of the matter.

Mr. Parmelee.—My recollection of the facts is that Mr. Cook was at Gananoque, his old home, not on Bureau business at all, and that he came back here and spoke to me about the 'Reporter' office, told me how it was equipped, that Britton was publishing a paper there in the face of a good many difficulties, and that there was a little pamphlet which they might print. What followed was that if they were in a position to do the work cheaply and well, with prompt delivery, I did not object. I did not intend to say that I did not know the order was placed until long after. What I intended to say was that I did not ascertain until long after that the 'Reporter' office did not do the work.

Mr. Cook.—I had not been near the 'Reporter' office or consulted them before I mentioned the matter to Mr. Parmelee. I was going to Toronto in connection with other work, and I dropped off from one train to the other——

Gentlemen in the habit of travelling between Toronto and Ottawa will notice what a direct route Mr. Cook followed:

——and I dropped off one train to the other and visited the 'Reporter' office to see what they had there. I had not been near them before or broached the subject, not did I know that there was such a thing when I was on my holidays long before. I found that they had the same power press as we had, a folding machine, a trimmer, and everything that was necessary to do the work.

Q. There has been further evidence given here by Mr. Parmelee, corroborated by another witness, that on one occasion in this room, when this particular order was under discussion, you mentioned that when the proofs of the work came to the Bureau, you saw that it was not being done by the Gananoque 'Reporter,' but by the Ottawa 'Free Press,' and that you did not make any mention of the matter because you did not want to bring Mr. Norman Smith down about your ears or something to that effect?—A. That is practically right. When the first proofs came here, the manager of the 'Free Press,' Mr. Barker, told me that he had made arrangements with Mr. Britton to do the work. After thinking the thing over, I thought, well, so long as they did it, we had a hard and fast price fixed. I did not know just exactly what to do, and I let the matter go.

Q. You did not report it to Mr. Parmelee?—A. No, I did not. I thought that so long as we got the work, and got it at a reasonable price, I did not want to incur the displeasure of the 'Free Press.'

Q. You were aware that the 'Free Press' was not doing it for the price you had fixed for the Gananoque 'Reporter'?—A. No. I asked Mr. Barker afterwards what he was doing it for. He said there was not much margin in it for them, he was kicking at what they had to do it for. As a matter of fact, he told me that they were doing it for something in the neighbourhood of $200 less than the Gananoque 'Reporter' got it for.

So that as a business transaction the Bureau could have paid what the 'Free Press' charged for it?—A. I do not know. We were paying for that work the ordinary rate the Immigration Department had been paying right along, and it was a pretty close price.

I might interject here that that statement is absolutely untrue as are most of Mr. Cook's statements.

Q. But not so close that the 'Free Press' was not able to shave it off a couple of hundred dollars?—A. I asked Mr. Barker how he could account for that. He said: 'We are dead, we are dormant, and it is a filler; there is not much in it, but it is better than nothing—better than having our presses standing.' I made up my mind that if we had pamphlets of that kind in the future, it would be a bidding proposition. I know that prices vary according to the amount of work in offices at times. You will get high tenders at certain times and low tenders at others. It depends on how busy they are.

Q. After the work was completed, the Gananoque 'Reporter' rendered their account, did they not?—A. Yes.

Q. And it was presented to you in due course, and vouched for by you?—A. Yes. We had a complete delivery of the work, and we put through an account for it.

Q. And to that account you attached this certificate: 'Examined, prices fair and just. (Sgd.) R. E. Cook?'—A. Yes.

Q. When you put that on the account rendered by the Gananoque 'Reporter,' you knew, as you have just explained, that the work was done in the Ottawa 'Free Press office?—A. Yes, I must admit that I was aware of it at that time.

The effect of that evidence was to leave me under the impression that this gentleman knew nothing about the Ottawa 'Free Press' having done that work until the proofs came to him from the 'Free Press' office; yet he admitted that when he certified the account as fair and just he had knowledge that the 'Free Press' had done that work for $200 less than he had certified the Gananoque 'Reporter' account for, and he explained that by saying that he thought that was the best thing to do.

But, there is another chapter of this transaction that has come to hand since this report was printed. You will observe in the evidence given by this worthy gentleman, upon whom the hon. member for Hastings places such reliance, that he mentions an interview that occurred with Mr. Barker of the 'Free Press'. After this report was printed and circulated the attention of Mr. Barker was drawn to the evidence given by Mr. Cook. After Mr. Barker had read that evidence he came down to my office to explain that Cook's version was absolutely false from beginning to end. He further explained that Cook had first of all arranged a price of $1,160 with the Gananoque 'Reporter,' that later on Cook had arranged a second price of $950 with him, and not only arranged that, but he had arranged that the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter' was to come to Ottawa, get the copy from the Bureau and go up to the 'Free Press' office with it; later still that when the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter' came to Ottawa, Cook actually telephoned, and made arrangements for him to go up; that later still, when the Ottawa 'Free Press' inquired as to how they were to be paid, this worthy gentleman told them to render their account to the Gananoque 'Reporter,' and that he would notify them when the cheque was issued from the Bureau to the Gananoque 'Reporter.' He also directed them to send the proofs to him while the work was in progress. This was such an astounding statement, in view of the evidence given by this gentleman who is now regarded as one of the new props of the Conservative party——

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, my hon. friend may well call 'order', but he should address his remarks to his own friends. This was such an astounding statement that I asked Mr. Barker if he would put it in writing; he did so, and I have here the following letter which I shall read to the House:

Ottawa, February 3, 1911.

Hon. Chas. Murphy, M. P.,
Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—My attention has recently been called to certain statements in the published report of the Printing Bureau inquiry which I desire to correct. The statements referred to were made by Mr. R. E. Cook in his explanation of the way in which he gave an order for the printing of 100,000 pamphlets to the Gananoque 'Reporter'. The facts for which I can vouch are as follow:

About the middle of January, 1910, I went to the Printing Bureau and interviewed Mr. Cook on business. In answer to my inquiry he said it was not likely that any work would be sent outside for some time, but that an order for 100,000 pamphlets had been placed with the Gananoque 'Reporter,' and that they were not in a position to handle it as they had not the necessary plant. He added that if I, on behalf of the Ottawa 'Free Press,' would quote a low enough price on the work he would advise Mr. Britton, the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter,' to give it to us, and that if our price was not satisfactory Mr. Britton would very likely send the work to Montreal. He said he would prefer to have it done in Ottawa, as in that case he could look after it and see that it was properly done. Mr. Cook then handed me a sample pamphlet from a prior edition, and asked me to get the price down low as Mr. Britton had a low figure.

After figuring the cost of the work I again went to the Bureau and told Mr. Cook our price would be $950.00. He said he thought this would be satisfactory, and that he would advise Mr. Britton when he came to Ottawa for the copy to leave the work with us. On January 25, 1910, Mr. Cook telephoned me that Mr. Britton was on his way up to our office with the copy, and that everything was satisfactory. Upon Mr. Britton's arrival at our office he stated that Mr. Cook had sent him up and I gave him a written quotation for the work which he then turned over to us at $950.00.

While the work was in progress I telephoned Mr. Cook as to where the proofs were to be sent and be told me to send them to him. This was done.

When I inquired from Mr. Cook as to the manner in which payment would be made, he told me to send our account to Mr. Britton, and that the latter would send this acount to the Bureau. He further informed me that he would notify me when a cheque was forwarded from the Bureau to Mr. Britton, and advised me to draw on the latter at sight. These instructions were followed and payment was duly made.

Yours truly,
(Signed) A. H. BARKER,
Superintendent Printing,
Ottawa Free Press, Limited.

I do not wish to characterize, in language that would be either harsh or unparliamentary, the conduct of any man, but, Sir, I leave it to you, and the House to say whether or not Mr. Cook was treated harshly or too leniently when he merely lost his position in the Printing Bureau. I am still prosecuting this inquiry, and when I have all the facts elicited, delay having been caused in getting some of them owing to the departure of Mr. Barker from the city, I intend to hand the matter over to the Department of Justice.

I do not wish to weary the House. I have been obliged to go into these matters in some detail, but the balance of the speech of my hon. friend does not, it seems to me, call for any special comment at this late hour. He did in one particular address himself especially to me, and asked me to give him my opinion of the fact that $60,000 had been expended for typewriters and typewriter supplies. He asked me if I did not consider that a little too high. Certainly I did, and I do. That also is a matter dealt with in the report, and it is because of the opinion that I hold in regard to that, that the purchase of these supplies has been stopped, and that the Bureau, since the investigation, has not purchased any supplies except those that were urgently required and which they had not in stock.

Now, my hon. friend read a large list of directories, dictionaries, and other goods that had been supplied to the various departments, and he seemed to find fault with that. Again, I have only to make this observation that it is not the business of the Bureau to determine what parliament or this or that department requires for its use. The Bureau's business is to purchase goods when they receive requisitions for these goods properly vouched for, and properly signed, either from parliament or a department. As my hon. friend has chosen to treat the investigation that was held by me, and which is still going on, as something that has never happened, and as he has chosen to disregard this report of nearly 500 pages, and to treat it merely as something which can be used to bolster up his motion, and to serve no other purpose whatever, let me, Mr. Speaker, draw your attention, and the attention of the House to some of the changes that have been introduced into the Printing Bureau in consequence of that investigation, and by reason of the recommendations made by the experts who assisted at that investigation.

In the first place the proofreaders who were formerly scattered throughout the building have been assembled in one room; the stereotype room has been consolidated; the stores department has been separated from the purchasing department and taken over by a chief storekeeper who is independent of the purchasing agent; six monotypes have been ordered and installed; time-recording clocks have been ordered and installed, and these are intended to do away with the irregularities that were found to exist in connection with the attendance books. A number of small offices have been torn down, and a long room established in which the whole clerical staff has been accommodated; the stationery storeroom has been made secure so that no one can have access thereto after office hours; a woman's lunch room established; a chief electrician has been appointed; a loose leaf and office device expert has been appointed; it has been arranged that all correspondence shall pass through the King's Printer's office instead of through those of various officials as formerly; additional ruling machines have been ordered; a controller of composition has been appointed; a purchasing agent has been appointed in order to keep the stores department separate and distinct from the printing department; the main entrance, halls and corridors of the building have been cleaned and painted; an internal telephone system has been installed; modern methods of requisitioning for supplies on purchasing agent and on stores clerk from the printing division have been introduced; an officer has been appointed to watch work jackets for the purpose of expediting work and to check overlooked orders for printing; a cost system has been introduced and its installation is in progress in the several branches of the Bureau where it is expected to be completed within a month; arrangements have been made to lessen rush orders from the departments so that they may be dealt with in a businesslike way; a register of correspondence has been established; linotype cleaners have been appointed so that the half hour lost each day by the operators in cleaning their machines may in future be saved; a lithograph expert has been appointed to supervise copy sent by departments and to check lithograph and map accounts; the practice of securing advance prices in all lithographic work has been established; a new stamp embossing machine has been ordered; a mechanical superintendent has been appointed; an internal fire brigade has been

organized among the employees for the protection of the building and the valuable property stored therein. The stock, regarding which so much has been heard from some hon. gentlemen and from a number of the journalistic Hessians who support them, has been reduced by over $100,000. The order in council that requisitions shall be made by the Deputy Minister or by an official appointed by order in council has been strictly enforced; a system of checking has been introduced into the stores branch which prevents stores being handed out without entry; the inward checking of goods has been improved and a receiving clerk appointed; weekly meetings of chief officials have been established, and weekly reports of these meetings sent to the Secretary of State; a catalogue of loose leaf devices and instructions for ordering the same have been prepared for use in all the departments; a new stock list is being prepared. Then, Sir, in addition to these reforms which are some only of those that have been introduced, the experts who assisted in the investigation of the Bureau have visited the establishment at least once a month since this report was presented to see that their recommendations have been put in force, and to make such further investigations as they think necessary. Now, Mr. Speaker, not further to take up the time of the House, I will merely say that on account of what we have done, on account of what we are still doing, on account of what we further intend to do, I must ask the House in view of the results of my investigation, of the reforms that have been introduced and of the saving that has already been effected to the country, to reject the motion proposed by the hon. member for Hastings as it is both unnecessary and impracticable in the form in which he has presented it.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). The Liberal party took charge of the Printing Bureau in July, 1896, and they have had control of it now for nearly fifteen years. The present Secretary of State took charge of it in 1908, and he has spent a good portion of his time this afternoon in showing us the rascalities which have been growing up in it while it has been under the management of the Liberal party. He has set forth in his report nearly every offence in the Criminal Calendar as having been perpetrated in the Printing Bureau; offences that have grown up while it was under the management of the Liberal party during the last fifteen years, and under his special management for about two years and a half. One would imagine that he was talking about something that grew up while the Conservatives had control of that department, but that is not the case. It will scarcely be believed that the Secretary of State has made such a report as the result of Liberal management for fifteen years. On page 2 of the report he says:

The incompetence of some officials, the dishonesty of others, and a complete lack of frankness on the part of those whose duty it was to keep their superiors informed as to the actual working of the Printing Bureau, were the chief causes that combined to unduly prolong the inquiry. If the parliamentary investigation into the Printing Bureau scandals of 1891——

He has not said anything about these matters that happened in 1891 while he was on his feet, but in his report he attempts to show that it was owing to some lax conduct of twenty years ago that all these rascalities in the Bureau have now occurred.

—If the parliamentary investigation into the Printing Bureau scandals of 1891 had been followed by the application of vigorous measures to correct the abuses that were then shown to exist, it is probable that the present inquiry would not have been necessary.

Of course not; something that happened twenty years ago had nothing to do with the lax management during the last fifteen years.

There can be little doubt that if a thorough overhauling had been made at that time the radical defects in the organization and management of the Printing Bureau would have been discovered and corrected, and that such action would have led to a more faithful discharge of their duties by the officials and employees. But, with the exception of a few dismissals, nothing was done.

That is the position of affairs to-day. If I remember right, most of those who were dismissed by the minister were dismissed for drunkenness, and as I understand hardly a man was dismissed by him for dishonesty. He has spent a good deal of time telling us about this man Cook, who he says falsified figures, altered orders, was guilty of forgery, but I am not aware that he has prosecuted that man. He finds fault with these people for not doing anything but making a few dismissals.

As a consequence, the evils that were left untouched spread and flourished to the serious impairment of the Bureau's efficiency and the gradual destruction of that spirit of loyalty and co-operation which ought to prevail in an establishment of its size and public importance.

That has all been going on for the last 15 years while hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power. It is not an opponent of the government who is making these statements; it is the Secretary of State, the gentleman who has had the conduct of this department for the last two years.

He said a good deal more in that connection, part of which was read by my hon. friend from East Hastings, and I will not repeat it. On pages 6 and 7 he says:

The undersigned would respectfully urge the speedy adoption of all the recommendations made in sub-report No. 1. These recommendations are the result of months of work, of great care and of a practical knowledge of the subjects to which they relate. On the score of economy alone the strongest argument may be advanced in their support. By adopting them in their entirety it is estimated that a saving of $150,000 per annum might be effected. That this is not an extravagant estimate is easily shown.

So that we have a system here, after the Liberals have been in power 15 years whereby, according to the Secretary of State, they are wasting $150,000 a year. At the bottom of that page he says:

An Act amending the Public Printing and Stationery Act is in course of preparation. It will be submitted to council without delay so as to ensure its early introduction in parliament.

Now, I may have overlooked that, but I do not remember having seen that Act this session; and this report is dated November 8, 1910. I am not aware that the Act there promised has been submitted to council or that we have seen anything of it in this House. Now, the hon. Secretary of State has told us that he has been investigating for two years, that he began his investigations in 1908. Well, let us see what has been going on while he has been investigating. Nearly the whole of these rascalities of which he is now complaining have occurred while he has been investigating. Let us look at page 105 of this report, where we have set forth overcharges on goods purchased in the United States, extending from October 30, 1907, down to June, 1910. That was a year and a half after he began to investigate, after he was appointed Secretary of State in October, 1908. In the case of one firm, G. W. Millar & Company, New York, the overcharges amounted to $49,691.77. The next was L. W. May, New York, from whom the purchase extended from November 30, 1908, down to May, 1910. You will remember that the Secretary of State began his investigations on that very day, the 30th of November, and the overcharges on these purchases amounted to $2,561.22. He was investigating then, and he has been investigating ever since, and these overcharges were going on during all the time that he was investigating. The next firm is the Heslop Paper Company, of New York, from whom the purchases extended from November 4, 1908, down to May, 1910, and the overcharges of that firm during that time amounted to $10,297.64. Another New York firm is the Gresham Blank Book Company, from whom the purchase extended from November 20, 1907, to September 21, 1910, and their total overcharges during that time were $10,104.69—and the Secretary of State was investigating all the time. Then we have W. H. Addoms of New York, from August 21, 1908, to May, 1910, and the overcharges during that time were $3,097.91. We have the Peerless Supply Company, from April 4, 1908, to November 24, 1909, with overcharges amounting to $6,793.69. Next, we have the Rogers Manifold and Carbon Company, of New York, from November 12, 1907, to June, 1910, with total overcharges of $11,621.44. We have a total of overcharges, while the Secretary of State is investigating, amounting to over $94,000. And that is the sort of investigation that we are asked to accept as being perfectly and thoroughly satisfactory.

Now, let us look at some of these sub-reports to see what they have to tell us. On page 37 we have the report of Messrs. Hyde and O'Connor. Speaking of the stock ledger they say:

This book is supposed to be written up every week so that the storekeeper by reference to it might be able to keep his stock properly assorted. However, as a matter of fact, at the time of our examination, the ledger for the present fiscal year was over three months in arrears, and for all practical purposes was useless. The clerk who keeps the book says that the reason he cannot keep it posted up is the length of time that elapses between the receipt of goods and the furnishing to him of the invoices to be entered in the ledger.

Again, at page 42, they say:

No time should be lost in putting into action a plan for doing away with the excessive amount of hand composition now done in the Bureau. About 160 men are so employed, on salaries of $16 a week, aggregating on full time $133,120 annually. It is a fair estimate that half of this amount might be saved by the introduction of machine composition, in addition to the saving in the purchase of expensive type, and the carrying of it in standing matter, as now has to be done.

On page 47 they recommend that a purchasing agent be appointed. At page 100 we have sub-report No. 2, dated June 23, 1910, made by H. O. Wilson, in which he says:

I beg to report that, in accordance with your request, I inspected the Stationery Department on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, and found a condition of affairs that is simply appalling——

Simply appalling, after the Liberals had been in power 15 years and the Secretary of State had been in office two years——

—and there was palpable evidence on every side of gross mismanagement in the method of purchasing stationery supplies. It appeared to me that the stock in the basement is in a chaotic condition.

There are rows after rows and tiers upon tiers of all sizes and grades of papers, and no one seems to be able to tell with any degree of accuracy, how long any particular pile has been in stock, or could even hazard a guess as to the length of time it was likely to remain there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the date of that?

Mr. CROTHERS. 23rd June, 1910. Where was the gentleman at the head of the Printing Bureau all this time? Did he ever go about to see the conditions of affairs? Did the minister ever go down and look around these various rooms? Neither of these gentlemen seem ever to have done so. The King's Printer never seems to have made any examination.

The only reason which could evidently be advanced was, that an order from the Printing Bureau might be received at any time for a supply of paper the same as a sample submitted, and it was therefore necessary to carry in stock a complete assortment of many kinds of paper in various sizes. There is paper stacked alongside steam coils, although nothing destroys the life of paper like artificial heat. There are also piles of wrapping paper, blotting paper and coloured paper, which, I should judge, are far in excess of necessary requirements, and I might say here, that even at the entrance to the building one is confronted with cases of paper piled in rows as high as possible. In my opinion, the paper should be standardized, that is to say, certain paper should be selected for certain forms and this would not necessarily imply that the paper should all be obtained from one manufacturer. The manufacturers should carry the stock which could be purchased from them as might be found necessary to keep it up to the limit of, say, two or three months' supply. If arrangements were made with the paper manufacturers that they could depend upon receiving orders for certain quantities within stipulated periods, they would certainly arrange to carry on hand a sufficient supply to make complete and prompt shipments.

There are cases by the score of Stephen's ink, piled here and there, and even in dark recesses where there is a possibility of them being overlooked. There is a large supply of Sanford's ink, which was discarded some time ago, and another ink called David's was purchased from New York recently. There are many cases of Sanford's mucilage, which have stacked there for months and months, and this brand of mucilage is not being used now because some one objected to the smell of it.

No wonder, even the mucilage smelt bad.

I would suggest that the surplus stock of paper, ink, mucilage, &c., be worked off as soon as opportunity will permit. A reference to the stock book reveals the fact that in a number of instances many reams of one kind of paper have not been touched during the twelve months, and there is no doubt that such paper could be substituted for some other kind requisitioned for by the Printing Bureau, even if it were a little better in quality than the paper desired. This would help in a great measure to relieve the congestion, the better supervision could be given to the stock, for under present conditions there must be some that is overlooked.

More prompt advice should be given by the Printing Bureau to the Stationery Department of paper required. I learned of one instance several months had elapsed after the job had been put in hand before the paper was ordered and it so happened that the particular kind of paper required was not carried in stock at the time. For the purpose of better service there should be continuity between the two departments in regard to the ordering of paper and the supplying of same. I mean by this, that the Printing Bureau should follow up their orders after a reasonable time has elapsed, and not wait until the stock is furnished them which may be some months after the order has been placed, leaving it in the meantime entirely to the judgment of the stock man whether he should institute inquiries to the paper dealers about the shipment.

I examined also the stock of sundry stationery supplies, and found that there was a large surplus of nearly every article. Pencils, which were the first article I looked at, I mention as an example. There are all kinds, grades and marks of pencils, and indeed there are pencils which were purchased at some remote date because some department fancied this particular kind and they were obtained in various grades from the softest to the hardest lead. After the demand for them had ceased no attempt was made to issue them in place of some other brand of pencil requisitioned for, and, in consequence they have lain as dead stock for months and months. An examination of the inventory book showed that there were more pencils on hand at March 31, 1909, that would have filled all the requisitions during the ensuing twelve months, but there were extensive purchases of pencils made during that time and consequently there was a still larger surplus on hand at the end of March this year. There are half a dozen cupboards filled with especially ruled ledgers and journals which may never be used.

Nearly every item is a repetition of another as far as surplus stock is concerned. There are several dozen different kinds of rubber erasers and scores of different kinds of pens. The records show that there is enough carbon paper on hand to fill all requirements for the next three years, and enough typewriter ribbons to meet every demand for the next five years, and I understand additional quantities of these goods have been purchased within the last three months.

They had enough to last five years, and yet were purchasing more, and the investigation was going on all this time. They had five years supply of typewriter ribbon on hand; and, yet while the Secretary of State was busily engaged in investigating they were buying more ribbons all the time. And we are asked to accept an investigation of this kind.

I visited two of the three outside stores and found carbon paper and typewriter ribbons piled in every conceivable corner, and there were also large quantities of waste baskets, twine, packing cases and other goods. Inquiry about so much twine being on hand elicited the explanation that for instance the postmaster at Toronto might at any time call for three bales of twine. Instead of carrying the twine in stock to fill such a requisition it could be ordered direct from the maker, and thus save the freight both ways between Toronto and Ottawa, and the necessary handling by the Stationery Department.

I suggest that an embargo be placed upon the purchasing of all stationery supplies until the stock is reduced to a proper level, and unless it is shown that it is necessary to order supplies to replenish the stock to keep it at a working limit. The department should not get tied up with any more contracts until the existing conditions are ameliorated. The stock on hand at the present time can be easily ascertained by having a statement made showing the quantity of each article on hand at March 31, 1910, the supplies purchased since, and the goods issued to date. A statement should be made giving details of existing contracts, and the quantities still to be taken to complete same.

In connection with the shipment of supplies, I found that there were three men employed in filling requisitions and six men packing the goods. There are certainly too many engaged in this work, as I have one storeman who parcels the supplies collected by three other storemen, and even the man who is parcelling goods finds time on occasions to fill requisitions himself.

It would be in the line of economy if the present requisition was discontinued, and one similar to the attached sample put into use, with an additional column for the stock on hand, and another line added in the heading for entering the number of clerks to be provided from the supplies ordered on the requisitions, and this form should be used by all the departments, instead of as at present some departments having special requisitions printed with supplies in detail, such as the Customs, Post Office and Militia Departments.

And so on for page after page of that report, but I do not think I will read any more of it. I want to refer to pages 128 and 129, sub-report No. 5 by Mr. Ryder, in which I find the following:

Having completed the taking of stock of the stationery branch of the Government Printing Bureau, and the checking of the stock ledger with the inventory, I herewith submit my report of the discrepancies in the stock ledger with the stock list as it stood on 8th August last. It shows shorts to the extent of $14,830.19, and longs to the extent of $9,010.32, leaving a net shortage of $5,819.87. In arriving at this result, I compared the stock lists as of the 8th August last with the stock ledger, and also with the stock list as taken by the Auditor General as of the 1st of April last.

For a full consideration of this statement, the deficit which it shows, and the methods pursued at the Bureau, it is necessary for me to add some further comments in the premises.

The stock ledger shows a shortage of 18,243 No. 6 manilla shipping tags. I investigated the day-book and the accounts for the purpose of ascertaining how this shortage arose, and I discovered that it was merely an apparent shortage, as a number of shipments to the departments had not been charged in the day-book or carried forward to the ledger. The result in this case was that there was no shortage whatever.

The ledger also showed a shortage of 3,187 pounds of twine. On further investigation in the manner followed in respect of manilla tags, the shortage was reduced to 1,100 pounds.

The stock ledger shows longs of 351 yards of buckram. On further investigating the day-book and accounts this was increased to 456 yards, a result indicating that in this instance also correct entries had not been made.

The stock ledger shown a shortage of 126,873 No. 7 manilla envelopes. Investigation of the books and accounts reduced the shortage to only 5,000.

These criticisms, I think, show, as my investigation of the stock convinces me, that to a great extent the shorts and longs as shown in the statement may be accounted for by defective bookkeeping, as the books do not show the actual transactions that took place in this branch of the Bureau. I ascertained that when goods are received they are not properly checked. In some cases only are the cases and other packages checked over to ascertain that the exact quantity shown by the invoices is received by the Bureau.

Then, there is not a proper method of describing the goods. It frequently happens that goods are entered in the stock ledger under one designation and distributed to the departments under another.

To illustrate the idea which the Secretary of State had as to proper conduct I would like to call your attention to another circumstance. A few moments ago he attempted to justify the Mortimer Company, Limited, in writing the letter to him of August 13. How does he attempt to justify it? He tells you the facts are that Cook had given a five thousand dollar contract in Toronto, and went to Mortimer and told Mortimer that the Secretary of State wanted him to put in a tender of over $5,000, so that the Secretary of State might have some writing to justify his paying $5,000 to the company in Toronto, and he tells us that Mr. Mortimer actually has the courage to write such a letter, and the Secretary of State we find, has the courage to put that letter into print in the public report telling us that his friend Mortimer was quite willing to join Cook to deceive this House and the country and to try to make them believe that tenders had been called for this work. That is what the Secretary of State comes forward and justifies before the representatives of the people in this House. Let me read that letter. And you will notice that the writer of it says that he believed that the story came from the Secretary of State through Mr. Cook. What was Mr. Mortimer's

opinion of the Secretary of State? It was that the Secretary of State was prepared to enter into a fraudulent deal with him. And what does the Secretary of State think of Mr. Mortimer when Mr. Mortimer was prepared over his own signature to falsify the facts in order to provide a paper for the Secretary of State to submit to the people's representatives in this House, if he were asked to do it, stating what was absolutely false. And the Secretary of State puts that letter in print and submits it for our consideration and actually has the courage to read it and I will read it also:

Ottawa, August 16, 1910.

Honourable Charles Murphy, M.P.,
Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Referring to our letter of April 22 last, addressed to the King's Printer and containing prices for an edition of Farm Grasses, we beg to say that the circumstances under which Mr. R. E. Cook obtained the letter mentioned are as follows:—

That is what Mr. Cook told him. And relying upon what Mr. Cook told him, he joined in that attempt to commit a fraud upon the people of this country.

At an interview in the Printing Bureau in April last, Mr. Cook stated to our Mr. Wm. Mortimer that you had given a contract for the edition of Farm Grasses to the Toronto Lithographing Company, and that as the contract amounted to more than $5,000 you desired to have on file correspondence showing that you had invited tenders for the work—

Showing something that was false.

—and that the Toronto Lithographing Company was the lowest tenderer.

The Secretary of State had sent Mr. Cook —so Mr. Cook said—to Mr. Mortimer to get this fraudulent tender in order that he might have it to give to the people's representatives in this House in case they should call for a return and ask if the lowest tenderer had got the contract.

Mr. Cook added that this correspondence was required in case a question was asked about the matter. Mr. Cook asked Mr. Mortimer to put in a tender slightly higher than that of the Toronto Lithographing Company, and as the tender of the latter company had been placed on Mr. Cook's desk where Mr. Mortimer could see it, the latter copied the figures and returning to our office made up a tender as requested by Mr. Cook. We assumed that Mr. Cook's statements were correct and did not make any inquiry from you. We were, however, aware when we wrote the letter of April 22 that the contract had previously been given to the Toronto Lithographing Company, and that our figures were not in the nature of a tender, but were to be used merely for the purpose of justifying the giving of the contract to the Toronto Lithographing Company as explained to our Mr. Wm. Mortimer by R. E. Cook.

Mr. CROTHERS.

Could a more damnable document be presented to the people?—to come forward and admit that they were parties to a deal to defraud and deceive this country. Have we any other reports coming before us month after month in which the same trickery is being used? I do not know, but very likely we have. I want to emphasize the idea of the Secretary of State's view of morals such as that when he asks us to accept an investigation he has made into the Printing Bureau. Now, what the Secretary of State should have done, I think, when he came into office in October, 1908, was to make a thorough investigation of this Printing Bureau and familiarize himself with it. He had had brought to his attention irregularities, and worse than irregularities, in other departments of the government. It will be remembered that this government in May, 1907, afforded a royal commission on this basis:

On a memorandum dated May 7, 1907, from the Minister of Finance, stating that while the general principles of the Civil Service Act are regarded as satisfactory, there are matters connected with the operation of the Act and the services and compensation of officials of the government which require more careful inquiry and consideration than can be given by the ministers of the several departments and, therefore, it is desirable that such matters be inquired into by a commission composed of gentlemen specially chosen for such purpose.

The minister, therefore, recommends that the following gentlemen,—J. M. Courtney, C.M.G., Ottawa, chairman, Thomas Fysche, Montreal, and J. G. Garneau, Quebec, be appointed commissioners, to inquire into and report on the operation of the existing Civil Service Act and kindred legislation with a view to the proposing of such changes as may be deemed advisable in the best interests of efficiency in the public service.

That such inquiry should include the following subjects.

1. General operation of the Civil Service Act.
2. Classification of the service.
3. Salaries.
4. Temporary employment.
5. Technical employees.
6. Promotions.
7. Discipline, hours of service, &c.
8. Efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staffs.
9. Retiring allowances.
10. Any other matter relative to the service which in the opinion of the commissioners requires consideration.

These gentlemen proceeded to carry on the inquiry, and they made a report. I will read from that report at page 20, and I read this in order to show that the Secretary of State, when he was appointed in the autumn of 1908, knew the probability that irregularities were going on in the Printing Bureau as these gentlemen found there were in other departments:

Without going so far as to say that the official who has been appointed through political influence and whose friends are in power is not amenable to discipline, the commissioners have found in certain instances that officials appointed by virtue of political patronage and remaining under its ægis have taken to themselves the idea that their services are altogether beyond the control of the higher officials; that, in fact, except from observance of office hours, their country or their chief is of no consideration.

I shall be able to show that there is evidence in this very report of men who say there was political pull. The Secretary of State in reading from that page this evening did not read the whole of it. If he had read the next question or the one after that, he would have found the witness stated that under the minister's predecessor there was political pull? Did any one charge the Secretary of State with anything in the way of political pull?

He accused the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) of not reading all of the evidence. It would take a week to read it all. The hon. member for East Hastings requires no assistance from me or from any other hon. member in this House; he is quite capable of taking care of himself here or anywhere else, but I cannot refrain from expressing the surprise I felt at the language with which the Secretary of State opened his remarks this afternoon, the paltry unprovoked and ungrounded statements he made with respect to the hon. member for East Hastings was a humiliation, coming as it did from a minister of the Crown, to every hon. member in this House, and I cannot but think the Secretary of State is a smaller man than I had ever considered him if, when he sees his words in cold print to-morrow, he is not ashamed of himself for having used them.

That the annual increase will follow is a matter of course, for their immediate superior in his report would not say absolutely that they were disobedient. Your commissioners are agreed that in the expansion that has occurred in Canada in recent years, which has been followed by a large increase in the ranks of the Civil Service, the later arrivals do not actively respond to regulations laid down in the government of the several departments. . . . .

In dealing with this subject, your commissioners have to submit that in the vast service such as exists at Ottawa, in the limited time at their disposal, it has been absolutely impossible for them to inquire fully into the efficiency of the officials in the several departments. There are probably, including labourers, some three thousand employees at Ottawa. In the Department of the Interior alone there are five hundred employees. In that department the junior branches are made up almost entirely of women. As has been pointed out, in Ottawa seven hundred women are now employed. That is a fact that must be taken seriously into account in considering the future of the service. It would take many months to examine the work of the Department of the Interior alone, and when so many officials are engaged in the several branches it would be hard to gauge with accuracy the extent of character or style of the work turned out by each.

Leaving the question of superannuation, your commissioners wish to refer again to the question of efficiency and sufficiency of the service. In addition to the efficiency in the administration of the departments a wider and broader question is raised, and that is how far the departments are efficient in looking after the best interests of the Dominion as respects their several expenditures.

You commissioners are of opinion that in many instances stores are ordered unnecessarily.

The very thing that was done in this case at the Printing Bureau.

And it may be doubtful that a good quality is always delivered. . . . .

In instances which have been brought to the notice of the commissioners, stores have been received which were not wanted and which it is difficult to get rid of. In fact, at different points stores have been shelved where in all probability they were unnecessary. The commissioners of 1892 dwelt on this matter and stated that they had had under consideration the question of having a director general of stores or a supply agent to purchase supplies for all services, but they had not had an opportunity of developing the subject. Your commissioners have come to the conclusion that the time has now arrived when it would be desirable in the public interest that purchasing agents, probably three, should be appointed at good salaries to make all purchases of goods required for the public service, and that all purchases required by the several departments should be procured by this means. In this connection your commissioners respectfully beg to recommend that inquiry be made as to the working of the Prevention of Corruption Act of the Imperial parliament passed in 1906 and the bribery clause in connection therewith.

Speaking of the Railways and Canals and Interior Departments they say:

Your commissioners have not visited this department, believing that other departments required more immediate inspection.

The same remark to a certain extent applies to the Department of the Interior. With its large staff of 500 employees at Ottawa, it would require months to thoroughly inspect the work and see that the several officials are properly employed.

The commissioners regret extremely that with the short time at their disposal they were unable to visit the Northwest, much as they desired to see how the land, and more especially, the timber sales are affected.

Of the Marine and Fisheries Department they say:

Your commissioners have taken up, and at great labour have followed through some of the files in this department, making ex-

tracts as they went along, which have been rewritten, as nearly as possible in chronological order, and which are now available and can be examined if required. The judgments they have formed are based largely on those extracts and on what they have seen in the offices. . . .

No effort seems ever to have been made with a view to cutting down this enormous mass of correspondence, a large amount of which with better organization could in our opinion be done away with and the rest of it more effectively handled.

There are officers enough in the department, both inside and outside, to do all the work efficiently if they were properly trained and organized; but there is no efficient organization. The only attempt at it is the appointment of men whose titles would seem to indicate what their duties are; but those duties have never been specifically defined. There is no record of anything of the kind, and there are no written or printed rules and regulations known in the service, which your commissioners think is lamentable.

It is practically impossible to fix responsibility on anybody.

This seems to answer the condition of things down in the Printing Bureau very closely.

The deputy is supposed to shoulder responsibility for everything as his signature shows; but that means that he speaks for 'the department,' and 'the department,' like the King, can do no wrong. There seems to be a huge redundancy of work which proceeds in a lumbering, haphazard way, giving rise to constant blundering and confusion. There is no sign visible of a single directing head, or an intelligent purpose, unless it be that of spending as much money as possible. Zeal for economy and good management, or pride in the work, is not visible. Perfunctory and mechanical discharge of duties is the rule, with apparently no perception of any need of improvement.

The lack of organization and of organizing power in the department has recently been very conspicuously and painfully illustrated by the fact that the accountant's or bookkeeping branch had apparently fallen into such confusion that expert accountants had to be called in to put things to rights, and create some intelligible system. After months of work by these highly paid experts the result has been at least greatly improved books as far as mechanical form is concerned, but probably little else; and this achievement has been accomplished at an almost fabulous expense.

There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department. There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitily assumed that there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise.

I would like to read extracts touching other departments, but I shall not take up time to do so. I am simply reading extracts from this report to show the conditions that must have been before the mind of the Secretary of State when he came to the office he holds, in October 1908. The government, after getting that report, had to do something and they appointed another commissioner to inquire whether or not certain officers of the Marine Department were men of integrity. We have Mr. Justice Cassel's report as to that. We have him finding that there were scores and scores of men guilty of bribery, bribers and bribees; some men had been guilty of theft but none of them were prosecuted. One or two were dismissed, one was superannuated on a large superannuation allowance but the rest were all allowed to go. What is the result? The result is that we have in that department to-day the loosest of methods and the loosest of morals, as is shown in the Lanctot job which we will discuss in the House during the next few days. The Secretary of State tells us that a man called McMahon, who occupied the position of King's Printer, as I am informed and verily believe, between the time when Mr. Dawson—

Mr. MURPHY. —Not King's Printer, Superintendent of Printing.

Mr. CROTHERS. I mean between the terms of office of the two King's Printers.

Mr. MURPHY. He was called the acting King's Printer.

Mr. CROTHERS. His name appeared on all documents as acting King's Printer, I am told, between the time that Dr. Dawson retired and the present incumbent was appointed. He was a man whom the Secretary of State told us to-day was superannuated for incompetency, and he was put in by a Liberal government to manage the Printing Bureau. I should like to read some of this evidence that we have, but I do not think that at this hour of the night I would be excused for doing so. I do not think I will go into that evidence. I call the attention of the House to the report of these commissioners to show what the Secretary of State had in his mind at the time he was appointed to this office. It will be remembered that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) moved a resolution that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into every large spending department, but it was voted down. If that commission had been appointed they would probably have ascertained the condition of the Printing Bureau and we would have escaped the exposures which have been made within the last few months. They refused to have that investigation and they refuse now. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) recited in that minute of council appointing these commissioners that it was necessary to have commissioners, because

the ministers had not time to look into these matters. If that was a good reason in reference to the conditions at that time it is a good reason now. This motion is that we should have a Royal Commission not only to look into this department but to look into every department that is connected with this department. The hon. Secretary of State read a sentence or two from some remarks which I made in the House in 1909, wherein I stated that if men were dismissed at once on its being shown that they were incompetent or dishonest, as soon as it came to the knowledge of the minister, or as soon as he should have known it, there would be no serious objection. Well, I did make that remark at that time, and I stick to it now, but the evidence that has been brought forward by the minister in this Blue-book and the evidence that was taken in the Public Accounts Committee shows that there was not a man in the Printing Bureau big enough for the job—not a single one. Do you suppose that if the King's Printer had been a man big enough for the position, conditions could have existed there such as I have pointed out to you this evening? Impossible. If the Secretary of State desires to carry out my ideas he will dismiss the whole outfit down there and get men big enough to run an institution of that kind in the interest of the people, and you will have it run honestly and efficiently. I think we have shown sufficient to cause us to doubt whether or not we can get a satisfactory investigation under the present Secretary of State. He dismissed Cook, but there is no prosecution. I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House at this late hour, as there are others who desire to speak. I think the matter should be committed to a Royal Commission to have an investigation open and above board where witnesses can be examined and cross-examined under oath. That is what I think the people of this country desire, and that is what the members of this House should insist on having.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon Territory). Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) is to be congratulated that this motion has been made, because he has been given an opportunity of presenting to the House the history of his dealings with the Printing Bureau since he assumed charge of that branch of the public service. In order, as I understand, to make a case in behalf of the appointment of a Royal Commission the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) started out to establish two propositions. The first was that irregularities had been committed in the Printing Bureau, and the second was that these irregularities had not been ended. In order to obtain his evidence that irregularities existed it was necessary for him to go to the report presented to parliament by the Secretary of State, and in that report he undoubtedly found evidence of the existence at a former time of great irregularities in the conduct of the Printing Bureau. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Crothers) referred to the irregularities connected with the over-stocking of the department and purchases in New York, and inquired why no prosecution had been made against any person, why no one had been punished for these irregularities connected with over-stocking and with purchases in New York. If the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to read the report that is on the table of the House, and which was in his hands while he was making that speech, he would see that the reason was that the man who is guilty of these irregularities took his own life and was no longer open to prosecution before any earthly tribunal. The gentleman who was guilty, Mr. Gouldthrite, was undoubtedly a very remarkable man. His career in the Printing Bureau shows that he went into that Bureau as a mere messenger in 1878, and, step by step, through various gradations, rose to the high position of Superintendent of Stationery in that department. He was a man who was well liked by every one. He was held in very high esteem by the King's Printer, under whom he had served for so many years; he was recommended by the King's Printer to his successor in office, he was courteous, gentlemanly, and competent, and when he appeared before the Public Accounts Committee he conveyed to the committee the very finest impression of his integrity and businesslike management of all the details of the Bureau. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat wonders why there was no discovery made in respect to his misdeeds for so long a period. That also is explained on page 5 of the report. The mere facility which enabled him to deceive the King's Printer, which enabled him to deceive the Public Accounts Committee, enabled him, for a period, to deceive the Secretary of State. It is not an uncommon thing in large institutions. We know of a great many instances in which banks in this and other countries, where there seems to be a businesslike and perfect conduct of their affairs, have been for years victims of the defalcations of clerks in their employ, and when these defalcations are disclosed it is always a wonder to those connected with the bank that such a thing was possible. So it was with regard to Gouldthrite. The evidence shows that whenever inquiry was made with respect to any transaction he had a most ready and plausible answer to offer, and that only

step by step was the Secretary of State led to the discovery that there was some irregularity. He started a most thorough investigation with regard to it, the accusations were established against this man, and he took his own life, and thus escaped punishment before any tribunal. That is a matter that may happen under any government, and department or any business in the world.

You may devise as many checks as you choose, but if you get a clever man who is dishonest he will in some way and on some occasions always be liable to escape from them and commit crimes of the kind which were committed in this case. The evidence shows that every possible investigation was made of the misdeeds of this gentleman, and that every endeavour was made to save the country from the loss as far as possible at the time that they were discovered. Over $23,000 was recovered after the discovery, and the only reason why he was not further punished was that he took his own life.

Now, I would ask what further disclosures in reference to these transactions could be made by referring this matter to a commission? The evidence is overwhelming, I submit, in this report against this man and of all the officials in the Printing Bureau he was the sole one responsible. I would refrain above all things from saying a word to impugn the honour of Dr. Dawson, the former King's Printer, but every one knows that for some time before he retired he was too old to actively discharge the duties of such an important office where he had so many subordinates under him, and which required great activity to cope with the complexities of the business. He further had the misconception of the law, that the Superintendent of Stationery in the matter of purchase and the Superintendent of Printing in the matter of printing were independent of him, when not even a country lawyer could read the statute without seeing that both officials were subordinate to the King's Printer. It was an error of judgment on the part of the former King's Printer when he supposed that he was not absolutely the head of the Bureau.

The hon. member for Hastings on the basis of the evidence laid before the House by the Secretary of State, was able to prove that irregularities formerly existed in the Printing Bureau, but the Secretary of State, instead of being blamed, is in my opinion to be complimented upon the fact that he placed fully and frankly before the House all the information that came to him in the course of his investigation. It would have been easy for the Secretary of State merely to have submitted a report dealing with the defalcations of the late Superintendent of Stationery; but the hon. minister frankly laid before us every detail in connection with the many transactions dealt with, and in consequence of that frankness the hon. gentleman from Hastings and his friends are able to make their charges to-day. Any one who reads the report of the experts employed by the Secretary of State, Messrs. Hyde, O'Connor, Wilson and Ryder, must come to the conclusion that no better qualified men could have been selected for that purpose. The logical excellence of the masterly report made by Messrs. Hyde and O'Connor is apparent to every one who reads it, and any one who wants to test the improvements made in the Bureau should read that report and compare the conditions formerly existing with those which exist to-day. I understand that one of these gentlemen is a well known Conservative in politics, but whatever his politics he is undoubtedly able and competent and his recomendations and those of Mr. O'Connor are being carried out as promptly as possible. It is rather an irony of fate that the very frankness of the Secretary of State, in placing before the House the full evidence of the investigation has been made the foundation of the motion of the hon. member for Hastings that a commission shall be appointed. It seems to me that before such a course is taken it would be necessary to show, not only that irregularities existed in the Printing Bureau, but that they still exist and that the recommendations which have been made have not been carried into effect. I cannot conceive how it would be possible for anybody of men to be more competent to investigate the Bureau than are the men appointed by the Secretary of State and to whose valuable report and recommendations effect is being given. The hon. member for Hastings urged as another reason why a commission should be appointed, the fact that a large number of directories and dictionaries and law almanacs had been purchased, but the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee showed that every requisition for every one of these was in the hands of the Auditor General, and the hon. member for Hastings and his friends could have examined them and if there was any impropriety further investigation might be demanded. However, these are matters that could properly be investigated by the Public Accounts Committee, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) could have had these vouchers produced and ascertained if irregularities in connection with them existed. But when one remembers that every office in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific is supplied by the Stationery Department with these articles it is easy to understand that large purchases of them would be necessary. After all, the minister can do little else in connection with such an institution as a

Printing Bureau than to see that a competent man is appointed in charge of it, and that his subordinates are competent, and that has been done. We may remember, too, that the defalcations took place in spite of the King's Printer and of the Public Accounts Committee and of the Auditor General, who made a careful inventory of the stock, but who was deceived by the unfortunate man formerly in charge of the Stationery Department, who succeeded in deceiving so many others.

The last hon. gentleman who addressed the House punctuated his speech by saying that all of this had occurred at a time when the Secretary of State was investigating the Printing Bureau.

Undoubtedly it takes a long time for a man who is not an expert to go into a printing office and get at the root of the evils there. The Secretary of State had much else to do besides investigating that Bureau. For a considerable period after he was appointed to office the session of parliament was current, and his attendance there was required ; but as soon as that was over, he began this investigation, and the evidence in this report is that from the very first he began to accomplish those reforms which are now satisfactorily inaugurated in the Printing Bureau.

I was glad that my hon. friend referred to the return of some of the evidence in respect to which was taken before the Public Accounts Committee, because it seems to me that the Under-Secretary of State, Mr. Mulvey, was correct in his idea with regard to what should be included under the term printing. Any one who went into a large printing office, and found on inquiry that a certain amount of the printing of that office was required to be done outside of the office, and asked what that printing cost, would, I think, get the cost of the printing without the cost of the paper. Mr. Mulvey thought that what was required was the material which would enable a comparison to be made between the cost of printing in the Bureau and the cost of printing outside. Whether the printing is done in the Bureau or outside, the paper must be bought by the government. In some cases in which the printing is done outside, the paper is furnished by the government and in other cases it is not furnished by the government, and I think Mr. Mulvey was taking the trouble to make his report such as the hon. gentleman, who asked for the information, desired in order to make a comparison, when he showed the cost of the printing without the paper, and in a separate return furnished the committee with the cost of the paper and those other items which he had deducted as being not printing, advertising or lithographing.

I do not think that at this late hour any useful purpose would be served by my delaying the House in going over the various items which were dealt with by the hon. member for East Hastings, and the hon. member for West Elgin. It seems to me that every one of those matters was well answered by the exhaustive reply of the hon. the Secretary of State. My hon. friend from West Elgin did return to the Mortimer letter, and he returned to it as though he were endeavouring to fasten on the hon. the Secretary of State the responsibility of endeavouring to fix up the file in view of the contract having been given to the Toronto Lithographing Company; but the evidence is overwhelming that the Secretary of State had nothing to do with that, but that it was due to the misrepresentation and false statements made by Mr. Cook to Mr. Mortimer, and that the Secretary of State knew nothing about it until the letter was written to him by Mr. Mortimer. I think the hon. Secretary of State is to be congratulated on this fact, that the moment he found that that contract had been let to the Toronto Lithographing Company in improper circumstances and without tenders, he cancelled it, and the company did not complete it. The honest and successful endeavour of the hon. the Secretary of State is shown in every line of this report to make public everything wrong in connection with the Printing Bureau and to put in operation improvements; and instead of a Royal Commission being required to investigate further, he should have a vote of approval from this House for his strenuous efforts to reform the Printing Bureau.

The hon. member for West Elgin referred to these things as though they had originated under a Liberal administration. I agree with him that no good purpose could be served by going back to the old Senecal investigation. There is no doubt that at that time there were irregularities there, and that those irregularities led to the dismissal of prominent officials; but that investigation was not followed up as it should have been. The report of Dr. Dawson, in 1892, pointing out things that should be done, was not acted upon, and it is a great surprise to me, after going over that report, that he did not call the attention of subsequent ministers to the reforms he then recommended and to the fact that they had not been carried out. I suppose it will never be possible to conduct so large an institution as the Printing Bureau without some irregularities and some peculations; but I cannot think that all the gentlemen engaged in that department are worthy of the condemnation passed upon them by the hon. member for East Hastings and the hon. member for West Elgin.

I believe that any one who makes inquiry and endeavours to find out the condition of the Bureau at the present time will find that it is manned by an excellent class of officials, that their conduct is most praiseworthy, and that the work of the government is being well and efficiently done. I for my part will vote against this resolution, because it appears to me that it is not a legitimate subject for the appointment of a Royal Commission, and that no investigation by a Royal Commission would do any good either in disclosing irregularities which have not been disclosed by this report or in effecting a cure which has not been effected by the means which have already been adopted.

Mr. EDWARD GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I recognize the futility of endeavouring to convince the government that it is a proper thing to investigate any department of government at the present time. I am sure that hon. members of the government must be growing weary, as hon. members of the opposition are growing disgusted, at the frequency of such scenes as have been enacted in this House this afternoon and to-night. Every once in a while, with very short intervals, some evidence leaks out or is brought forward which is convincing, and unanswerable, that wrong-doing, crookedness and inefficiency exist in the various departments of the government, and some hon. member of the opposition, having investigated that evidence and satisfied himself as to the sufficiency of it, rises in his place in this House and asks the government for an investigation of a particular department; and ever since the investigation into the Department of Marine and Fisheries, such a request has been invariably met with a flat denial on the part of the government. The government does not see fit to answer the reasonable request that is made, founded on good and substantial evidence, for investigation, by any substantial reasoning or argument; but it is always the same answer, namely, that no good will come from it and there is no necessity for it. In my view, that is no substantial answer to such a request at all. Unless the government is able to convince this House that there is no wrongdoing in the particular department attacked, when evidence is produced, such as has been produced in the present instance, if the government is desirous of maintaining what it claims to be its good name before the people of this country, it seems to me to be in the interest of the government as well as of the country as a whole, that an investigation should take place. But the government invariably meets such a demand with an absolute refusal.

Notwithstanding that fact, the government invariably meets such demands with an absolute refusal, and in addition an attempt is usually made to attack the character or political reputation of the member of the opposition who has the courage to stand up in this House, and upon sufficient evidence demand an inquiry into the conduct of any one of the public departments. In common with my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) I too was very much surprised at the attitude taken by the hon. the Secretary of State, when opening his address. His speech to-day is the first effort, to my knowledge which the hon. gentleman has made in this House, and I think it will be generally admitted that he made a very bad beginning when he challenged a comparison between his own political record and that of my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). I think that the political record of my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) is in such an atmosphere that it would compare more than favourably with that of the Secretary of State himself. To say the least, it is just as honourable for my hon. friend from East Hastings to be a member of the opposition and have aspirations, as it is for the hon. the Secretary of State to occupy a seat in the cabinet and owe his appointment to political expediency or force, and not because of any political ability. If there is any difference between the two, my hon. friend from East Hastings has certainly the advantage most materially on his side.

I do not intend at this late hour to detain the House at any length; but in reading the report presented by the hon. the Secretary of State, it occurred to me that he has characterized the work of the Printing Bureau in such elegant and illuminating language, that his language ought to be collocated and put upon the public records of this House. From pages 2, 3 and 4 of his report, I take these choice expressions in which the minister has characterized the officials, and the work performed in the Printing Bureau under his control:

Incompetency of officials; dishonesty of others; complete lack of frankness; destruction of the spirit of loyalty; lax management; private business transacted during business hours; practice of coming late to work; a number of employees drink to excess; making false entries; alterations of orders after they had been signed by the minister; forgery; lack of business methods; contracts let without competitive prices; no written records of transactions; details of transactions only obtainable from correspondence and verbal statements and these statements frequently conflicting; deceiving the Auditor General; deceiving the King's Printer; deceiving the Bureau accountant, deceiving the Secretary of State; engaged in dishonest buying; false swearing in investigations; perjury; explana-

tions could not be relied on; buying from three firms, two of whom had no existence in fact; dishonest relations with American firms; dishonest buying; collusion between buyer and seller; intermediary planned and attempted frauds on the government; conspiracy to defraud the government; loss, $94,168.36.

That is the language in which the hon. minister himself has characterized what he found to exist in the department as a result of an investigation extending over a period of about two years or a little more. What language would be required to describe the findings of a Royal Commission? It is a little singular that in the report of this investigation which, according to the answer given by the hon. the Secretary of State to my question this afternoon, extended from November, 1908, until June, 1910, not a single date is given as to when these irregularities, and that crookedness, and the incompetency of the officials began. A very pertinent question was put to the minister this afternoon by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). He asked whether in the investigation, any of this crooked work, incompetency and graft was shown to have existed prior to the hon. the Secretary of State assuming charge of this particular department, and the only answer that could be obtained was that the system which the minister found in force when he took charge had been in force for a period of about a year and a half previous. But you will see that that practically was no answer to the question at all. I am informed that in the whole investigation, not one single item that could be characterized as a dishonest or improper transaction was discovered during the time when the hon. Senator Scott was minister of the department or the late Mr. Dawson was King's Printer. If I am not correct in that statement, it will be very easy for the hon. minister, who has all the evidence, facts and figures in his possession to point out any one instance of dishonesty or improper conduct during the incumbency of those two gentlemen. If he does not do so, the conclusion to be reached is simply this, that all he has found in the way of crookedness, improper dealings and dishonesty in his department have existed only since he himself took office.

It is also somewhat singular that the hon. minister should have endeavoured, but in a very clumsy way, to shift the responsibility for the conditions of affairs that exist in this department. In the third clause of his report, he tries to lead to the conclusion that such conditions was only a continuation of the bad system inaugurated by the Conservative government, and he makes reference to an investigation into the Printing Bureau in the year 1891. He was attaching all the blame to the Conservative government which was in power from 1891 down to 1896. Well, Sir, I can only say in answer to that, that the minister has not taken an occasion to refer to one single tittle of evidence to show that there was any such condition of things existing in the department from 1891 down to 1896. And even if he had, even if he had shown that the Conservative government during that time was lax or was guilty of any wrong-doing in not further investigating that department, he would only have shown that this government is three times as guilty, because, whereas the Conservative government had only five years after that date, this government has had three times as long. The government on every occasion when evidence is brought forward to show dishonesty, crookedness, graft, incompetency in any department of government simply declare, as on this occasion and many others, that their policy is that the lid must be kept tight down and that no investigation is to be allowed. This may satisfy hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House, but I venture to say it will not satisfy the people of this country. The last speaker (Mr. Congdon) seemed well pleased that the Secretary of State has conducted an investigation into the affairs of the Printing Bureau. He thinks that that is all that is necessary. But does it not occur to the hon. gentleman that this so-called investigation is simply an ex parte one, one where the desire would not be, I venture to say, to make conditions as bad as the evidence could possibly make them, but to make known only what it was impossible for them to keep back. And, if a Royal Commission were granted on this matter and this matter gone into thoroughly, the minister of this department could have knowledge of the conditions upon which he could reorganize the affairs of the department so that they could be administered in the interest of the country as a whole. I think this is only one more illustration of the desire of the government to avoid investigation to prevent the country from gaining information to which the people are entitled as to how their affairs are conducted by the men who have those affairs in charge.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, you have no doubt observed that the discussion so far in regard to this matter has been carried on by lawyers. And, while I do not hope to present any remarks I shall make with the ability which has characterized these gentlemen I nevertheless wish to say a few words before the motion is put. I have always had an impression up to a couple of years ago, that the fact of a man occupying a position as a cabinet minister was an indication of superior ability and breadth of mind. I say I held that view until I came to this parliament. But I have had that view shattered since I came, and I regret to say

that the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) in his opening remarks in answer to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) in the very evident animus he showed against one person who was dismissed from the department has not left on my mind an impression at all complimentary to himself. However, that is of very little consequence. The hon. member for East Hastings, in presenting his case, said there was ample evidence in the inquiry made by the hon. Secretary of State of incompetency, lack of frankness, lack of loyalty on the part of employees, of moneylending on the part of employees, of laziness and insubordination, of drunkenness, of defective bookkeeping, of dishonesty, of perjury, and in fact of all the crimes in the calendar excepting murder.

The Prime Minister said that if the hon. gentleman from East Hastings could prove that this incompetence, and lack of frankness and other evils existed in the Printing Bureau there was no need for further investigation. We have frequent instances of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the government desiring to run away from anything in the shape of an investigation. I remember that, not very long ago, when the Minister of Public Works was put through a political Turkish bath by one of the members on this side, the Prime Minister said he was 'prouder of Pugsley than ever.' So, we have had on the part of the government frequent instances of their desire to prevent everything in the way of investigation. The Secretary of State says that his investigation has been a thorough one and there is no need of anything further. But he also said that he started this investigation in November, 1908, that he has been carrying it on ever since and he now differs from his leader who says that if these things are true there is no need for further investigation. The Secretary of State says he is not through but must carry it on further. It will have appeared to you, Mr. Speaker, as to other hon. members that, notwithstanding the investigation began in 1908 there was nothing material came to light until after Goldthrite disappeared; before that the investigation does not seem to have resulted in very much.

Now, I wish to refer to the manner in which this investigation was carried on. Suppose a man was on trial for some crime which he was supposed to have committed and witnesses were brought forward and examined privately, not under oath, the man on trial was not given any opportunity to cross examine these witnesses, but after a time the person hearing the evidence says: The man is guilty of dishonesty. What would any person think of that sort of a course? It would not be tolerated in any civilized country, yet that is precisely what has been done by the Secretary of State.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. MURPHY. If the hon. gentleman will read the evidence he will find the proof that that was not the way in which it was done. He will find witnesses cross-examining each other showing that they were in the room when the examination in chief was being conducted.

Mr. EDWARDS. Were any witnesses examined under oath?

Mr. MURPHY. No, no one was examined under oath.

Mr. EDWARDS. No one was examined under oath. Since the Secretary of State has referred particularly to Cook, was Cook allowed to cross-examine the witnesses brought forward in reference to charges made against him?

Mr. MURPHY. He had that opportunity, he was in the room, and could have examined the witnesses, and my hon. friend must have heard me this afternoon read from the report an observation made by Cook to the King's Printer.

Mr. EDWARDS. My information is that Cook did not have an opportunity of cross-examining the various witnesses, that nearly all the evidence was taken by one person at a time being brought in before the minister, and being examined, and that the person interested in the matter did not have a fair opportunity of questioning the various witnesses brought forward. Not only that, but in a matter affecting not merely their position, but their character, the parties interested should have the right to have counsel there, men competent to cross-examine witnesses, if the minister was desirous of giving the person accused of wrong-doing a full opportunity to justify himself, or to give him what is generally called a fair deal in the matter. That was not done. Nor do I think that the evidence brought out justifies the course which has been taken in regard to some persons dismissed. I wish to refer to the position of this man, R. E. Cook, who was referred to at length by the Secretary of State. The hon. minister referred to the book 'Farm Weeds' which was got out some years ago. Mr. Gliddon, I believe the accountant of the department, went to Toronto, and finally the work was given to the Toronto Lithographing Company. Shortly after the Secretary of State took office, a requisition was made for a new and enlarged edition of this work 'Farm Weeds' and Mr. McMahon, acting King's Printer at the time, wanted to ask for tenders. On that occasion I am told that Mr. Cook suggested that since the Toronto Lithographing Company had the plates for the illustrations they would have a decided advantage in the matter, and a better bargain could be obtained privately. That suggestion made to the Secretary of State was acted upon

and Cook, I believe, was sent to get prices from the Toronto Lithographing Company to which the work was finally given.

I now come to that little pamphlet 'Farm Grasses.' The former book, 'Farm Weeds' had received a good deal of favourable comment all over the country, and I understand that the Minister of Agriculture made no secret of his very great pleasure and satisfaction with the way that book was received. When this further work was to be got out the King's Printer told Cook that as the Minister of Agriculture was so well pleased with the Farm Weeds book this order would have to be given to the Toronto Lithographic Company, but he was instructed to ask the Copp Clark Company for prices as a protection. Cook got prices on the book 'Farm Grasses' from the Toronto Lithographing Company, and the prices he obtained were $1,100 lower than the prices for the similar work at a previous time. No mention was made of the fact by the Secretary of State in referring to Cook's connection with the matter to-day. Cook left a copy of the work to be done, and got such a favourable price from the Toronto Lithographing Company that he was told by the King's Printer that the work must be given to the Toronto Lithographing Company, and he told the Toronto Lithographing Company to go ahead and order their paper.

Mr. MURPHY. Has the hon. member been informed where the Toronto Lithographing Company got their paper for it? He is repeating statements made by Cook.

Mr. EDWARDS. From the old country.

Mr. MURPHY. It was in that fiction that Cook, if I may use the term, bluffed the Copp Clark Company from putting in a price by representing to them that the paper was to come from the old country. He said the paper had to come from the old country, when as a matter of fact the Toronto Lithographing Company got the paper from St. Catharines.

Mr. EDWARDS. These differences in statement between the Secretary of State, and the person who is very deeply interested in this matter go to show the need for a thorough investigation into this matter.

Mr. MURPHY. It has been investigated.

Mr. EDWARDS. It should be investigated in a way it has not been so far. It is only British fairplay to give Cook's statement in regard to this matter; he has been characterized here to-day as being dishonest, not only incompetent, but a dishonest man. He has had no opportunity to defend himself. He had no opportunity to defend himself in the inquiry carried on by the Secretary of State. He is a man whom I have not met half a dozen times in my life. He was in the Printing Bureau for 23 years. He rose from the bottom to a position where he commanded a good salary, a salary high enough to excite the cupidity of certain favourites of the Secretary of State, and if he had not drawn such a good salary possibly he would be in the Printing Bureau yet, and I contend he has not had an opportunity to give his side of the case. As a matter of fairplay I propose to give his statement, and if the Secretary of State is not satisfied, he as Secretary of State can make his statement, but in fairplay to the man to whom he has referred, and whom he has deprived of his office and has to-day endeavoured to deprive of his character, it is up to him to vote for, and allow this resolution to go through, granting a thorough investigation which will show the position which Cook occupied in the department, and if he was as dishonest as the Secretary of State says, something further should be done. Charges have been made here against Mr. Mulvey. I dare say a thorough investigation into his conduct would not be amiss.

In regard to that pamphlet, 'Farm Grasses,' Mr. Cook says that the King's Printer, when he came back and stated the price which he had obtained from the Toronto Lithographing Company, told him that he had done well. It was about a week later that Mr. Cook met the hon. Secretary of State and told him what had taken place. The Secretary of State appeared to be very angry about that, said that he should take prices from other firms and told the King's Printer to get prices from different American firms. The King's Printer informed him that he did not know what American firms to apply to. That did not satisfy the Secretary of State, he must have prices from these other firms, the King's Printer secured the necessary funds for travelling expenses for Mr. Cook, and Mr. Cook was sent on this journey to get prices. Mr. Cook visits Toronto, Buffalo, and New York, consults the large firms which are engaged in this work, obtains prices from these firms, comes back and reports to the King's Printer. The prices given by these firms were in every case very much higher than the price he had obtained from the Toronto Lithographing Company. The Secretary of State at that stage of the game insisted on letters of submission to these firms asking for tenders. The King's Printer told him that there were no letters of submission. When Mr. Cook went on his journey to see these firms he did not know the names of the firms to which he was going, he had to hunt them up and consequently this submission was a verbal one and there were no letters of submission on file. That

made no difference to the Secretary of State who insisted that he must have letters of submission. The King's Printer then decided that formal letters of submission would be sent to each firm with a covering letter explaining that the inclosed letter was purely formal, and merely intended to place on file in the department.

Mr. MURPHY. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman while addressing the House, but the information given him is so far from the fact that I dislike allowing him to proceed when he has been informed in error. I was not insisting that a letter be written, but that I should be given in writing the verbal request that was made to each of the alleged tenderers in order that I might ascertain what were the conditions of submission to each.

Mr. EDWARDS. Did not the Secretary of State receive from the King's Printer a letter stating that letters of submission had not been sent to these firms.

Mr. MURPHY. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think that possibly is another thing that might very well be investigated. I think that if he looks over his file he may find such a letter stating that no letters of submission were in existence when Mr. Cook was sent away, that he submitted the matter verbally to these men and that consequently such letters could not be produced. However, the demand was made then, as alleged by Mr. Cook, that these letters of submission be placed on file. These letters, if the statement of Mr. Cook is correct, had to be handed in. When Mr. Cook got the prices he had no letter of submission and consequently he was not able to obtain letters of submission. If his statement is correct in that regard then it means that these letters had to be ante-dated, and the Secretary of State was actually forcing Mr. Cook to ante-date the letters. The Secretary of State asks what we would think of a man who would ante-date letters? I might answer that question by asking what would we think of a Secretary of State who would force a man into that position. We see this man sent to get these prices, and he was ordered by the King's Printer to obtain these letters. Mr. Cook says that he is ready to swear that he only carried out the instruction of the King's Printer given to him before his departure, and the fact that he was supplied with the necessary funds for travelling expenses by the King's Printer lends colour to his statement. I say that when we find this great discrepancy between the statement of the Secretary of State and the statement of Mr. Cook it furnishes us with another reason why we should have an investigation, which would be an impartial investigation, where witnesses would be examined under oath in order to give every man a fair show. Just a short time before Mr. Cook was dismissed—about an hour before—he states that he was ordered to send $5,000 to the Montreal 'Herald' by this man Mulvey, who is the Under Secretary of State. When he was told by Mulvey to send this $5,000 to the Montreal 'Herald,' he replied that he could not do so because he had no voucher or account from the Montreal 'Herald,' and that he had nothing to protect himself. Mulvey insisted that he send the money. Mr. Cook says that he told Mulvey that he would wire to the Montreal 'Herald' asking that they forward their accounts before the money would be sent. Within an hour of that this man was suspended for three months and at the end of three months he found a letter of two or three lines in his letter box when he came back telling him that he was dismissed without one reason having been given him.

It struck me this afternoon that it is a very serious matter for any member of this House, and especially for a man who is a cabinet minister, to rise in his place and charge a man, who has been in the public service for 23 years, and who has risen by sheer ability from the bottom on towards the top of the ladder in the department, with incompetency and dishonesty after having deprived him of his position. That is a very serious matter indeed. Well may we say:

> Who steals my purse steals trash, but he that filches from me my good name robs me of that which not enriches him, and leaves me poor indeed.

In this case the Secretary of State robs this man—deprives him of his position which he has held for so many years, and this afternoon he arose in this House and in so far as he could do so deprived him of his character.

It is very interesting to look over some of the items in connection with this overstocking at the Printing Bureau to see where these supplies actually came from. I have been told on what I believe to be good authority that some men who profited by the over-stocking of the Printing Bureau, by the ordering of supplies, figured very largely in the last election on behalf of the Secretary of State, that they were travelling around in their automobiles doing their best to elect him, and that they figure to a large extent in the sales of typewriter ribbon, carbon paper and supplies of that kind, the result being that the Bureau has three or four years' supply on hand. That is a matter which possibly the Secretary of State would not delve into very deeply in his little investigation, but which a Royal Commission would go into, perhaps

to the discomfort of the Secretary of State. We could well understand why the Secretary of State would not care about an investigation which would be an investigation. When the Secretary of State was examining one of the men he laid down the rule that if a man came to the department the worse of liquor he was to be suspended for a week, and that for the second offence he was to be dismissed, and nobody will find fault with that, but at page 251 of the report we find him make this statement to a witness.

Although the penalty is not to be enforced in the case of men who do not drink, I want to ask you to inform the members of your staff that the regulations for the future is that if any man comes to the Bureau under the influence of liquor he will be suspended for a week without pay for the first offence, and will be dismissed for the second.

Mr. MURPHY. May I give an explanation of that? The witness under examination then is one of the chief officials in the Bureau, but he is unfortunately deaf, and when I was explaining to him the rule regarding intemperance I was first amused and them somewhat discomfited to find that he interpreted it to mean that it applied to all his staff even though they did not drink, and I was repeating what he had wrongly thought to be my instructions to him, and it is the repetition of the remarks of the official by me, that is reported at page 251.

Mr. EDWARDS. I read not the words of the man who was hard of hearing, but the words of the Secretary of State, and it struck me as amusing coming from a lawyer who was acting in a judicial capacity, that he had laid down the rule that the penalty for drunkenness was not to be enforced against men who did not drink. I thought that if that was an indication of the ability of the Secretary of State to act as judge in an investigation, we had better have a more competent tribunal. The Mortimer letter was touched on very much to the discomfort of the Secretary of State by the member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers), but I may inform the House that Mr. Cook alleges that Mortimer told him that letter was written at the dictation of the Secretary of State himself. I would not be at all surprised at Mortimer, whatever one may think of the Secretary of State in that matter, because a man who would take the position that Mortimer does here would be ready to do almost anything that some person in a higher position might ask him to do. There is no doubt, judging from the evidence, that there has been gross incompetency in the Bureau, and that the law has been violated openly in regard to the printing of the voters' lists. The King's Printer is supposed to keep in type a complete copy of the last list used, but notwithstanding that forty-one lists in Ontario, fourteen in Quebec, three in Nova Scotia, one in New Brunswick and six in British Columbia have been disposed of in violation of that Act, the department itself thus breaking the law. It has been stated here and not contradicted by the Secretary of State that everything has been bought without tender except paper and envelopes, and that the stuff bought without tender is more than twice what is bought by tender. Surely if the Secretary of State knew anything about the business at all, he would know that supplies like carbon paper and rubber bands deteriorate very rapidly, and that the stock on hand should be not more than sufficient to meet current requirements, and when he found the supplies piling up year after year and month after month, it seems to me that the minister himself was incompetent in not looking after that matter sooner than he did. The Secretary of State threatened to-night to refer a matter to the Justice Department, but I do not think there is any danger of his doing anything of the kind. It was currently reported some time ago that there was a difference of opinion between the Secretary of State, and the head of the Civil Service Commission in regard to the appointment of officials, and at the request of the Secretary of State the matter was referred to the Minister of Justice, and my information is that the Minister of Justice being absent at the time the Secretary of State himself was acting Minister of Justice, so that in suggesting that the matter be referred to the Minister of Justice for settlement he was suggesting actually that it be referred to himself. I doubt very much if he carries out his threat to refer this matter to the Justice Department, because it appears to me that the government is not inclined to investigate the matter thoroughly although we have ample evidence that the Printing Bureau requires thorough investigation. I do not wish to cast any reflection on the Secretary of State, but I do not attach any importance at all to such an inquiry as he has made. An inquiry without the witnesses being under oath is not a fair inquiry. When men who have held official positions for many years and whose reputations are at stake, are called to give evidence I do not think the minister is justified in speaking as he did to-night. It could not be expected that in an inquiry conducted by the head of an important department all the facts would be obtained as they would be by an impartial tribunal. Many persons coming forward to give evidence, knowing that they were in his hands, would not speak as freely as they would before a Royal Commission. But sufficient has been elicited by this inquiry to show that there is incompetency and that there is need for a more searching inquiry.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I would not have taken any of the time of the House were it not for one statement made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) which I think ought not to be allowed to go unchallenged; that is, his statement that Mr. Cook, about an hour before his dismissal, had been asked to send $5,000 to the Montreal 'Herald.' While the hon. gentleman has not stated that he was dismissed for not sending the money, that is the only inference that can be drawn from his statement. The hon. member states that he is not a lawyer, but he has certainly made a very strong plea for a royal commission to clear up the character of this one man Cook. The gravamen of his plea is that Mr. Cook would have an opportunity to be examined under oath and to state the facts as he knows them. Perhaps the hon. member is not aware that Mr. Cook had that opportunity on the 20th of January, 1911, when he was examined by the hon. member for East Hastings and other members of this House before the Public Accounts Committee. He had there every opportunity to tell his whole story. If he had any cause of complaint against the Secretary of State, he had a chance then to say so. If there was anything he required to explain in reference to the report made by the Secretary of State, he had then the opportunity to do so under oath. I cannot see what object would be gained by giving this man Cook any further opportunity to make statements under oath, because he had all these opportunities and he took precious good care not to avail himself of any of them, but confined himself to giving evidence on two points: first, on the manner in which the report was compiled, showing the cost of the printing and paper, saying that the report contained only the cost of the printing and not the cost of the paper; and, secondly, as to the manner in which contracts were let in the department. Now, my hon. friend from Frontenac evidently has talked this matter over with Mr. Cook and comes here with a special brief to protect Mr. Cook. Well, if my hon. friend wanted an investigation in order to have this done, I would not find so much fault; but when an hon. member wants a royal commission in order to protect a man who is guilty of the letter and the conduct which has been narrated here by the Secretary of State, it seems to me that he ought to be handed over to the civil authorities for prosecution rather than be given a chance to clear himself before a royal commission.

Mr. EDWARDS. Why don't you do it?

Mr. CARVELL. It is not my business to do it. I think Mr. Cook and his friends ought to be well satisfied that he is allowed to go scot free without being dragged before a royal commission. If my hon. friend from Frontenac knew as much about the law as he does about other things, he would know that the result of an inquiry by a royal commission might be that his friend Cook would find himself before the civil authorities or perhaps the criminal authorities to answer for his conduct. In order to give the history of this man's action regarding the Montreal 'Herald,' I want to quote a letter which was sent by the superintendent of immigration to the King's Printer, as follows:

6th July, 1910.

Sir,—With regard to the application of the Herald Printing Company for a further advance on account of the Atlas being printed for this department, I beg to say that the following is a statement of what was ordered and what has been shipped, with the values of shipments in each case:—

	Ordered.	Shipped.	
French	60,000	60,000	$5,400
Flemish	50,000	52,000	2,860
Finnish	5,000	5,700	313
Dutch	10,000	10,000	550
German	75,000	15,000	825
Swedish	15,000	5,000	275
Norwegian	15,000	5,000	275

The total value would be $10,498 and after deducting the advance of $5,000, which has already been made, leaves a balance of $5,498. I would recommend that they be given a further advance of $5,000.

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. D. SCOTT,
Superintendent of Immigration.

C. H. Parmelee,
King's Printer,
Ottawa.

You will bear in mind that just previous to the date of this letter the 'Herald' building in Montreal had collapsed, and they had written to the Department of Immigration asking for their money. That was followed by a telegram from the 'Herald' to the Secretary of State, as follows:

Montreal, July 8.

Hon. Chas. Murphy,
Ottawa, Ont.

If you could authorize King's Printer to pay amount due us for printing atlas, it would accommodate us greatly.

J. S. BRIERLEY.

The next day the following telegram was sent by the Secretary of State to Mr. Brierley:

July 9, 1910.

J. S. Brierley,
The Herald,
Montreal.

Will ask King's Printer to expedite payment as requested. Pleased to assist in any way.

CHAS. MURPHY.

On the same day, I am informed by the Secretary of State, this telegram was taken down to the King's Printer by Mr. Mulvey.

While Mr. Cook may tell his friends that he was dismissed because he would not send $5,000 to the Herald Publishing Company, we have the evidence to show that he was saying what was not true.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Cook did not tell me why he was dismissed because he was not told himself.

Mr. CARVELL. Then my hon. friend admits that he was in conversation with Mr. Cook.

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly. I make no secret of that.

Mr. CARVELL. And he admits that he wants an investigation before a Royal Commission in order to have this man reinstated?

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not say anything of the kind. It is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman cannot speak without misrepresenting.

Mr. CARVELL. I said I did not believe that Mr. Cook had ever been asked to send this money, and I say so still because instead of sending $5,000 or any amount of money, the Herald Publishing Company was asked to send an account, and on the 13th of July they sent an account. That account is headed the Herald Company, Limited, Montreal, July 13, 1910, and they give an itemized account of all the printing they had done for the Interior Department, and the total was $10,212.75. That was on the 13th July, 1910. It was sent to Ottawa, and on the 14th July, the day following, two cheques were sent, one for $5,000 and the other for $5,212.75, issued by the King's Printer in favour of the Herald Publishing Company.

With that evidence before the House I do not see that there is any necessity for appointing a Royal Commission in order to clear the character of Mr. Cook. In my opinion he has had all the opportunity any one could require to give his evidence before the Public Accounts Committee. He did not choose to give his evidence or his friends did not give him a chance to do so, and I again say that I can see no reason why a Royal Commission should be appointed to go into this matter again.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Were I so easily satisfied as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Carvell), it would be unpardonable for me to take up time at this hour in the morning. But I would like to take a few minutes in showing some reasons why a Royal Commission should be issued notwithstanding the attitude taken by my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell). But before doing so I would like to remind hon. members that since this House last voted to refuse a commission of inquiry into the departments then remaining uninvestigated, we have had in three of these departments, startling and most ample evidence of the necessity that then existed for such an inquiry. We have had the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Customs combined—not at that time under suspicion, but since brought into the lime light by the proceedings at Vancouver, indicating operations on the part of officers of various ranks in those departments, combined with the patronage committee at Vancouver, which caused losses to the revenue of this country that may reach to $1,000,000. The ministers and their supporters in this House, however, were quite satisfied that there was nothing to investigate with respect to the Department of Customs and the Department of Trade and Commerce. But they have now $1,000,000 loss to the revenue to show how foolish they were in their self-satisfaction. Then we have had the operations at the government yards in Sorel, and I am not referring simply to the matter which has been under investigation before a committee of this House and which is shortly to be discussed. I am referring in addition to further evidence that this department at Sorel is a sink hole of iniquity, that it is being exploited in all directions and in every manner in which a department of that kind can be exploited for the benefit of friends of the government. Evidence has been offered and rejected because of the limited scope of the inquiry incidental to which this evidence came out. That is another department as to which these hon. gentlemen were quite sure there was no necessity for any investigation.

Now we have this Department of Printing. Hon. gentlemen opposite were equally confident that there was nothing which could be profitably investigated in that department. But the evidence in this blue-book shows that their misplaced confidence caused this country a direct loss in the neighbourhood of $100,000, as to which the minister has now the most conclusive evidence.

Without attempting to detract from the credit due the hon. the Secretary of State, for the courage with which he undertook this investigation so soon after he assumed the responsibility of the department—a courage which brought out this volume of startling testimony—I wish to ask him whether he is now prepared to blight the reputation he got for that display of courage by appearing before the country—as he will if he persists in refusing this commission—as simply a quitter, as a man who entered upon a noble task but abandoned it on the first appearance of danger to his associates. The danger is not to

himself since he was not there at the begining of these affairs, and it was perhaps impossible for him, as they had gained such strength, to check them sooner than he did. But now he comes before this House, with this volume opening up so many avenues of inquiry, and tells us by implication that he dare not, that the government of which he is a member, dare not, that its supporters in this House dare not take the responsibility of following up the inquiry and disclosing the whole ghastly story to the country.

Without attempting to limit the possible scope of an investigation by a commission such as we ask for, I might mention a few of the subjects disclosed in this volume of evidence. In the first place we have the plain statement made by the Secretary of State himself that one of the officials in the Printing Bureau systematically forged orders for supplies to that department—forgeries which cost this country a large sum of money. Now, forgery is an offence punishable under the Criminal Code. The minister must have had conclusive evidence of that offence or he would not have taken the responsibility of branding a former employee of the government in the way he has in this book; and yet after having branded him before the country as a forger, he is content to let the matter rest and let him go unpunished. We ought to have a Royal Commission to find out why this man, guilty of forgery, is, with many other persons in the employ of the government or dependent on the government for favours, protected against the consequences of his crime.

Mr. MURPHY. To which employee does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). To this much discussed Cook. He was the man who committed the forgery, was he not?

Mr. MURPHY. I thought the hon. gentleman was referring to another man who had forged requisitions, and I was going to explain that no large amount of money had been lost.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am not sure that Cook is the man indicated by the remarks of the Secretary of State himself, which are contained in the preliminary portion of this book.

Mr. MURPHY. He is not.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I was under the impression that he was the person referred to. However, there is something to be discovered there which should be brought out by a commission or otherwise.

Then there is another statement by the minister. He said that there was an intermediary between Gouldthrite—the one man who has been punished because he punished himself—and a New York firm, which was grossly defrauding this government. The name of the intermediary has not been given. I think this is a fit subject for an investigation by a Royal Commission, and that this Royal Commission should find out who is the intermediary and why he is protected and is not now serving the sentence provided for by the law of this country for the work in which he was engaged in defrauding this government.

Then, we had the promise by the ministers to which the hon. member has referred already, of a Bill to amend the Printing and Stationery Act so as to make it impossible for these abuses to continue. We were promised on the 8th of November last that that Act would be immediately submitted to council, that it might be placed before this House at an early date. Now, we have passed the natural limit for the presentation to parliament of the last of the government's business for this session, and we have not that Bill before us so far as I know. If it is before the House it must have been presented within the last few days during which time I have not been present. I submit that we are entitled to hear from some of these gentlemen why that Bill has not been presented; who in the council has blocked it,—because I presume that the minister presented it according to his promise—why it has been blocked, and who is to be protected by the keeping back of this Bill.

Then, we have a very significant inquiry by the minister in one of the exhibits in this book as to the dealings with Business Systems, Ltd. No result appears to have come from that inquiry. I take it for granted that, without some very convincing reason of wrong-doing in connection with the orders given to that firm they would not be branded in the significant way in which they are branded in this letter written by the minister. I would like to hear before a Royal Commission what Business Systems, Ltd., have been doing in connection with the government to deserve the reputation given to them in this blue-book.

Next, we have a reference to a very material shortage in the government supplies. The minister, seemingly, has found himself unequal to the task of discovering what has caused that shortage, in other words who secured possession of these supplies. If the minister cannot find out that I would like to have that point investigated by a Royal Commission. It seems to me a most ordinary work of police duty, a duty for which the Dominion police or the police of any city should be quite competent. There has been a robbery of a large quantity of sup-

plies—so large as to attract attention even in an institution so loosely administered as the Printing Bureau within the last eight years—and it should not be beyond the power of the police to get some clue as to the locality of those goods.

Next, we have a reference to what is called 'loading'—that is overcharging for printing orders, overcharging to such an extent that the Printing Bureau now has a credit for manipulation, dishonest manipulation as this book shows, amounting to some $300,000. The effect of that loading—a very polite term—has been that department after department comes to this House asking for an appropriation for printing considerably in excess of the amount required. All these twelve ministers have read the statement in this book that they are paying more for printing than the printing costs the Bureau; they have read of the improper use being made of the money which is illegally obtained by them from parliament; and yet they sit silently in this House without a shadow of a sign of any desire on their part to know how this has been brought about, and why, it having been brought about, a remedy has not been sought in the way of a reduction by which their departments might save the money expended in this 'loading' process. I would like to find out through a Royal Commission who benefits by this 'loading'—to what extent the friends of the government have benefited, of whom the department has been making the most extraordinary purchases out of the savings provided by this form of fraud on the people.

Then, there is an exhibition made in this blue-book of extraordinary incapacity throughout all the departments, incapacity causing the addition of 50 per cent to the cost of printing the great majority of the reports, incapacity or worse so great that even in connection with the budget speech—which one would think could be safely printed as delivered—it causes great unnecessary expense. While it took 425 hours to put into type the original budget speech, 312 hours were spent in making changes. That is only a sample of what is going on through all these departments, something that would not be tolerated in any business institution in the world. Some sort of excuse might have been imagined for such a state of things in the days before the typewriter came into vogue. With the fatigue of pen writing and the illegibility of copy prepared in that way, you were always confronted with the difficulty of properly editing manuscripts before they were placed in the printer's hands. But with the typewriter universal, it is as easy to make the changes and edit the copy in typewritten form as in the proof of the type in the Bureau. And yet, in the face of that, through all these years we find this sinful waste going on in every department, and the ministers and their followers sit back and with one accord say there is no subject for investigation in such a state of affairs.

Then, at page 100, one of the expert investigators refers in general terms, and without attempt to supply details, to the condition of affairs at the Bureau as 'simply appalling.' The minister meets that condition by dispensing with the services of twelve unfortunates out of the hundreds of employees he has at the Bureau. I submit that further investigation is required to ascertain which part of this condition so 'appalling' has been dealt with by dismissing eleven inebriates and one untruthful man as we are told in this report; and which part yet remains to be dealt with.

Then, we come to the statement of large quantities of goods abstracted from the warehouses outside the Printing Bureau before the Printing Bureau was used as a storehouse for supplies of paper, large quantities of goods, amounting to thousands and thousands of dollars. There is not the least suggestion of police investigation or any other investigation to find out who profited by the removal of these goods. There is only one inference to be drawn from that. It is impossible for these goods to disappear surreptitiously in the sense that a sneak thief would take two chickens from a shed at night. These goods must have been taken by the dray load. There must be some men connected with the government service who know when the drays arrived, who filled them, where the drays were delivered, and the beneficiaries by these removals. Here is another subject for investigation by this commission, yet these gentlemen see nothing to investigate. We have a statement of an extraordinary and sudden change in the departments generally in the typewriters they use, a change so sudden, that it left the Printing Bureau with thousands of dollars worth of typewriter supplies, ribbons particularly, which have now become obsolete, because the government have ceased to use these particular typewriters. I do not think there is a member in this House who believes that there was any legitimate reason for suddenly dispensing with all the typewriters of the make for which this Bureau had laid in this enormous mass of supplies and thus to make those supplies entirely useless. There is a subject for investigation right in that; what influence was at work to secure this extraordinary displacement of one typewriter and the installation of another? What friend of the government benefited by it? What contractor? Was there a contract? Were tenders called for? Why did the transaction occur? There are many subjects there for inquiry by a commission. Then we have a

statement that at the time of this investigation a large number of accounts for lithographing were examined by the expert called in by the minister, and this expert declares he made a deduction from nearly every account. The deduction seems to have been accepted by the parties rendering the accounts without protest, a fact which indicates that the accounts in the first place were fraudulent and were part of a system to defraud the government by the padding of accounts. These were not one or two accounts, but this expert says that the extortion prevailed in nearly every account submitted to him. Here we have a subject for investigation, that the names of the firms responsible for putting these dishonest accounts before the lithographing department of the Printing Bureau should be pilloried just as the names of others are pilloried in this Blue-book. There is a subject for investigation by a Royal Commission.

Then we come to a reference to political pull producing disorder in the Printing Bureau. We have specific references on page 185 and page 237, in one case with the name of the person exercising it. It is the merest passing reference to political pull. It seems to me extraordinary that the inquiry into this branch of the subject stopped there, that further light was not thrown on the nature, results and beneficiaries of the pull at the Bureau. That in itself would occupy a Royal Commission for quite a time, and is a subject which could more properly be investigated by a Royal Commission than by any other body, and which certainly cannot be satisfactorily investigated by any minister.

Then we have the most serious statement made by the minister himself, referred to in several paragraphs, starting at page 233. This is information which must have come from reliable sources, or the minister would not take the responsibility of stating it. It is said that machinists in the employ of firms in Ottawa, paid by this government for attendance on machinery at the Printing Bureau, are deliberately damaging the government's machinery so that they may be called in again to effect further repairs. That statement was made in the most deliberate way by the minister himself. I take it for granted that he had authority for that statement, or he would not place these firms under this terrible ban from which they must suffer through this unsupported statement.

I think it is due to every firm of machinists having dealings with the government that we should hear more as to this transaction, that we should find out through a royal commission or otherwise, precisely what machinists are under suspicion by the government, what wilful damage to government property has been brought about.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster).

Although this amuses the Minister of Inland Revenue who has roused from his lethargy to take an interest in the proceedings, I want to tell him that in the eyes of the people of the country it is no matter for amusement, that if this occurred in reference to his own printing office in Victoria, if, after calling in a machinist to make repairs to a press he found the machinist loosening a bolt, or removing a part causing injury to the machine, and perhaps stopping the issue of his paper, he would not regard it as a joke, or any laughing matter. Why should a minister of the Crown regard as a joke in connection with the Printing Bureau, something which would be a police court offence if practiced upon his private plant?

Lastly, I wish to refer to this man Cook, whose crimes have been so vividly depicted by the Secretary of State to-night. I want to ask the Secretary of State and his colleagues whether he and they supposed that Cook performed all these villainies simply because of original sin, whether it ever occurred to them that there must be some motive if Cook is the man the minister portrays, that there must have been something behind his actions. In other words that there must have been something in it for Cook. That is the impression conveyed to myself, and I think that is the impression that will be given to any unbiassed reader of that book, that the man who went through all these extraordinary operations, placed orders here, there, and the other place, where in ordinary course they would not have gone, was animated in his placing of these orders by some thing more than mere friendship, and when he went to the extent of risking his position by making false statements to the government, by forging documents to present to the government, by writing letters months after the dates they bore, and handing them in to the minister, it appears to me that he did not take all these risks simply for the sake of fooling the minister; it seems to me that the minister has said too much about Cook unless he proceeds to investigate who were the beneficiaries of the Cook transactions, and what benefit Cook got out of these transactions.

The hon. member for Carleton opened up a new field for speculation. It seems to me that he said too much about the Montreal 'Herald' or too little. The Montreal 'Herald' is at any time a legitimate subject for inquiry in this House. The extraordinary amount of money received by that institution every year, and the suggestions as to the proprietorship, and the secrecy observed as to who are the beneficiaries of this extraordinary bounty on the part of the government, all call for inquiry. I would like to know whether the Montreal 'Herald'

really engages in the class of work covered by the specification read by the hon. member for Carleton to-night. Perhaps the Montreal 'Herald' does; I do not know whether it does or not. I was under the impression that it did not go in for printing in all these foreign tongues, and the production of lithographic maps on the elaborate scale called for by the atlas of Canada. It also occurred to me, as I am familiar with the trade, that it is an extraordinary position for a printer to be put in to say to one of his customers immediately after the total collapse of his building—and for the fact that it is mentioned here I am indebted again to the hon. member for Carleton—Here, I have a very large order on hand for you, you have made me a payment on account, now my building has totally collapsed and is a wreck, you pay me the rest of the money that is coming to me. If the hon. member for Carleton were better versed upon this subject as to which he undertakes to enlighten the House it might have occurred to him that none of these books would be ready for delivery to the government until the work, with the exception of the binding, was all completed.

Mr. CARVELL. I read a letter from Mr. Scott, the Superintendent of Immigration, stating that certain quantities of each kinds of books had been delivered, and I gave the price he figured them at, and it amounted to something over $10,200.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Those quantities had been delivered?

Mr. CARVELL. Quantities delivered. That presented the amount ordered and delivered.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I did not understand it in that way.

Mr. CARVELL. Then the hon. gentleman could not have listened very carefully.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I listened very carefully, but it is some time ago, and the hon. gentleman has made a number of extraordinary statements. While he is in a communicative mood I would like to trouble him further with the question whether or not he has any information as to whether that work was performed in the 'Herald' office or in some other office?

Mr. CARVELL. I have not.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). He has no information. His recent answer then is quite in keeping with what I said a moment ago when we recollect that these books were printed in a number of languages. Of course, each language would be delivered separately; so, it is quite possible for a quantity of these books to be delivered, and yet the remnant not delivered, but totally destroyed in the wreck of the 'Herald' building. But, on the face of it this is a transaction requiring explanation too. I do not think it is reasonable that these books should remain in the 'Herald' building, and not be destroyed in the collapse of that building. If they were there they certainly were destroyed and yet the government has paid in full for them.

Mr. CARVELL. Would not that properly come under the purview of the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have not the privilege of being a member of the Public Accounts Committee, but I have very often been a spectator at that committee, and from my experience as a spectator, if I wished to find out something which it was the desire of certain members of this House to conceal, the Public Accounts Committee is the last place to which I would go seeking for information. I have detained the House longer than I intended, but I think I have shown some reasons why we should have a commission to further prosecute the inquiry commenced by the Secretary of State.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to say one or two words. It is rather a remarkable thing in the first place that none of the colleagues of the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) have found themselves in a position to come to his rescue in connection with the matter which has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). I would not be prepared to say that the colleagues of the hon. gentleman have not shown their wisdom in that regard. I shall not attempt to go into detail with regard to this subject for it has already been very fully and thoroughly discussed, but I may say to my hon. friend the Secretary of State that I was extremely astonished at one remark that he made in the course of his speech this afternoon. That was his statement that it was the most natural thing in the world—I did not take it down but I remember it very well—for the Mortimer Company, Limited, to have written the letter to him which appears on page 297 of the report. I hope I am not quoting the hon. gentleman incorrectly. I noticed the observation when he made it. It arrested my attention immediately because I had just been reading the letter, and if he has such an appreciation of the letter and the circumstances attending it I am bound to say that his ideas of such matters are absolutely on a different plane from those which I entertain. The letter of the Mortimer Company, if it means anything, means that an employee of the department of which he is the head, came to that company and told them that he, a minister of the Crown, the Secretary of State for Canada, desired a let-

ter to be used in parliament for the purpose of deceiving parliament and deceiving the people of this country, and that the company thought it was the most natural thing in the world that such a request should have been made and were prepared to comply with it at once. If that letter means anything less than that I would like the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to tell me what it does mean. I cannot, by any construction of the English language contained in that letter, make it amount to anything less than what I have just now alleged. I will read it if any hon. gentleman in this House doubts my statement. When we hear a minister of the Crown, speaking for his colleagues in the government, speaking on this occasion for the Prime Minister of Canada, tell the parliament of Canada and the people of this country that it was the most natural thing in the world for this company to have written that letter under these circumstances, I am bound to say I am surprised that the Prime Minister sits dumb in his seat. It is the most remarkable statement that I ever heard made in this parliament. What does it mean? Does it mean that the Mortimer Company have been doing this thing before that it is only an incident of the enormous business that they have been carrying on with the government? Why, Sir, if there were no other reason for an inquiry by a Royal Commission then, I say that not only in justice to the people of Canada, not only in justice to the government of Canada, but in justice to the Mortimer Company themselves, a Royal Commission ought to be granted at once in order that it may be made to appear to the people what this letter does mean and what the circumstances are under which they have been carrying on business with the government.

It is idle to expect that the Prime Minister or any of his colleagues will consent to any investigation of this kind. I repeat what I have said before: That if they were sensitive about such matters they would pay out of their own pockets the hundred thousand dollars that have been lost to the people of Canada by their refusal to grant the inquiry I asked for on the 30th of April, 1908. According to the statement of the Secretary of State the $94,000 or $100,000 which have been lost to the people of the country in these Printing Bureau scandals that are a disgrace to the government, have been for the most part if not altogether lost since I asked the Prime Minister and his colleagues to grant an investigation which would have saved every dollar of this money to the people and probably hundreds of thousands of dollars besides the particulars of which we do not know because the lid is kept closely upon some of these departments. On the 30th of April, 1908, I moved for that investigation, and the answer of the Prime Minister was a quibble, nothing more than a quibble. He had the audacity to state, and he repeated it the following year, that the Civil Service Commission, which had entered into an investigation that the government never contemplated, had done this work thoroughly and completely. I challenge that statement now and if he doubts it I can read to the Prime Minister statement after statement from the report of that Royal Commission showing in the most unequivocal and definite manner that they only touched the very fringe of the inquiry that ought to be made. In face of that the Prime Minister ventured to burk that inquiry, to refuse that inquiry and the people of Canada are to-day out of pocket nearly $100,000 in one item alone, because of that refusal. In 1909, on the 1st of April, after the general elections, when the Toronto 'Globe' and the Montreal 'Herald' and other Liberal papers had called upon the Prime Minister to cleanse the Augean stable of the filth that had accumulated, my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), in a speech in which there was not one line or word of partisanship, in a studiously moderate speech, implored the government of Canada not only for their own sake but for the sake of the coutnry to grant the inquiry he then moved for. Again the answer of the Prime Minister was that the Civil Service Commission had made a complete and exhaustive inquiry, a statement which was absolutely denied and falsified by paragraph after paragraph in the very report to which he alluded. I make that statement deliberately in the face of the Prime Minister, and if he ventures to deny it I can give him the proof. There was the further statement made by the right hon. gentleman on that occasion in reply to the moderate and patriotic speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty), when the right hon. gentleman said: To the pure all things are pure, and therefore every department of this government ought to be pure in the eyes of my hon. friend from St. Anne. I say that the answer of the Prime Minister cannot be characterized as anything higher than a quibble. To-day, his Secretary of State gives the same answer. We had it in 1908; we had it in 1909; we have it again in 1911. The Civil Service Commission in 1908 spoke of the awful condition of some of these departments and expressed their belief that other departments which they had not time to investigate should be investigated forthwith, but yet the Prime Minister says that that investigation was full, complete and exhaustive. True, with respect to one matter and one matter only mentioned in that report, they appointed Justice Cassels to investigate a particular feature of one department and Mr. Justice Cassels investigated that parti-

cular feature of that particular department with the result that his report shows that not only the suspicions of the Civil Service Commission were correct but that he himself unearthed matters that were not even dreamt of by the Royal Commission which made that scathing report upon one department of this government. Then we came to parliament and we pointed out that Mr. Justice Cassels had not only expressed the belief, but pointed to the almost absolute certainty that a certain species of graft and corruption and dishonesty which appeared in that particular department could not possibly be confined to it alone, and in 1909 my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) moved his resolution and we were told there was nothing to investigate. To-day the Secretary of State repeats the futile answer of the Prime Minister in 1908 and the equally futile answer of the Prime Minister in 1909. I shall not go over the facts that have been set forth with great force and cogency by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) as to why this inquiry should be granted. Let me ask, why should it not be granted? What detriment can there be to the public interest by the granting of such a Royal Commission of inquiry? The investigation by the minister was not held under oath, and I refer to the statute upon public inquiries to be found in Vol. 2, R. S. C., pages 1779, 1780, under which the Secretary of State could, if he so desired, have conducted the inquiry under oath:

> The minister presiding over any department of the Civil Service of Canada may appoint at any time, under the authority of the Governor in Council, a commissioner or commissioners to investigate and report upon the state and management of the business, or any part of the business, of such department, either in the inside or outside service thereof, and the conduct of any person in such service, so far as the same relates to his official duties.

A commissioner so appointed has the most ample power and authority to examine witnesses on oath and conduct the inquiry to the very end in a thorough and exhaustive maner. When my hon. friend the Secretary of State tells us that he was very much engaged in connection with the session of parliament, and his duties as a minister of the Crown, all of which I sincerely admit, he simply shows us that he undertook to do a work for which he was not very well fitted, a work which ought to have been done, and might have been done, and better done, by the appointment of a commissioner with power to take evidence under oath. That has never been done up to the present time, and I say that until that is done, there has been no inquiry into that department of such a character as the public interest of this country demands. Look at the very conditions revealed to us this afternoon by the hon. the Secretary of State. When did he begin this investigation? In November, 1908. When did he end it? In the summer of 1910. When were these frauds upon this department committed? As to nine-tenths of them, between November, 1908, and the summer of 1910, during the very time in which he was engaged in this investigation. A better comment on the investigation could not be made. I am not finding fault with my hon. friend the Secretary of State in one respect in that regard, because I know that as minister of the Crown he has many matters which must necessarily engage his attention outside of his investigation of this department; but I am pointing out to him that if at the time when he first conceived that an inquiry was necessary, he had appointed a commissioner, or commissioners, selecting some of those very technical men whom he afterwards called in to assist him, and if he had enabled those men to give their undivided attention to a thorough and complete investigation of the department, he probably would have saved the people of this country between $75,000 and $100,000, and the investigation would have been of so thorough a character as to satisfy the people of this country, and that has not been done up to the present time. I can only say in conclusion that I do not regard the investigation that has been made as a thorough or satisfactory one; I do not regard the attitude of the government with respect to this as any more satisfactory than it was on the 1st of April, 1908, or on the 30th of April, 1909, and I am prepared to support the motion of my hon. friend from East Hastings.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend opened his remarks by saying that he was astonished that none of the colleagues of the Secretary of State had come to his rescue. For this there was a very good reason, that the Secretary of State did not need any rescue from anybody. The Secretary of State—I submit it to the judgment of every impartial man in this House—made an honest, a fair and a complete defence of his position. Every man in this House must admit that he made his defence in a frank and open manner, and that it did him infinite credit. Anything that could be said in his support by any of his colleagues or by anybody else could not add to the effectiveness of that defence. I will take just one point mentioned by my hon. friend a moment ago as a cause of reproach to the Secretary of State; but in my judgment it is to his credit as showing that he wanted to make his defence thorough. My hon. friend commented on the letter written by Mr. Mortimer, stating that it had been written at the suggestion of the Secretary

of State to cover up certain transactions in the department. My hon. friend the Secretary of State, when he undertook to probe the department, did not conceal anything, but exposed everything in the department, favourable or unfavourable, and his object in asking for that letter from Mr. Mortimer was to have evidence against a dishonest official, to see how far his dishonesty had gone, and the consequence of that and other evidence is that that officer has been dismissed, and is no longer in the service. Does it seem extraordinary that conditions in the Printing Bureau should have been so lamentable as they have been proved to have been? Even in the best regulated departments there may be dishonest officials, and even while the rascality is going on the man at the head of the department may not be aware of it. But when it is called to his notice, it is his duty to deal with it, and there his responsibility commences. What more can be asked of any man, whether at the head of government, or in any other position, than that as soon as he has reason to believe that something wrong is going on in his department, he should take all precautions to eradicate the wrong and improve conditions. This is what has been done by my hon. friend the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In connection with that, what does the right hon. gentleman think of the conduct of a company in writing such a letter for such a purpose, and is the government still doing business with that same company?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What I think is this: that a company which is seeking for business will always try to get the business it is seeking for. The methods may not always be very honourable. It does not follow that they are dishonest; but the companies are very apt to take the methods of the men with whom they deal. This company was dealing with one of the officers who were dishonest. Of one of them we do not need to speak, because he is no more. I believe that all the work and supplies which he had charge of are now done by tender. Now, my hon. friend the Secretary of State took office in the month of August, 1908, and he was not very long in office when he thought he should give particular attention to the affairs of the Department of Printing. He began by writing two letters, one to the Acting King's Printer and the other to the Superintendent of Stationery, informing them that henceforth they were not to buy any supplies. That was the first thing to be done. But my hon. friend had reason to believe that the Superintendent of Stationery had fraudulent transactions with a firm in New York. Such transactions are always hard to discover. My hon. friend did not rush into the investigation at once,

but he went to New York and got information, and as soon as he got it, he started the inquiry. The result was effective and immediate. The moment the investigation commenced in earnest, that officer disappeared from the country. That was the first result of the long preparation which had been made by my hon. friend the Secretary of State, for the investigation. It was taken the moment he started it and brought out a revelation of the conditions which formerly existed in the department and which my hon. friend has done everything possible to remedy. The only reason why hon. gentlemen opposite now ask for an investigation by a Royal Commission is that the investigation by the Secretary of State was not under oath. True, it was not under oath, but it was none the less effective. The book we have here, and which has been copiously quoted from, shows that the work was effective.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my right hon. friend will allow me, I said that I would not enumerate the reasons gone over by other speakers and particularly by my hon. friend from New Westminster and then I said that I would add one other reason.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will come to the further reasons given. The investigation was not under oath but it was thorough and effective, and the result was put upon the table early this session. But is that all we have? No, since that time there has been an investigation under oath on this very thing. These gentlemen who now want a Royal Commission have been investigating this very department in the Committee on Public Accounts the last two or three months. Why then should they ask for another investigation? My hon. friend, the Secretary of State, investigated his department and placed his report on the table. Gentlemen of the opposition were not satisfied, and they themselves had another investigation before the Committee on Public Accounts, and still they are not satisfied and want another. What is there more to investigate? All the facts have been disclosed. There is enough to show what was the condition of the department, and it is shown also that the minister has taken every precaution to undo the wrong that was done and establish a new condition of things. I appeal to the fairness of every man on the other side that there is no more reason for another investigation. If at the opening of the session, when the report was laid on the table, the opposition had said: We are not satisfied, we want another investigation, we do not want it before a committee of this House but want a Royal Commission—I could understand that. But at the opening of the session, they took their own

course. They did not ask for a Royal Commission but they asked for an investigation before the committee on Public Accounts and they got it. And now they have it, they ask for another. What is there more to investigate before a Royal Commission which could not be investigated before the committee on Public Accounts? What witness is there whom they want to examine before a Royal Commission who could not be examined before the committee on Public Accounts? Is there any reason why there should be more security in the one case than in the other? There is no sense in their asking for this Royal Commission of inquiry. They have taken their course, and if they want more investigation, the committee on Public Acounts is still there and they can have it.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Northrup.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,
Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Barnard,
Best,
Blain,
Borden (Halifax),
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Cowan,
Crosby,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Daniel,
Edwards,
Elson,
Fraser,
Gilbert,
Goodeve,
Herron,
Hughes,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lortie,
Macdonell,
McCall,
Magrath,
Nantel,
Northrup,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Price,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thornton,
Wallace,
Wilcox,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Wright.—56.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allard,
Allen,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
McCoig,
McColl,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Congdon,
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Ecrément,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Forget,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Gladu,
Guthrie,
Hunt,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
Lemieux,
Leggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
McAllister,
Michaud,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Robb,
Ross (Rimouski),
Roy (Dorchester),
Rutan,
Schell,
Sealey,
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Sperry,
Talbot,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Todd,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Verville,
Warburton and
White (Victoria, Alta.)—92.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Graham,	Barker,
King,	Lewis,
Clarke,	Foster,
Miller,	Osler,
Harris,	Beattie,
Low,	Thoburn,
Martin (Regina),	Donnelly,
Harty,	Lalor,
Smith (Middlesex),	Marshall,
Carrier,	Maddin,
Smith (Cornwall),	Broder,
Wilson,	Forget,
McGiverin,	Worthington,
Parent,	Middlebro,
Paterson,	McCarthy,
Savoie,	Monk,
Turgeon,	Haggart (Winnipeg),
Seguin,	Doherty,
Emmerson,	Boyce,
McCraney,	Bradbury,
Gordon (Kent),	Currie (Simcoe),
Gervais,	Taylor (Leeds),
Ross (Middlesex),	White (Renfrew),
Turiff,	Jameson,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Papineau,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Champagne,	Bristol,
Conmee,	Maclean (York),
Cash,	Henderson,
Tolmie,	Meighen,
Molloy.	Blondin.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT — JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the Prime Minister whether or not appointment has yet been made to the Judicial Bench of Prince Edward Island?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that His Excellency the Governor General is absent from the city just now. On his return if my hon. friend will put his question I will give him an answer.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I understand the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections will be taken up on Thursday. What business will be taken up tomorrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-day we intend to take up government Bills—all the Bills except the Banking Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.05 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

WEDNESDAY, April 26, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WATER-POWERS CONTROLLED BY THE DOMINION.

*Mr. MONK:

Is it the intention of the government, during the present session, to provide such legislation as will regulate, limit and submit to restrictive conditions the alienation of water-powers controlled by the Dominion of Canada?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not the intention of the government to submit any legislation to this effect this session.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

*Mr. MONK:

In case the Georgian Bay Canal is constructed, will the Americans be entitled to the use of said canal? If so, in virtue of what treaty or agreement.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The government is not aware of any existing treaty or international agreement which would seem to have application to this work.

NAVY RECRUITING REGULATIONS.

*Mr. MONK:

1. What regulations, if any, have come into force pursuant to the Navy Act since the return presented to this House on the 11th January last?
2. Has the government offered any inducement to postmasters or other of the officials in the public service of Canada to recruit men for the new Canadian Navy, or cadets for the naval training school, and upon what conditions does such recruiting take place?
3. Has any order in council been passed upon the subject? If so, at what date?
4. Has any circular upon the said subject been addressed to postmasters or other public officials?
5. Has any commission or remuneration been paid by the government for such recruiting? If so, what amounts and to whom?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Revised rates of travelling allowances. 25th January, 1911.

Revised ratings and pay, electricians. 25th January, 1911.

Regulations for entry of naval instructors. 25th January, 1911.

Revised regulations for entry of medical officers. 31st March, 1911.

2. Recruiting stations have been established at certain places throughout the Dominion; where available the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries has been appointed recruiting officer; in other places the postmaster.

The recruiting officers are paid a fee of $2 for each recruit finally entered.

3. 1st August, 1910. Order in council approving instructions relating to recruiting for the naval service of Canada.

4. Circular issued by Post Office Department dated 6th February, 1911, authorizing certain postmasters to act as recruiting officers. Postmasters appointed as recruiting officers have been supplied with a copy of the Instructions for Recruiting.

Reply to question 5 is as follows:

Name and Residence.	Fees.	Disbursements.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
R. A. Wiallard, Montreal, Que	42 00	5 56	47 56
J. S. Stewart, Kingston, Ont	14 00	3 22	17 22
W. B. Rogers, Toronto, Ont	32 00	1 76	33 76
W. A. Moffat, Pembroke, Ont	4 00	0 29	4 29
T. G. Taylor, Charlottetown, P.E.I	18 00	3 16	21 16
J. Gauvreau, Rivière du Loup, Que	4 00	0 76	4 76
P. McDonald, London, Ont	8 00	1 54	9 54
W. A. Adams, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont	2 00	.....	2 00
	124 00	16 29	140 29

KNIGHT'S POINT, P.E.I.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What amount of money is proposed to be expended on the Breakwater at Knight's Point, P.E.I., this year?
2. What is the nature of the work supposed to be done on the Breakwater at Souris, P.E.I., during this year, and will the work be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1 and 2. $2,000 for repairs and renewals of covering, floor stringers, &c., of deck, and close and fender piling portions of the inner face, &c., of breakwater at Souris. Such repairs are usually executed by day labour.

CANADIAN LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

*Mr. MONK:

1. Has the Canadian Light and Power Company submitted to the government the plans of the new works the company intends to execute in connection with the development and increase of its power on the Beauharnois canal?
2. On what date were said plans sent in for approval?
3. Has the government caused a report to be made upon the said plans and proposed works, who has been intrusted with the preparation upon the said report, and has the report been completed?
4. Is the government satisfied that the proposed works will not interfere with the navigation of the St. Lawrence river?
5. Has the government taken any action in respect to the application for the approval of said plans?
6. Has any order in council been passed?
7. On what date was such action taken and said order in council passed?
8. Will said plans be laid upon the table of the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.
2. 30th November, 1910.

3 and 4. The project is being thoroughly and carefully investigated by District Engineer Michaud with the view of deciding what effect such works will have on navigation.

5. Yes, all interested parties have been notified to attend a hearing to be held on 1st May.

6 and 7. No.

8. Yes, if requested.

*Mr. MONK:

1. By whom were the plans prepared for improvements and extensions submitted for approval by the Canadian Light and Power Company in connection with the Beauharnois canal?
2. Were the said plans so submitted for approval to the government accompanied by an engineer's report? If so, what is the name of the engineer?
3. Has the government approved said plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Plan supplied by the Canadian Light and Power Co. bears the stamp of J. C. White & Co., Engineers, Contractors, 45-49 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.
2. Yes, signed by J. C. White & Co.
3. No.

HAILEYBURY DOCK.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

What has been the total expenditure on the dock at Haileybury, Ontario, up to the present time, and how much more will it take to complete the same?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1. (a) $40,503.46; (b) about $18,000 to complete.

TETAGOUCHE RIVER WORKS.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries any information as to a new dam being built on the Tetagouche river, Gloucester county, New Brunswick, by Mr. John P. Legere, for the purpose of generating electric power?
2. Was any fishway provided in the old dam built by the same gentleman?
3. Is it the intention of the government to insist on a fishway being built in the proposed dam?
4. Has the department any reports of its officers or correspondence on the subject of providing a proper fishway over this obstruction?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. It has no information of a dam having been built there since 1904.
2. No fishway was required in the dam built at that time, as it was considered that such was impracticable.
3. Answered by 1 and 2.
4. Reports were obtained at the time the dam referred to in the answer to Question No. 1 was built.

HALIFAX WHARFAGE.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. Is it a fact that vessels loading at the Intercolonial railway wharf at Halifax are not charged side wharfage, while vessels loading at the Intercolonial railway wharf or wharfs at St. John are charged side wharfage?
2. If so, what is the reason for this discrimination, and is it the intention of the Intercolonial railway authorities to continue it?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. Because the city of St. John, who own the wharfs there, charge side wharfage and as the railway adopts the tariff of the city, the Intercolonial railway charges wharfage, at, and should continue to do so, so long as the city of St. John does.

THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture), moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Copyright Act, chapter 70 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by providing for—
(a) the protection in Canada of the copyright in original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works;
(b) the fees to be paid for the registration of copyrights;
(c) penalties for the infringement of copyright; and
(d) the prohibition of the importation into Canada of certain reprints of copyright works.

He said: Perhaps it would be well I should give a little explanation of this resolution which covers a subject of very considerable importance. The passage of the Act which it is proposed to found on this resolution will, I trust and believe, mark the termination of the discussion in regard to the important subject of copyright which has extended over the whole period of our existence as a dominion. Under the British North America Act, copyright in Canada appears to be entrusted to the parliament of Canada. However, uunder the Imperial Act of 1842, the copyright law of the empire prevails in Canada and in all the other parts of His Majesty's dominions. The result has been conflict between the imperial legislation having force in Canada and the Copyright Acts passed by the parliament of Canada. Efforts have been made by the representatives of Canada to solve this difficulty. So far back as 1872, there was a Canadian Copyright Act passed which was disallowed. Later, in 1889, a copyright law was passed in Canada which the then Governor General assented to because it contained a clause saying that it should only come into force by proclamation of the Governor General in Council and that proclamation has never been issued, due to objection on the part of the imperial authorities. The result has been that in Canada the Imperial Act is in force and up to the present time no important Canadian legislation, in regard to copyright, has been permitted. It is true that in 1900 this parliament passed a Copyright Act which the imperial authorities, when it was submitted to them by the then Governor General, Lord Minto, considered not to be in conflict with their own law, and, therefore, His Excellency assented to it, and it is now on our statute books. The allowance of that Act was due to the acquiescence of the imperial authorities and not to a successful assertion of the right of the parliament of Canada to legislate. For a long time back representatives of Canada have insisted on the exclusive right of Canada to legislate in regard to copyright in Canada. Sir John Thompson was perhaps one of the most prominent of those who took this ground, and I wish to refer to the memoranda and despatches which were drawn up by him dealing with the whole subject most exhaustively, and to my mind, most successfully, in the light of Canada's legal right as well as her right as a matter of policy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where are Sir John Thompson's memoranda to be found? A very important state paper such as that undoubtedly was, ought to be easily accessible to members of this House. When I wanted to look at it, I had the greatest possible difficulty in having it hunted up.

Mr. FISHER. I think it will be found included in the returns brought down to the House in 1891 or 1892. I could refer to it myself because it is in the file of the department, but I quite agree with my hon. friend that it ought to be accessible, and I shall be glad to make it accessible to everybody who wishes to study the question. Canada took the legal ground as well

as what I might call the ground of imperial policy to legislate. Our legal right, however, has always been disputed by the imperial authorities, and Sir John Thompson failed to secure assent to his views as expressed in this memorandum.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is, briefly stated, the argument of the imperial authorities that the British North America Act does not give to Canada the complete right to legislate?

Mr. FISHER. I did not intend to go into that question. I am just giving a short historical statement of what led up to the present situation. I shall be glad in the discussion which will follow, to give further information on that point. The question of copyright was taken up in the Imperial Conference of 1907, but it was not discussed at any length, being reserved for what was called a subsidiary conference. That subsidiary conference was held last spring in London, and I was authorized by the government to represent Canada there. Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Newfoundland were also represented, as well as the imperial government. That conference was presided over by the right Hon. Sidney Buxton, by whom copyright matters are looked after in the imperial government. The conference lasted for several weeks, a number of meetings were held, and a series of resolutions were adopted embodying the conclusions of the conference. At that conference the exclusive right of the self-governing dominions to legislate in regard to copyright was conceded. The impediment to this right was contained in the statute of 1842, of the imperial parliament, and it was agreed that, in the Bill which was to be introduced into the imperial parliament by Mr. Buxton as a result of that conference, that Act should be repealed, so as to leave the way clear for the principle of self-government of the overseas dominions with regard to copyright to be recognized and maintained. In reply to the invitation to take part in that subsidiary conference last spring, the Canadian government said they wished to discuss the question from all points, and not to be hampered by any particular part of the question being laid down as not open to the discussion, and the work of the conference took that shape. There was no restriction in the discussions, and, therefore, we were free to present our views in regard to the whole question of copyright. Speaking as a representative of Canada at the conference, I took the view that was laid down by Sir John Thompson in regard to Canada's right to legislate. I did not dwell so much upon the legal aspect, which had been decided against us, as upon the question of imperial policy. I took the ground that the British North America Act appeared to give to Canada the right to legislate, and that it was a necessary, inherent right in our general right of self-government, and I am glad to be able to say that the representatives of the imperial authorities and the delegates of the other self-governing dominions unanimously agreed to that proposition. Therefore, I think I am justified in saying that the result of that subsidiary conference is the solution and the finish of the difficulties which had existed for many years as between the Canadian view and the imperial view on this question. Immediately after the conference was over the right Hon. Sidney Buxton introduced in the Imperial House of Commons, a copyright Bill, the terms of which had been discussed in that conference. In consequence of the dissolution of the English House shortly afterwards, the Bill was not proceeded with, but in the new parliament which is now sitting at Westminster, he has introduced practically the same Bill, with some very slight modification, and I was glad the other day to receive a despatch from him informing me that the second reading of the Bill had passed. This entitles me to say that the House of Commons of Great Britain has accepted the principles that were agreed to at the Copyright Conference, and I am, therefore, the more entitled to say on behalf of Canada that the principle which we have contended for so long, that Canada should have the sole right to legislate in regard to copyright in Canada, is accepted by the imperial government and House of Commons, and I have no doubt will be accepted by the imperial parliament and become law. I might say, in answer to the hon. leader of the opposition, that the contention against this, from a legal point of view, as I understood it, was that the British North America Act of 1867 did not repeal the Copyright Act of 1842, and did not do away with the powers or rights conferred on British authors by that Act—that although the British North America Act did permit Canada to legislate on copyright as far as the Dominion itself was concerned, it did not repeal the imperial Act which had force all over His Majesty's dominions, and that the two powers were concurrent, and the British law officers had always maintained up to the present time that while Canada had a right to legislate, that right was subject to her legislation not being in conflict with the legislation of the mother country. That is a legal point on which I would not presume to give an opinion, but Sir John Thompson took very strong ground upon it, and to my mind his argument seemed conclusive. However, it did not appeal to the

imperial authorities in the same way, and the home government never acknowledged or recognized its force sufficiently to accept it and allow it to control.

Mr. LENNOX. That is subject to the legislation which existed in British North America in 1867.

Mr. FISHER. Yes. Our contention was that the British North America Act affirmed the exclusive right of the parliament of Canada to legislate on copyrights in Canada, but the imperial authorities contended that while it conferred the right on the Canadian parliament to legislate on copyright in Canada, that legislation must not be in conflict with the Imperial Act which had force in Canada, and which was in no sense impaired or repealed by the clauses in the British North America Act.

I want to speak briefly about some provisions of the Bill I propose to introduce. A great deal of it is the same as our present copyright law. There are one or two things, however, that I ought to explain. In the first place one of the chief objects of the imperial authorities in the holding of an imperial copyright conference last spring was to secure uniformity of copyright legislation throughout the empire. They also desired to harmonize British copyright legislation, whether of the motherland or the overseas dominions, with the copyright legislation which had been accepted by the Berne Convention or international union. The British authorities adhered to the International Berne Convention, and a little over two years ago there was held in Berlin a continuation of the Berne Convention, now commonly known as the Berlin Convention. In that certain new ideas were introduced into the International Union Convention, and the question arose as to whether Great Britain, on her own behalf, and on behalf of the rest of the empire, should adhere to the Berlin Convention. At that meeting the representatives of Great Britain agreed to the changes subject to the indorsement by the authorities at home. The authorities at home had studied the matter, they appointed a commission under the presidency of Lord Gorrell to study the whole question, and the commission made a report to the home authorities. But before taking action on that report the imperial authorities wished to hold this imperial conference. Therefore the question came up, not only as to imperial legislation, and legislation of the different self-governing dominions, but also as to legislation in connection with the International Union, and the subject of adherence to the International union on the part of the British Empire was part of the work of the British Conference. In addition to the acknowledgment of the rights of the self-governing dominions to complete autonomy with regard to copyright legislation, the British Act also recognizes the complete right of these dominions to decide upon the question of adherence to the International Union. Of course any such adherence being an international matter, must be dealt with by the Foreign Office of the imperial government, but it must be dealt with by that Foreign Office at the request of the self-governing dominions. There is in the Act now before the British parliament complete and absolute freedom for each of the self-governing dominions to adhere to the International Union or not as they may decide for themselves. One of the chief objects of the conference was uniformity; and in the draft Bill which I propose to introduce, we have endeavoured to follow the lines of the British Bill as much as possible. Therefore, it will be found in quite a number of instances that clauses which really cover the same point as other clauses in our present law are framed in a different way so as to be as much as possible in harmony with, and follow the lines of the imperial Act, but the meaning is exactly the same as in our present law. However, there are a few things in which the new Act will materially differ from the old. A very important one is the period of copyright protection. The International Union adopted a period longer than was formerly the case. It adopted the period of the life of the author and 50 years thereafter. The British imperial authorities discussed that point at length. There was a great deal of doubt and hesitation as to the acceptance of it, but finally Mr. Buxton adopted it in his Bill. I have included that in our own Bill, and am proposing to ask parliament to give the same copyright protection under the Canadian law as is given by the Imperial government, and the different countries which are adhering to the International Union. I do this in the interests of harmony and similarity in the copyright law, not only of our own empire, but the world at large.

There is another very important item in this Bill which I might as well allude to now. Under it we define and provide for Canadian copyright very much the same as the old Act did. That is to say the conditions for obtaining copyright in Canada are practically identical with what they have been. There is one provision in this Bill, however, which we have never had before. In view of the desirability of imperial uniformity of copyright in the different parts of the empire, and perhaps with a certain deference to the fact that heretofore the imperial copyright law obtained over the whole empire, I am going to ask the House to provide a machinery by which

we can have the same reciprocity in copyright protection all over the empire. That is to say that, if Canada secures for her copyright holders copyright protection in the mother land, or in Australia, New Zealand or South Africa—copyright protection the same as the people of these various countries have—I propose to ask parliament to authorize the granting of copyright protection in Canada to the owners of copyright in the various parts of the empire. I call this for the sake of simplicity, imperial reciprocity in copyright. There is one condition, however, which I wish to embody in this Act. Those who have studied copyright at all, know that in Great Britain no formality as it is called is required to secure copyright. Great Britain will give copyright to the foreigner who prints his book abroad and who does nothing in the British Isles in regard to his book except to put it on the market. He is not required to print it, or to publish it, or even register it in Great Britain, but only to put it on the market. That is inconsistent with the provision of our copyright law, for we have required that a book must be printed in Canada and registered in Canada in order to secure copyright here, and I do not propose or wish to lessen these conditions. Therefore, when it comes to a question of reciprocity with, let us say, Great Britain, while I propose to give to anybody who has copyright in Great Britain copyright protection in Canada, I would propose to make it a condition that he shall be a subject of His Majesty or a resident in Great Britain, and that the article that is to be copyrighted shall be made within Great Britain. The same will be the case with regard to Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Newfoundland.

Mr. SPROULE. That will not be exactly reciprocal with Great Britain.

Mr. FISHER. I propose to make that a condition of reciprocity. I may explain that the international union does not impose this condition; it gives copyright protection on works published and printed and copyrighted outside the union provided these works get copyright protection in any country of the union. To my mind, that is a blemish on the conditions of the international union. It seems to me that under that provision there is no inducement to countries which are not within the union to enter the union. The subjects or citizens of countries outside the union, by simply getting copyright we will say in Great Britain which is a member of the union, enjoy all the advantages of copyright in the union countries. That, as I say, to my mind, is a weakness in the union. I think it would be a weakness in imperial reciprocity, largely because of the fact that the mother country in her copyright legislation is so liberal and free. I confess, that, so far as Canada is concerned, I would not like to propose or adopt the same absolute liberality and freedom. Therefore, if we grant reciprocal copyright to the people of Great Britain, give them copyright protection in Canada by reason of the fact that they have copyright protection in Great Britain, I think it is only just and fair that it should be restricted to the people of Great Britain and to the works or objects made in Great Britain instead of being free to the whole world. If we did not make that a condition, everybody and anybody in the whole world could secure copyright protection in Canada by simply getting copyright in Great Britain, as Great Britain allows them to do.

This proposition of reciprocal copyright would come in under a clause of the Act which provides that the Governor in Council, on being satisfied that the other country to the reciprocal arrangement has granted similar privileges to Canadians in that country, shall be empowered to allow that country's subjects or citizens the privileges provided in Canada under the Bill. I also follow the English Act in another point, and that is in authorizing, as the English Act does His Majesty in Council—here authorizing the Governor in Council—to make initial arrangements with foreign countries in regard to copyright protection. If a country will make a special arrangement to grant us privileges equivalent to or compensating for the privileges we grant to them the Governor in Council, if this Bill passes, will be authorized to make that arrangement.

One point I have omitted to speak of which is important. There are different kinds of copyrights—literary, musical, dramatic and artistic. In this Act they are all grouped together, and they all get the same treatment and come under the same conditions. In Canada that has not been altogether the case heretofore. In Great Britain it was still less the case. There have been a great number of copyright Acts in Great Britain, and the law has been extremely complicated; and one of the desires of the conference was to secure uniformity and simplicity in the law, and, for that reason, the British Act groups all these different kinds of copyright together making the necessary conditions and detail to conform to the particular object. I propose to do that in the Act. There is another point of interest that I think the hon. member for Simcoe has alluded to, and that is in regard to penalties. In this Act I propose to introduce a penal clause which will cover dramatic and musical copyright as well as literary and artistic, and will secure, through criminal action, protection to owners of copyrights. I think

I have fairly covered the ground in a general way to enable the House to understand the resolution. When we come to discuss the Act in committee we can take up the details more at length.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister speaks of a British subject or a bona fide resident in Great Britain, what interpretation does he give to the words 'bona fide resident'?

Mr. FISHER. Foreigners who come to reside in Great Britain, and make it their home, but who do not take out naturalization papers, or take the oath of allegiance, would still be considered bona fide residents and would be treated the same as a citizen. That is the way in which the British Act is framed. For instance, we might have an Italian or an American residing there, as a number of Americans have done. They are really, to all intents and purposes of the copyright, British subjects, but they have not taken out naturalization papers or sworn allegiance. That is their authors' home or residence.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a foreigner goes there, and desires to get the reprint of a book, and he enjoys the copyright of the country, and after that was under way for a length of time he left the country, would his work still enjoy the benefit of the copyright?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I think it would if he was a bona fide resident at the time he secured the copyright. That would not apply to what might be called a colourable residence. If a person went there only for the purpose of securing a copyright, I think he would not be called a bona fide resident. I discussed that at considerable length in London, and objection was taken to any definite period being fixed, and the decision of the conference was that we should use terms which would fairly treat the people concerned. The idea of the conference was to give liberal protection to the creator of a literary, artistic, dramatic or musical work, to give him such an interest in his production that he and his family might enjoy all the reasonable profit and advantage of his having created that work. There is no doubt that it is a complex subject. The older countries are a little more appreciative of what I might call intellectual work. I found a strong feeling, not only amongst authors, but amongst the general public, that it was only fair and right to give to authors of these intellectual productions a reasonable protection for the fruits of their labour. I would commend to hon. members the study of the report of Lord Gorrell's commission. It is probably the most exhaustive and complete compendium of information in regard to the copyright that can be found anywhere, and it influenced me a great deal. As to the question of the duration of the copyright, I personally thought that 50 years after the death of an author was a ridiculously long period in which to give copyright protection. But the argument was put forward, and discussed before that commission, and the report shows conclusively, that long as this period seemed at first, it is only a just and fair protection to the intellectual product of the author. As a matter of fact, I suppose nine out of ten copyright works die long before the fifty years have expired; then nobody wants them, and copyright protection is of no further value. But for those who do live, it does not seem too long a period, for the fact that they do live shows the work to have been the product of genius, and in that case fifty years is not too long a period to give copyright protection. A work which lives for that length of time is of such value to the world at large that the author deserves for himself, and for his family to reap the advantage which the copyright will give them. This feature was adopted after very serious discussion. In England, when Mr. Buxton first introduced his Bill last year, and announced that copyright was to be given for fifty years, there was almost a howl of protest; but I see that the second reading of the Bill was passed without any objection whatever being raised to it.

Mr. SPROULE. Take a country that is not included with those who took part in the Berne Convention. Suppose a subject of that country proposed to get copyright in Canada, could it be got entirely independently of any reciprocity arrangement between that country and Canada, and when it was secured independently from that country, if there was an arrangement between Canada, and that country, would the copyright which was secured by a foreigner in Canada extend to every other country that was included in the Berne Convention?

Mr. FISHER. Under this Bill the foreigner cannot obtain copyright in Canada. Therefore, any foreigner can only obtain copyright in Canada by reason of an arrangement or convention between Canada and the country to which he belongs. The Act says that the Governor in Council may make an arrangement, whenever they are satisfied that a country gives an equivalent or compensating advantage to that which is given in Canada. If the copyright protection is obtained in Canada and Canada is a member of the international union under the present regulations of the union, that copyright would hold in every country that belongs to that union. Canada is now in the international union. Unless the regulations of the international union are somewhat modified I would not suggest that Canada should in the future adhere

to the union, because one of the chief difficulties I see in adhering to that union is the condition which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), has cited. At the present time Great Britain is a member of the union. The United States is not a member of the union. A United States author, by simply selling his book in England, can get copyright in England and that gives him copyright throughout the whole union, although the United States gives absolutely nothing in return for it. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the feature of it that appeals to us. We give the advantage and get nothing in return.

Mr. FISHER. No. Therefore, I would propose, if this Bill passes, not to adhere to the union except on the condition that only citizens of the countries of the union should get the advantages of copyright protection in Canada. But, I must say frankly, that is contrary to the present rules and regulations of the union. There is, however, a provision in the union that by permission, a country may adhere to the union with reservations, not adhering to the whole of the regulations of the union. I believe, although I am not positive about it, because a change may have taken place, that England proposes to adhere to the union with a reservation. Whether the countries of the union will permit adherence with that reservation I do not know. Negotiations are going on. I would propose to adhere to the union only on condition of the reservation that it would be only citizens and subjects of the countries in the union that would have any rights to copyright protection in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the minister a copy of the Act which has just received its second reading in the British House of Commons?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I have just one copy. If my hon. friend would like to ask any question I will try to look it up.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister referred to the law as it existed prior to 1867, and said that, that law, existing at the time when we were confederated and when we obtained the British North America Act, it was understood or determined that the law would not be repealed by force of the British North America Act. Does the Bill which is now before the British House of Commons purport to repeal that Act?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it repeals all existing copyright legislation in England.

Mr. LENNOX. So that we will begin at the beginning?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the minister to indicate that we will have protection by way of penalty. We will probably have under the Act the ordinary right to suit against a person who infringes a literary or dramatic work, but what I am more interested in is that we shall also have a penal clause in the Act so that those persons who are without substance but possess great activity and ambition in taking the works of others will be amenable and we will be able to get at them?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, that is included in the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. That is something that the Bill aimed at a session or two ago?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, exactly.

Mr. PORTER. May I inquire from the minister if it is the intention to amend the Copyright Act in such a way that the production of an opera by a resident or citizen of Canada will be protected by the granting of a copyright for it here in Canada? In the city where I live a man produced an opera a short time ago and I applied to the office here for a copyright for the protection of that work. I found I could not obtain it here and that I had to obtain it in London, England. It appears to me that if it is not the intention to provide for such a copyright it ought to be taken into consideration and an amendment should be made to cover that point.

Mr. FISHER. The Act as proposed will include that.

Mr. LENNOX. There is nothing in our Act is there, with reference to securing reciprocal rights between ourselves, say, and the United States?

Mr. FISHER. Only that the Act empowers the Governor in Council to enter into an arrangement with a foreign country provided the Governor in Council is satisfied that the foreign country gives as much as it gets.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no doubt the minister appreciates the importance—I know he does—of what has taken place and of securing fair reciprocal rights between ourselves and the United States in that regard. That will be done, the minister says, by order in council, and by an arrangement between the two powers.

Mr. FISHER. Heretofore the people of the United States have secured copyright in Canada by reason of securing it in England and only in that way. They may do that by the simple sale of the article in

England. This law does away with that because English copyright will no longer be in force in Canada after this Act passes.

Mr. SPROULE. That gave them the right to publish cheap reprints here.

Mr. FISHER. This will prevent that.

Mr. SPROULE. But they have exercised that right for years, have they not?

Mr. FISHER. There has not been very much of what is called the sale of cheap reprints here. I am speaking of the American author or publisher, and he gets copyright protection in Canada by securing copyright in Great Britain.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, we objected to that.

Mr. FISHER. That was one of the difficulties we have had, and the new law both in England and here does away with that absolutely. Another of our difficulties was that it has been the practice of British authors to secure copyright in the United States, the United States publisher setting up the type and printing and publishing the book in the United States, and the British authors include in that arrangement the Canadian market which they throw into the bargain, with the result that the United States publisher is able to sell in Canada the books printed in the United States under the United States copyright. The new law will prevent that.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister, of course, does not mean that the right heretofore obtained in England under copyright will not be preserved?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, certainly, the rights already obtained will be preserved.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does this Bill establish in Canada a system of copyright practically along the same line as that of Great Britain and the other dominions of the empire?

Mr. FISHER. As nearly as possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is similar legislation to be introduced in Australasia, South Africa and New Zealand?

Mr. FISHER. The British copyright Bill introduced by Mr. Buxton supposes first that it may be accepted by the different dominions by legislation of their own; second, that where it is impossible to accept the British Bill in its entirety, the Dominions will adopt legislation practically identical with it; and the third supposition is that one of the Dominions may insist upon legislation which is in conflict with the British Bill. Under the first supposition the British Bill will come into force in a Dominion beyond the seas by the legislation

of that Dominion. There are provisions in the British Bill which would be inconsistent with our present copyright, which I do not think Canada is prepared to abandon, and we aim at passing legislation which is practically identical with the British Bill. That will have to be judged by the home government, and if they declare that our legislation is practically identical with theirs, then the provisions of the British copyright law, so far as they affect British copyright, will be open to us in Canada. If, however, we adopt legislation which is inimical to the British copyright law, and the Secretary of State declares that our law is inconsistent with the British law, we then have the privilege under Mr. Buxton's Act, of repealing the British law now in force in Canada to the extent it is in force here. The British Act itself repeals these laws as applied to Canada if we shall adopt the British Act. If we adopt legislation which is practically identical with the British legislation, the Secretary of State for Great Britain will declare that the British Act applies and, therefore, the laws of Great Britain heretofore in force in Canada are repealed. If we decide to pass legislation which is inconsistent with the British Act, and the Secretary of State so declares, we are given authority to repeal the British laws which are to-day in force in Canada in so far as they apply to Canada. Under the three modes of procedure, we have, therefore, absolute freedom by the new British law.

Mr. DOHERTY. The minister said that no foreigner will be in a position to obtain copyright; do I understand that a person must be a British subject to get copyright in Canada?

Mr. FISHER. A British subject or a bona fide resident.

Mr. DOHERTY. The present law requires that a person shall be domiciled here; are we to understand that it is intended to diminish that?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to give a legal opinion on that point. The intention is that the person shall not merely be a casual visitor coming here for the purpose of getting copyright, but a real resident of the country. The question of domicile as discussed in the conference seemed to be hedged round with a good deal of difficulty, and the legal members preferred the term in the Bill to the term 'domicile.'

Mr. DOHERTY. I am afraid that 'bona fide residence' will be more difficult to determine than 'domicile.'

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps so.

Mr. SPROULE. What steps will a foreigner require to take to obtain copyright under that provision?

Mr. FISHER. As I understand it, he would have to be really residing in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose he just came here and declared his intention of remaining here, would he be required to do anything further to show he was a resident of Canada?

Mr. FISHER. His residence here would have to be practically permanent. It would not do for him to come here to reside simply to get the copyright.

Mr. SPROULE. He would not be fool enough to tell if that was his object.

Mr. FISHER. I understand that, but if he merely came here for a few months without getting a house and showing intention to reside, I think the courts would hold that his copyright was not valid. The question would have to be settled by the courts on a trial as to the validity of his copyright.

Mr. DOHERTY. His good faith would depend on what he intended, and I understand from the minister that he would have to intend to take up permanent residence.

Mr. FISHER. Practically permanent.

Mr. DOHERTY. I always understood that residence was a pure question of fact, and when you take up residence with the intention of making it permanent you get domicile. You will only create confusion by changing the term, because you may get to a point where it would be almost impossible to determine the question of fact whether the residence here is bona fide.

Mr. FISHER. There was considerable discussion on this point. Instances were given of foreign authors who had made their residence in London and others who had made their residence in Italy. We have the case of Marion Crawford, a well known American writer, who resided in Italy, though not a citizen, for many years. Many such instances were brought up, and the idea was that persons who were really residents were entitled to a copyright of the country in which they resided. But there was no hope or expectation that a person should be able to reside for a short time in a country for the purpose of obtaining a copyright. I remember many years ago, for instance, that Mark Twain came and resided for six weeks in Montreal for the express purpose of obtaining not a Canadian, but a British copyright. I think that kind of residence would indicate a colourable purpose, and I would not desire that under this Act a foreigner should be able to obtain a copyright in that way. But if a writer from abroad came to reside in Canada, and made himself a resident here, though he did not choose to swear the oath of allegiance, and take out naturalization papers, I think he would be looked on under this Act as a Canadian resident and entitled to Canadian copyright.

Mr. DOHERTY. I would like to have a little more than residence and a little less than domicile.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister give us a list of the countries in the union, or where can a list of them be obtained, and what provisions are necessary to enable a country to join the union?

Mr. FISHER. To become a member of the union a country has to agree to abide by the conditions of the union, which are embodied in a long and complicated series of resolutions. The chief idea of it is, however, that each country will give to the subjects or citizens of every other country in the union the same copyright protection that it gives to its own citizens. For instance, Canada is to-day in the Berne Convention, and every copyright in any of the countries in that convention is valid in Canada. That is the essential of the Berne Convention—in the last few years called the Berlin Convention.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume that the word 'residence' is used in the English Act as now introduced the same as in ours?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Was that the word that was in our Act before?

Mr. FISHER. No, the word 'domicile' was used.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister happen to recollect the word used in the English Act now being repealed?

Mr. FISHER. I can not say off-hand.

Mr. LENNOX. There is a good deal to be said on the question whether domicile or residence is the better word. As I understand it, you can have several residences, but only domicile. Take a case of this kind. An American author resides in Canada for a portion of each year. Suppose he resides here one year, and the next year applies for a copyright. That is a case in which I presume he would be thoroughly entitled to a copyright, would he not?

Mr. FISHER. The English Act does not even use the words 'bona fide.' It simply says 'a British subject or resident.'

Mr. LENNOX. I was referring to the intention of the Act. We have some cases of this kind. American authors live in Canada for a portion of the year and in

the United States for a portion of the year. Some of them will own houses in Canada. Suppose there is evidence that a person had lived here a portion of last year, we will say, that would be evidence of good faith, I should think, and he would be entitled to a copyright.

Mr. FISHER. I should think that, under those circumstances, reading the British Act, he would be.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister referred to resolutions that were passed at the subsidiary conference last year. Can he furnish us with some copies of those?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, we have a large number of copies of the proceedings of that conference, and I will see that they are distributed among the members.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, I presume it would be easy for the government to get a few copies of the Bill now before the British House of Commons.

Mr. FISHER. We might get a few. We have only one now. I will cable and ask for a number of copies of it to be sent here, but I would not like to delay our discussion till they came.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition spoke of Sir John Thompson's argument in reference to this matter. It would be a great satisfaction to the members of the House if they could have that argument before them. If it was the subject of a return, copies of that return, I should think, could be obtained.

Mr. FISHER. I will look that up and see whether or not it was printed. There is, of course, a copy of it in my department, which any hon. gentleman is welcome to come and look at, but I could not allow it to be taken out of the department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The memorandum of Sir John Thompson was printed on heavy blueish foolscap paper, and there were copies of it at one time available. It would be worth while to have that reprinted so that it would be available to members of parliament.

Mr. FISHER. There may be some available, and I shall have a search made for them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) in what he said about the word 'resident.' I am trying to puzzle out what that word may mean. When you substitute it for the word 'domicile,' it is obvious that some distinction is intended, and it is rather complicated by the use of the words 'bona fide.' When we have the Bill before us we can discuss it, but I am inclined to think it will afford a very satisfactory condition of affairs for members of the splendid profession to which my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) and I belong. Whether it would be equally satisfactory to the public at large may not be quite so evident.

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to give an opinion as to the respective meanings of the different forms of expression. But as I have explained, that was the idea of the conference, and I think they were unanimous, and the British draftsman of the Bill chose that word. I wish to follow the imperial Bill as much as possible in every particular except where it conflicts with what I consider the necessary conditions of copyright in Canada. The only object for substituting that word for 'domicile' was to have similarity with the imperial Bill.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 184) respecting the Copyright Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADDRESS TO THE KING.

Mr. MONK. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask a question. I have seen it stated in the newspapers that my right hon. friend is leaving for England to take part in the Imperial Conference on the 12th of May, is it the intention of the government to have an address to His Majesty on the occasion of his coronation adopted in this House? I believe that is the usual practice; and as the days now remaining are all in the hands of the government, I suppose steps will be taken to that end. The reason I ask now is that if an address is to be conveyed to His Majesty by the right hon. gentleman or his colleagues, it will have to be properly engrossed, and the time remaining would scarcely be sufficient to put it in proper shape for presentation. Possibly the matter has escaped my right hon. friend's attention.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it has not. I have asked a gentleman, on whom I rely in these matters, to inform me what is the precedent with regard to this. I remember very well that we adopted addresses on the death of a sovereign, but whether we have had addresses to the incoming sovereign has escaped my memory. I shall let my hon. friend know at an early date next week.

THE SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE.

Bill (No. 179) respecting the Songhees Indian Reserve—Mr. Oliver—read the second

time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill is to give the necessary statutory authority to a transaction for the surrender of an Indian reserve situated near the city of Vancouver, B.C., which has been a source of difficulty for a number of years. Recently the British Columbia government made an arrangement with the Indians of this reserve for the surrender of their rights. This arrangement was not within the terms of the Indian Act, and required the sanction of parliament to give it proper legality. This Bill is simply to confirm the agreement, the terms of which are in the schedule of the Bill. It is somewhat extraordinary legislation, but the case was an extraordinary one, and such a one as warranted this radical departure from the ordinary procedure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is dependent on the surrender by the Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To carry out an agreement between this government, and the government of British Columbia respecting a piece of land which, I suppose, is required in connection with the growth, and extension of the city?

Mr. OLIVER. Exactly.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. OLIVER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 177) to amend The Indian Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the minister please explain this Bill. I may say that I have had some inquiry from Indians in various parts of the country, including, if I remember correctly, the Six Nations, who desired to know whether or not the Bill affected ther rights, and, if so, in what way?

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill is made up of four sections each independent of the other and each intended to meet a condition now existing in connection with the administration of Indian Affairs. I do not know that the Bill would especially affect the right of the Six Nations, but, if the conditions contemplated exist in the case of the Six Nations the Bill, of course, would be applicable in their case. But I may explain that it is not because of anything in connection with the Six Nations that the Bill is being brought forward. Several provisions are considered desirable owing to the changed conditions resultant from pressure of population. The Indian reserves throughout the country have been selected, one may say, with very good judgment; the reserves are probably the choice locations in the Dominion of Canada from one end to the other. Consequently, with increase of population and increase of value of land, there necessarily comes some clash of interest between the Indian and the white man. Now, while the purpose of the Indian Act is to protect the rights and interests of the Indians, and while the administration of the Indian Department is also for that special purpose, it is not right that the requirements of the expansion of white settlement should be ignored, —that is, that the right of the Indian should be allowed to become a wrong to the white man. Certain provisions of this Bill are made with a view, as far as possible, to protect the rights of the Indians and still protect the public interest, which, as the House is well aware, sometimes clashes to a certain degree with the rights of the Indian as set out in the Indian Act. I shall have to explain each provision in order to make my point perfectly clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the minister goes into the details, may I ask whether this Bill will be in conflict with any contract made between the Crown and the Indians, or in conflict with any treaty rights secured to the Indians during the period since this country was first settled? That is, by this Bill are we over-riding rights which have been secured to the Indians by contract or by treaty?

Mr. OLIVER. I can hardly answer the question as directly as it is asked. In taking the right to expropriate a right-of-way for a railway through an Indian reserve, it may be, we are infringing upon the treaty rights of the Indians; I am inclined to think that possibly we are. At the same time, it has been an established principle that, in the case of a railway, as the public interest is supposed to demand its construction, private rights must give way to the public interest. And it has been held—and it is a matter of law and administration that the Indian right stands in the same position as a private right of other parties and must give way to the public interest in this construction of a railway. The law as it stands makes provision for the expropriation of a right-of-way for a railway under a Dominion charter, but it does not make provision for the expropriation of right-of-way for a railway under a provincial charter. Certain cases have arisen in which railways under provincial charter required to cross an Indian reserve, and the present condition of the law practically means that the will, or wish, or it may be said even the whim, of a small band of Indians actually stands in the way of the will of the people of a whole province and of the

development by railway of a certain section of that province. The first section of this Bill embodies the principle, that, as it is considered right and proper to give expropriation rights against Indian lands to railways chartered by Dominion authority, it is also right to give that same right of expropriation to railways chartered by provincial authority. That is the purpose of the first section as it appears in the Bill, and the principle of that section I think will hardly be disputed.

The second section is the most important; it contains a very radical departure from previous legislation in regard to Indian rights and Indian land. But, it is the belief of the government that, in the light of recent circumstances, and particularly, I may say, in the light of the circumstances surrounding the surrender of the Songhees reserve—a Bill confirming which has just been consented to by parliament—some such action as is suggested in the second clause of this Bill is necessary for the mutual protection of the actual rights of the Indians and the well-being of the white people. For while we believe that the Indian, having a certain treaty right, is entitled ordinarily to stand upon that right and get the benefit of it, yet we believe also that there are certain circumstances and conditions in which the Indian by standing on his treaty rights does himself an ultimate injury as well as does an injury to the white people, whose interests are brought into immediate conjunction with the interests of the Indians. I have had the question of the Songhees' reserve under consideration for several years. It has been a difficult question to settle. The form of the settlement recently made has not been such as could be approved as a general principle. The settlement that was made could only be approved as a very exceptional case, and under exceptional conditions. The government believe that when such cases occur in the future, as they certainly will occur, it would be very much better that there should be a statutory provision having the sanction of parliament, that would adequately protect the material interests of the Indians, and at the same time would protect the interests and the welfare of the white community residing adjacent to the Indian reserve.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many heads of families in the Songhees band?

Mr. OLIVER. Forty-one, I think. The whole number of the band is about 100. It was the case of the Songhees reserve that brought particularly to the attention of the government the desirability of this provision in section 2. There was a band of Indians owning as well as occupying in common about 100 acres in the city of Victoria, most valuable land for the water front, and valuable for many other reasons; and their occupation constituted not only a bar to the progress of the city, and, therefore, to the welfare of its inhabitants and to the enterprise of the transportation companies, but by reason of the Indians remaining in occupation of this land in the city of Victoria, they themselves were not only not benefited, but were absolutely injured; they were worse off by reason of living upon this land than they would have been if they had been living in some other place. There was the question of title as between the provincial government and the Dominion government that seemed to complicate the case; but I need not discuss that now. But here was a case of 40 heads of families owning as well as occupying land that had a very great money value, but receiving absolutely no benefit from the ownership of that land beyond their mere occupation of it, and by reason of their occupation, the land being situated as it was, they themselves were suffering great moral deterioration. While we want to pay every respect to treaty rights—and I think nobody will accuse any government of Canada of doing otherwise than paying the fullest respect to treaty rights—it is absolutely necessary, in a progressive country, that existing circumstances and existing conditions should be taken account of. It does not seem to us that the condition existing in regard to the Songhees reserve should be repeated. We wish to prevent it, and we have provided a remedy that we believe is contained in section 2 of the Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is there any definite clause in the Indian Act whereby all the sales of Indian lands are conducted in a manner similar to the sales made by the government of other lands?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer my hon. friend directly without reference to the Act, but I do not think there is any specific requirement as to the form of sale; that is to say, there is no statutory requirement that the sale shall be by auction, or by tender after advertisement, or in any particular way; there is no provisioin in the Indian Act which is on all fours with the School Land Act, which makes the sale by auction mandatory in every case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that the sales conducted in the past have been made along very different lines. Some sales are made where the bushranger, or the man who has charge of a certain tract of country, disposes of that for the Indians, and reports to the department; and I notice they have many other ways of disposing of the land.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not be able to give my hon. friend definite information

without reference to the Act, but it is scarcely necessary, because whatever may have been the practice in the past, the present practice is that in all cases the land is sold by auction. I think the only exception is in the case of small islands in the Georgian bay, valued at less than $100; in those cases the land is sold at the valuator's price. All other Indian lands are sold at public auction. If it is the wish of the House I could give an explanation of the provisions of clause 2. The principle is that it is not to the interest of the Indians that they should occupy land immediately adjoining or forming part of a large town; and it is also accepted as a principle that wherever an Indian reserve does occupy land adjoining or within a town site, the existence of that reserve is ordinarily a detriment to the town. Therefore, we make provision in section 2 that when these conditions exist, that is to say, that the reserve lies close to a town or within a town, the town having a population of 10,000, then it shall be possible to bring before the Exchequer Court the merits of the case, and all the conditions which bear upon the Indians and the white people respectively. On the case being heard by the judge of the Exchequer Court, a decision may be given as to whether the Indians should be transferred from that reserve to some other locality. Provision is also made that when such a decision is rendered it shall cover the question of compensation for the land, and the question of exchange. The different subsections deal fully with the matter. It is first to prevent purely speculative demands for the removal of Indians, and next, when the case has been tried before an impartial tribunal, to provide to the full for the protection of the monetary and material rights and interests of the band the protection of which rights are a charge on the country.

Mr. PORTER. That object, of course, is one that commends itself to the reason of every person, but it appears to me that the provision, as made in this clause 2 of the Act, of which the hon. gentleman has just been speaking, delegates the authority of parliament to the judge of the Court of Exchequer. It appears to me that that is an erroneous principle. If in parliament the power is vested to deal with the matter, parliament alone should deal with it. I can quite understand that parliament could not, as a body, investigate the conditions as well as perhaps the judge of the Exchequer Court could do it, but it seems to me that if the judge of the Exchequer Court were empowered to investigate the conditions and then report to parliament and allow parliament to deal with the matter, parliament would be aware of the facts and circumstances and there would be no possibility of such a controversy arising in connection with the disposal of Indian lands as that which took place in parliament recently. It would be a wiser provision that the judge of the Exchequer Court should ascertain the facts, then present these facts to parliament and let parliament deal with the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the principle laid down by the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter), would be at all conducive to what we have in mind in introducing this Bill. Let me address myself to the question which was put a moment ago by my hon. friend opposite to my colleague as to whether or not this legislation is interfering with the treaty rights of the Indians. To a certain extent this legislation does interfere with the rights of the Indians. It has been at all times under British government, on this continent a principle that the rights of the Indians must be preserved. That is the primary law, and we have had evidence of great inconvenience to the public and to growing communities arising out of strict adherence to that principle. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), has just introduced a Bill —an exceptional Bill—to deal with a question such as this is. We had this question brought to our attention in connection with the Songhees Indians of British Columbia. Some forty or fifty years ago, perhaps more, Sir James Douglas made a treaty with the Songhees tribe and he gave them a tract of land on the shore of the ocean. Then it was nothing but the bleak shore, but in the course of time, the city of Victoria grew up around that reserve. It has been for a long time a grievance with the city of Victoria, that they could not improve the Songhees reserve. I need not say to my hon. friend that the Indians, with their habits, did not at all improve the tract of land which was in their possession. As this land bordered the ocean it was essential to the development of the city, but the Indians would not surrender their rights and for years it was a constant subject of dispute between the Indians and white men of Victoria. I am quite sure that when my hon. friend opposite visited Victoria he must have heard of it. All those who visited Victoria heard of it. At last it was settled by a happy compromise between the Dominion government, the provincial government and the Indians, but it was settled, as stated by my hon. friend, in a manner which would have been more acceptable if we had had a general law.

Now, there are other communities, especially in British Columbia, who are in

the vicinity of Indian reserves. The city of North Vancouver is in the vicinity of such a reserve and there is a reserve also in the vicinity of Vernon, in the Okanagan valley. Every one knows that when a city is growing up in the vicinity of an Indian reserve it is not a benefit, but rather an injury both to the Indian and the white man. What are we to do under such circumstances? We must preserve faith with the Indians. That is the first principle which we must adhere to. On the other hand we cannot ignore the condition of cities growing up in the vicinity of Indian reserves. How then is the matter to be settled? We have come to the conclusion that it should be settled under general principles, not as stated by my hon. friend from West Hastings, that parliament should be called upon to interfere and settle each particular case, but that every case should be settled by itself as the matter arises. What is the principle that is involved in this legislation? The principle involved in this legislation is that whenever there is a reserve in the vicinity of a city, or rather, whenever a city has arisen in the vicinity of a reserve, and has grown to the proportions of 10,000 souls, under such circumstances, not everybody, not every individual, but the Indian commissioner, may apply to the Court of Exchequer and put the question to the court whether or not it would be in the interest of all concerned, the Indians' interest first of all, and the interest of the communities in these growing cities, that the Indians should be dispossessed, upon fair compensation of course, and given another reserve, as we have done with the Songhees. When we made the agreement with the Songhees that they should give up their reserve, the provincial government undertook to give them a reserve elsewhere and pay them a certain sum of money. That would be the first question to be settled by the court. The Indians would be represented by the Indian commissioner, the city may be represented by its own counsel, the Court of Exchequer will determine, having taken all the circumstances into consideration, and having taken evidence, as to whether or not it is to the advantage of both the city and the Indians that another reserve should be provided for the Indians. If the court is of opinion that it is not in their interest, of course, the demand is not to be granted, but if the court is of opinion that the time has arrived when, in the interest of both the Indians and the city, the Indians should be transferred to another reserve, then the court will fix the conditions by which compensation will be given and under which the rights of the Indians will be preserved. I think it is as fair a settlement as it is possible to provide, and if you have general conditions embodied in a statute that course is preferable to leaving each case to be decided by parliament as it may arise.

Mr. PORTER. I think that the right hon. Prime Minister and myself are perfectly agreed; at least, I quite agree with the statement that he has made as to the advisability of determining this matter in the interests of the public and also in the interest of the Indians themselves. I only differ from the right hon. gentleman as to the manner in which the final act should be done. I quite agree with the procedure as it has been pointed out, down to the point where the judge of the Exchequer Court, having taken all the evidence and considered the conditions, will make a report to council recommending that (he thinks) that it is for the advantage of the Indians and of the white settlers as well, that a new reserve be given to these Indians, or that they should be allowed to continue where they are. That report, based upon the evidence submitted to the court, I think, ought to be submitted to parliament, and let parliament say whether the recommendation of the judge shall be approved, or whether it shall be rejected. That is the only point of difference between my right hon. friend and myself. It seems to me to be a bad principle for parliament to delegate its supreme authority to the court to deal with a matter of this kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think every hon. gentleman realizes that conditions exist to-day in the vicinity of cities and incorporated towns, particularly in western Canada, where it would be in the interests of the white population, and of the Indians themselves that the Indians should have lands allotted to them elsewhere. I suppose the government justifies this legislation upon the principle underlying the power of expropriation which is vested not only in the Crown, but in companies carrying on work of a semi-public character such as railways. On the other hand it must not be forgotten that this is a very extreme step and one altogether out of the path of tradition so far as the Canadian government is concerned. For the past two hundred years, it is our boast that the British government has scrupulously observed its contracts and treaties with the Indians, and the Indian has learned to know that he can look forward at all times with confidence to the sacred fulfilment of any treaty he makes with the British Crown. It may be that the necessities arising out of the growth of this country, especially in the west should justify parliament in taking the extreme step now proposed, but I do not

believe that this parliament or this government has any warrant to go about it in the wholesale way proposed by this Bill. The breaking of treaties with the Indians of this country—because you cannot put it lower than that—is a thing that should not be entered on with precipitation. I have letters from men whose ancestors fought under the British flag in the war of the American Revolution, and came to this country under solemn treaty made with the British government at that time, and under these treaties, which are in force to-day, these men have been allotted lands in this country. When you ask parliament to pass a law under which treaties that have been sacredly observed for a hundred and fifty years shall be departed from at the instance of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs upon the order of a court, and without any right to the Indians so far as this legislation shows, to be represented on that proceeding, except by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, you are proposing a very extreme step. The Indians in Canada have certain rights granted to them by treaties, and, heretofore, these treaties have never been departed from except with the consent of the Indians themselves. You treat the Indians as not being capable of dealing with their own affairs, you treat them as wards of the government, and you who are their guardians propose to judge for yourselves and through your own courts as to whether or not treaties made with the Indians shall be departed from, and you do not purpose that that proposal shall come before the parliament of the nation every time a treaty is to be violated. On the contrary your purpose is to create a procedure and a practice by which every one of these treaties can, without the future sanction of parliament, be departed from without any effective means being afforded the Indians to oppose the carrying out of any particular project in any particular instance. I venture to think that the suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) is a wise one. If we take the extreme step of departing from any one of these treaties without the consent of the Indians, each particular instance should be brought before parliament in order that parliament may determine whether or not such a condition has arisen as would justify any such extreme step. We ought not to go further than that.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). I heartily concur in the remarks of the leader of the opposition, I believe that the power that the government is asking in this Bill is altogether too arbitrary when they propose to take from the Indians the reserves granted to them by the Crown without giving them any voice in the matter. I have here two letters addressed to me by the Six Nation Indians who are very much concerned in the matter. They have a magnificent reserve lying within six miles of Brantford which has a population of over 10,000, and if this legislation is passed their reserve is liable to be confiscated under this extraordinary power given to the Exchequer Court. The letters are long, and I shall only read one or two paragraphs from the letter addressed to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Their letter to me reads:

We have inclosed herewith a letter of inquiry to you which with its questions is almost verbatim identical with letters of inquiry addressed to Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Wm. Paterson which we believe will fully explain the subject matter to you.

We ask these questions because we consider that should this Bill apply to the Six Nations it would be trampling upon our conceded rights from the British Crown. The Six Nations having been granted their lands by special deeds (Haldimand and Simcoe deeds) from the British government with whom they formed an alliance both offensive and defensive, and having been always in the early history of British North America, recognized and treated as allies of Great Britain, in the various wars in North America at that early period were given a special deed of the lands bordering upon the Grand river, and which were set apart as their reserve as compensation for the lands which lost and forfeited in the State of New York and other parts of the United States while fighting for the British cause in the battles of the American revolution. In view of these facts the Six Nations are on a different footing from those of any other band of Indians in Canada, in that they hold a special deed of it from the British Crown, for reasons as already stated herein.

Should it appear to you and your colleagues in the loyal opposition that this Bill apply to and disastrously affect the Six Nations we would be pleased if you would ask the government to supply you with more data and particulars bearing upon the peculiar and unique position which the Six Nations occupy in their relation to the Crown and in the holding of their lands.

As the city of Brantford is within ten miles of this reserve we are of the opinion that an aim is being made by some unscrupulous persons to legislate us out of our reserve, by virtue, of this enactment, in a similar manner as was done on the St. Peters reserve.

We will furnish you further details of this matter, should it be required by you and your colleagues. We shall also esteem it a favour if you will kindly send us copies of the unrevised 'Hansard' during the time that this Bill is pending before the House.

This is signed by Chief Josiah Hill, Chief Jamieson and Chief J. W. M. Elliott. Secretary of the Correspondence Committee of the Six Nation Indians. I have another long petition from the Indians which I do not intend to inflict on the House, but there are some questions here to which

they ask me to secure answers from the government. After reciting the different clauses of this Bill, this petition goes on to say:

We therefore, in behalf of the chiefs of the Six Nation council and of the people of the Six Nations, beg to request that you will kindly ascertain, and tell us from information which you may be able to obtain, either from private members or from the floor of the House, answers to the following questions, to which we will be pleased to receive answers from you.

1st. Is it the intention of the government to make this enactment a general one, and applicable to all Indian reserves in Canada?

2. This committee also asks; what is the full intention of this Bill?

3. Does it include or apply to the Six Nation Indians or their reserve, or not?

This is signed by the same chiefs who signed the other. They point out in an earlier part of this petition that you are taking power to run a railway through a reserve, and may at any time confiscate part of the reserve for railway purposes without obtaining the consent of the band. The Indian Act provides how Indian lands shall be alienated. Clause 49 of that Act sets forth clearly that no land can be alienated from a band of Indians until the band have been called in council and a full majority of the male members of the band have voted in favour of the alienation. The present Bill seems to be a departure from the provisions of the Indian Act. It is a drastic change which I do not think ought to be enacted at this time. I concur most fully in the suggestion that there should be a thorough investigation. I believe that it is quite proper for the minister to take power to have the matter investigated by the court; but after all the information has been obtained, I believe that information should be submitted to parliament, and parliament should say whether or not it is in the interest of the country and in the interest of the Indians themselves that their lands should be alienated and that they should be removed to some other reserve. I feel that the powers asked for in this Bill are altogether too arbitrary. They would violate treaties made with the Indians by the Crown of Great Britain. We have always boasted of the manner in which we have treated the Indians in this Dominion, contrasted with the treatment they have received in other parts of this continent; but if we enact this measure, we shall be taking power to violate every treaty that we have made with the Indians in British North America without consulting them. We shall be giving the Superintendent General powers that I do not think any Superintendent General or the Department of Indian Affairs ought to have. I think it would be just as reasonable for the minister to propose a Bill to do away with the dual language in Canada as one to deprive the Indians of their treaty rights, and if any man brought before this House a Bill for any such purpose, it would raise a howl in the country that would open the eyes of the government. I can conceive of special cases like that in Victoria; but in that case the arrangement was made after consultation with the Indians by the British Columbia government and the Indian Department of this government, which is supposed to protect the rights of the Indians; so that the Indians had an opportunity of bargaining what compensation they should have and how the change should be brought about. But this legislation, if it goes through, will deprive the Indians on every reserve in Canada of that right. The minister in charge of the department might see fit to ask for the removal of any band of Indians in any part of Canada who came within the scope of the Bill without giving them any opportunity of arguing their side of the case or voting according to the regulations provided by the Indian Act. It has always been well understood that no lands could be alienated from any Indian band in Canada without the full consent and concurrence of the Indians themselves, and I think it is an arbitrary act on the part of the government to ask for power to take that right away from them.

Mr. PARDEE. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) that the Bill contains such arbitrary provisions as he tries to make out. I think the primary question to be considered is how to get at what is to-day in a great many vicinities a pretty burning question. There ought to be some principle laid down by this House, either the way the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) has suggested, or otherwise, or at least some measure ought to be adopted by this House providing some means to meet just such cases as are covered by this Bill. That instance is not the only one of a community which adjoins an Indian reserve in which it is in the interests of the Indians, as well as the community, that they should be moved to another reserve. There can be no question about that at all in the minds of any one who has actual knowledge of the conditions on such reserves. Whether or not the case is as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) puts it, I am not prepared to say; but it does appear to me, although it may not be specifically said in this Bill, that the Indians on any reserve have a right to be heard before the reserve is taken from them in the way provided in this Bill. It would not be in the mind of any one that a reserve could be taken without the Indians being given a chance to state their case, and I have no doubt that such op-

portunity will be given them by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Taking the Bill as a whole, I am entirely in accord with it. Although it is very desirable that the Indian rights should be fully taken care of, these rights should not be allowed to overshadow everything else. The interests of growing communities have to be recognized. If you take nine-tenths of the Indians throughout the Dominion on reserves close to growing communities, and remove them to some other reserves, where they have equal rights and privileges, 99 per cent of the Indian population will be just as happy and well off as they are to-day, and in many cases better off, because it is usually to the detriment of the Indian that he should live near a large municipality. I think, therefore, that the principle of the Bill should be adopted whatever may be the way finally decided upon as the proper way in which to carry it out. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) says that the only way in which a portion of an Indian reserve can be taken from the Indians is by vote of the tribe or surrender. But the moment you go to an Indian for a large or small surrender, he will make the price upon the land so absolutely prohibitive that it is almost impossible to get it. Even though the Indian may have treaty rights, which he undoubtedly has, I do not think that he should be allowed to retain a position in which he can absolutely refuse the surrender of lands imperatively needed for a growing community. Therefore, I support the principle of the Bill; and whatever conclusion this House may come to as to the ultimate machinery by which these lands may be taken from the Indians, or surrendered by them, after a decision by this House, or the Supreme Court or otherwise, some machinery ought to be put upon the statute-book in order that that may be accomplished.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all right for the superior power now in this country, the white power, that came in at first and dispossessed the original possessors, and has taken nine-tenths, and possibly more, of all the lands the Indian then possessed, and has pushed its settlements right up to the treaty lands which these Indians supposed they had preserved to them by the honour of the British sovereign, the great father of the Indians—it is all right for the supreme white power now to come and say that this sort of thing ought not to be continued, that it is against the interests of civilization, and then add the comforting plea—of which the supreme white power makes itself the sole judge—that it is also against the interests of the Indians themselves. But although we have the power to-day, we must recollect how we came to have it. We must take into consideration our position as compared with that of the Indian. If you take away from him the rights conferred on him by treaty, you must be magnanimous in the first place, and in the second place, if any change be made, you ought to surround it with every possible precaution. I am not so unreasonable as to say that instances will not occur in which it will not be for the benefit of both that other reserves be given the Indians, and that they should vacate their present reserves. But they should not be compelled to give up their reserves arbitrarily. And no reserve should be taken from them without the most sacred sanction possible that they will receive fair consideration, and fair treatment. I think the least that can be put around the Indian right in the first position of things is to give him the opportunity of believing and knowing that the supreme authority in this country will have final supervision, and that is the parliament of Canada. Now, I hope my right hon. friend will not allow this legislation to go through in the way it is proposed. I believe it would be an outrage. I have not as much confidence in the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs as I had when I was much younger. I used to think that he was a sort of God in equity, whose whole object was to conserve the rights of the Indian first and entirely. I have modified my opinion, and look upon that official now as the paid officer of a party government, and certain things which have occurred within the experience of men who have been in public life the last 25 years would, I think, bear out that conclusion.

Why, by this legislation you put it in the power of a man who gets his position because of public service, who holds it at the will or whim of a party, and who is under the absolute domination of one of the members of the cabinet to practically dispossess the Indian of what he holds by right of solemn treaty. I do not think that will commend itself to the people of this country, and I do not believe it commends itself to the good sense of this House. You must have some method and means, some mechanism ; but there is one body to whom, before his rights are taken from him, the Indian should have the right to appeal, and that is the parliament which represents the whole people of this country and not merely a part of the people or a party from amongst the people. You make it possible under this Bill to dispossess any Indian tribe of all they possess, and to do it in the absence of parliament, and without the knowledge of parliament. Is not that true? After we separate, after the prorogation of parliament, your Superintendent General is told to get busy. He does; and when he is told he does it quickly. The matter of the dispossession of the

Indians is brought before another paid official of this government specially appointed—not before a board of judges, but one single judge, who, however able he may be, has not the wisdom, nor in his court can there be the co-ordinating and corrective power that there is in a bench of justices. He undertakes the examination and makes his award, which goes to council, and council, within three or four or five months after the commencement of the proceedings may dispossess a band of Indians of their solemn treaty rights even against the protest of those Indians themselves. I say that is not right; I say it is outrageous. You may argue that it is not the government that does it, but parliament which has given the authority. The majority of parliament gives the authority, that is the majority of the party in power. Now, I say that the parliament of Canada, itself should have the first say about the matter. I am met with the argument that the government is responsible to parliament, which can punish them if they do wrong. What an empty thing that is! Any who have been in this parliament for the last ten years know how empty a thing it is. Suppose that the grossest injustice is done and a member of parliament brings up the matter and asks for a Royal Commission of investigation, has he the least chance in the world of ever getting it? We know that now it has come to be an absolutely tenet of the party opposite to allow no investigation. You will get no investigation, and consequently you will not be able to get any facts, but the facts that the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs chooses to give you, including the report of the judge as to matters of examination and compensation. But suppose you did get an investigation, the Indian is dispossessed, his property is gone from him. I believe there should be no general plan, no mechanism which can be used in this way, but that if a case occurs that case should be submitted to parliament, and parliament should be wise enough to do the right thing in the matter. Submit it to parliament, with the report of the judges, and all other information that can be given to enable parliament to be seized of the facts of the case. But I believe that parliament should deal with the case before the Indian is dispossessed; and I shall be deeply sorry, and I believe that a great wrong will be committed, if this matter is made an order in council—Superintendent General of Indian Affairs matter, to be decided outside of the cognizance of parliament. The Indian holds what he holds by virtue of the honour and sense of justice of the British Crown. It is conferred upon him by treaty, and it is a mighty solemn piece of business when we undertake to dispossess the Indian of that which belongs to him by treaty—a mighty solemn piece of business—and ought to be surrounded with every safeguard. I have in memory instances of how Indian lands have been dispensed within the last ten years in this country, and by this government, and it does not enamour me more of this mode of operating through the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs—the will of the minister with an order in council which he gets to bear him out.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I wish to confirm what has been well said by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) as to the undesirability and, in fact, the wrong of interfering lightly with treaties made with these Indians. The views of hon. members seem to be affected in some cases by the question of whose ox is gored. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) no doubt, takes the view that this Bill would be popular from the white man's standpoint; but we should remember that these Indians are in our power, and we should try to defend those who have no other defenders. I therefore, take the side, as I generally do, of the weak, and the weak in this case are the red men. They have treaties which it is suggested by this legislation we should practically set aside. It seems to me the first question involved is not the question whether it will be better for the white man living in the neighbourhood of the red man's land, but the question of breaking a pact made with the ancestors of these Indians. It will not do the country any good to start in that line. If this country has a standing in the world to-day, it is because it is supposed to keep its pacts; it is a child of the British nation which always keeps its pacts. I do not want any new or twentieth-century ideas in that regard ; the idea which for hundreds of years have been the strength and the honour of the British nation are the ideas that I would prefer to see maintained. These pacts have been made and they are not to be altered without conference and negotiation. The Indians have located upon certain pieces of land, and they are entitled to the luck—if you like to call it that—and the benefits derived from the fact that their land turns out to be in a progressive part of the country. If land taken up by our ancestors turned out to be valuable, we should not expect that fact to be made a reason why we should hand those lands over to somebody else. And we must give the red man the same quality of justice that we would give to the white man similarly situated. If the Indians see it to be in their interest to change for a larger quantity of land, they should have the right to negotiate; and I think, with

all due deference to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, that they are more likely to make a good bargain for themselves than he to make it for them. But they should be allowed to negotiate and not have their land confiscated. They should not be obliged to change to another location even if it is, as the hon. member for West Lambton says is a fact, absolutely blocking some deal that white men want to put through. They have a right to block anything they do not think in their interest. Supposing we did pass some legislation, who is to judge of the expediency in this matter? What qualification has the judge of the Exchequer Court to deal with the question of expediency here? He is not authorized to make but only to administer the laws which this parliament makes. Then there is no provision made here that any particular people shall be notified. It is true judge of the Exchequer Court would have the right to call any one before him he saw fit, but he is not obliged to; and the imputation throughout the statute is that he is to be guided by the opinion of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. I do not think we ought to delegate to any judge a large question of this kind. Where it is proposed to break a contract made by His Majesty's government with these people, this parliament is the only competent authority to deal with the question. We should be very careful indeed, even as a parliament, before we undertake to interfere with that contract. I do not think even a bench of judges, not even fifty judges, have a right to interfere with this solemn contract, simply because they are not elected by the people and are not responsible for the honour of the country, and we should not lay upon them the responsibility of an Act so grave. But if the government is bound to pass this Act, notwithstanding the protest of the leader of the opposition, the minister should, when he comes to section 5, consent to have this matter reported to the Governor in Council, and let the Governor in Council report it to parliament at its next session for parliament to act upon.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). I have no hesitation in saying that I am in thorough accordance with the principle of this Bill. In saying this I do not mean to say that it is a principle that should apply to Indians all over Canada, but it is a principle that does thoroughly apply to an Indian reserve with which I am acquainted. There is an Indian reserve of something over 100 square miles situated between North Bay and Sturgeon Falls. The Indians on that reserve would not be benefited if they were represented on a board to take care of their own interests. They are simply children, children of the forest, and I believe they would be protected just as well under the provisions of this Bill as they could be in any other way. I desire to see the interests of the Indians protected in every way, protected just as well as those of the white men, and even better, because they require more protection from the fact that they are not able to look after themselves. Take the case of this reserve between Sturgeon Falls and North Bay. It would help the Indians, it would help the country, and it would help the surrounding towns to have a road built through that reserve, but the Indians will not agree to it. It would be a very material help to the Indians if they were moved into some other place away from the white people, and I think the Indians are of the same opinion. What may apply to Indians in other localities, Indians who are more intelligent, if you like, may not apply to the Indians I refer to. I would only say in conclusion that I think the principle laid down in this Bill would be a good principle to adopt with regard to the reserve situated in my constituency.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior how many acres of Indian lands he has disposed of within the last ten years?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to give my hon. friend the information offhand, but I could give it to-morrow.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In reference to this matter, I wish to say that as to the way the Indian lands have been disposed of in the past, they have been sold at ridiculously low prices, practically given away to friends of this government. Now, this Bill proposes to give to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs more power than he has had in the past. I think it is our duty to investigate this measure thoroughly before taking action. I ask you to remember this fact, that on the 9th of March, 1908, I asked the Minister of the Interior how many acres of Indian lands had been sold since 1896, and what was the total amount received for them, and the answer was that 620,000 acres had been sold from the 1st of July, 1896, to the 31st of March, 1907, and the amount of money received was only $1,525,000, or about $2.50 an acre. This method of disposing of the Indian lands has been continued year after year up to the present time. When we find that a Bill now is to be introduced whereby the Superintendent of Indian Affairs can simply dispose of Indian lands without coming before parliament or making any public sale I feel satisfied that we are taking a very serious step in reference to the Indians.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At six o'clock I was calling the attention of the House to the manner in which the sales of Indian lands have been conducted and arguing that if the object of this Bill was to hand over the disposal of Indian lands to the Superintendent General it would be most unwise for parliament to pass such a measure. I realize that in some cases it may be wise to dispose of Indian lands, but is it not possible that some better scheme could be adopted. On June 15, 1906, the Minister of the Interior submitted a Bill to amend the Indian Act and the discussion on that measure is reported in 'Hansard' as follows:

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the policy of the minister in reference to these reserves? Is he going to sell any of them that are not utilized by the Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the suggestion as it was put forward in the House, and that is the policy of the department as I will take occasion to point out. It may be interesting to the committee to know just how much land is affected this way. I have had some figures prepared which show that in the province of Manitoba the Indian population is 6,870, and that the area of reserve is 326,013 acres. The Indians are entitled, under the treaty, to 160 acres to each family of five, but, taking the Indian population and the area of the reserve, there are to-day held in Manitoba a surplus of 106,073 acres over and above what was recognized in Manitoba as their treaty right. That amounts to one-third of the area to which they are properly entitled in setting apart those reserves. Of course, the Indian Department or the government have no right or authority to interfere with their holding, although it is in excess of the amount contemplated by treaty. The only way they can be induced to release their holding is by purchase, as they are proprietors in every sense. In Saskatchewan and Alberta there is an Indian population of 14,020 and the acreage of the reserve is 2,619,154. In the Northwest the Indians, under the treaty, are entitled to 600 acres to each family of five. But, on that calculation, there is left a surplus of 824,954 acres in Saskatchewan and Alberta over and above the treaty allowance of 640 acres to each Indian family of five. If the Indian treaty in the Northwest was on the same basis as that of Manitoba—that is, 160 acres to each family of five—the surplus in the Northwest would be 2,171,114 acres. That is to say, that the Indians in Saskatchewan and Alberta are holding to-day 2,171,114 acres over and above 160 acres to each family of five.

If it is the intention of the Minister of the Interior that he should dispose of all these lands so as to leave each Indian in the Northwest with 160 acres or 640 acres as the case may be, then he is taking a very advance step in the Indian administration. The Indians are our wards, and it is our duty to look after their interests as we would our own. This Bill places in the hands of the Indian Department extraordinary powers. Subsection 2 of clause 2 reads:

2. The order in council made in the case shall be certified by the Clerk of the Privy Council to the Registrar of the Exchequer Court of Canada, and the judge of the court shall thereupon proceed as soon as convenient to fix a time and place, of which due notice shall be given by publication in 'The Canada Gazette,' and otherwise as may be directed by the judge, for taking the evidence and hearing and investigating the matter.

Subsection 5 reads:

5. The judge shall transmit his findings, with the evidence and a report of the proceedings, to the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council may thereupon give effect to the said findings and cause the reserve or any part thereof from which it is found expedient to remove the Indians to be sold, aliened or leased upon the best terms which, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, may be obtained therefor.

This enables the Superintendent General and the Governor in Council to dispose of these lands as they see fit. Would it not be wise, if it is necessary to take such a course as this, that each case should be submitted to parliament, and that parliament be allowed to have something to say in the matter. We all know how 48,000 acres of the St. Peter's Indian reserve was disposed of for $5 per acre and less, and now that the Indians are removed from that reserve there is little in the treasury to represent the value of that land which to-day is worth $20 or $25 an acre. I call the attention of the minister to the fact that some years ago 500,000 acres of Indian lands were disposed of by the agents of the department at an upset price which I submit is a most unfair way in which to sell the heritage of the Indians.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Does not the hon. member know that for years past not an acre of Indian land has been sold except to the highest bidder at public auction?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That may be.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Why don't you say so?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What I say is that previous to 1906 the lands were sold in the way in which I have described. I placed the whole story on 'Hansard,' and since then the minister has been more careful. But when it comes to selling lands at public auction in the way in which the St. Peter's reserve lands were sold, there is no doubt in the world but that the Indians do not receive justice. Then, another section of this Bill says:

171. The annuities payable to Indians in pursuance of the conditions of any treaty

expressed to have been entered into on behalf of His Majesty or his predecessors, and for the payment of which the government of Canada is responsible, shall be a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and be payable out of any unappropriated moneys forming part thereof.

It seems that even the government can go to work and dispose of the money in compensating the men who have been carrying on the sale and in that way distribute to a large extent the amount received from these lands. If the government is determined to push this measure through there ought to be a clause inserted in it providing that Indian lands shall be sold by public auction, and that not less than three months' notice by advertisement shall be given of the sale, and, further, that all sales should be ratified by parliament. I call the attention of the minister, in this connection, to an article which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of Saturday, February 28, 1908, which is well worthy of his consideration. That article reads:

When, in the year 1869 the Hudson Bay Company surrendered the vast territory which they had held for two centuries to the British government, it was immediately transferred to Canada, but the purchase was made at an immense outlay. It would seem at a casual glance that all that was necessary was to bring immigrants to the country, but there were other claimants to the fertile lands, and their claims could not be overlooked.

It was the Indian tribes who for centuries had been lords of the western empire, where they chased the buffalo over the plains and caught fish from the lakes and streams that formed the great obstacle in the way of peopling the new possession. Something necessarily must be done, and the claimants opened the way by asking the government to make treaty with them. They feared they were to be driven from the land of their fathers, and they wanted something in return.

The passage of the Manitoba Act brought matters to a head. Hon. Joseph Howe, who was at that time Secretary of State, appointed Wemyss M. Simpson, Indian commissioner, to go to Winnipeg, and by treaty secure the extinction of the Indian title to Manitoba and all fertile lands possible. The new commissioner secured the assistance of Hon. Jas. Mackay, who was widely known and respected by all the Indian tribes of the west. On the advice of Governor Archibald all the Indians of the Chippewa and Swampy Cree tribes were invited to gather at lower Fort Garry, twenty miles from Winnipeg, and there they would be met by a representative of their great mother who would talk to them.

The great meeting took place on June 27, 1871, and more than one thousand Indians, men, women and children, gathered outside the fort before the day set. When their tents were pitched along the banks of the Red river it formed a most interesting sight. To prevent the sale of liquor and also to make an impression upon the savages, Major Irvine, in charge of the troops at Winnipeg—now governor of Manitoba penitentiary—was present with a body of soldiers. All the provisions during the nine days' negotiations were furnished by the government, and it was no inconsiderable item.

Governor Archibald first addressed the Indians. He told them that they were not to be driven out by the incoming settlers, but that the most fertile lands would be given to the Indians. Nothing was to be left undone to better the condition of the red men. 'Your great mother,' said Governor Archibald, 'wishes the good of all races under her sway. She wishes her red children to be happy and contented. She wishes them to live in comfort. She would like them to adopt the habits of the whites, to till land and raise food and store it up against a time of want. She thinks this would be the best thing for her red children to do, that it would make them safer from famine and distress, and make their homes more comfortable.

'Your great mother, therefore, will lay aside for you "lots" of land, to be used by you and your children forever. She will not allow the white man to intrude upon these lots. She will make rules to keep them for you, so that as long as the sun shall shine there shall be no Indian who has not a place that he can call his home, where he can go and pitch his camp, or if he chooses build his house and till his land.'

The address of Governor Archibald, whom the Indians recognized as a friend, created a deep impression upon the assembled red men.

The Indians were promised that their rights would be reserved in that western country. We cannot be too careful in passing legislation such as this, and I would urge on the minister to insert a clause in the Bill which will provide distinctly that from this time forward all Indian lands to be sold shall be sold at public auction after three months' advertisement has been given of that fact, and that a statement of all the Indian lands which are up for disposal in that manner shall be laid before parliament for our general approval before they are disposed of.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. OLIVER. In connection with the proposed amendment, I wish to offer, for the consideration of the committee, a further suggestion in the same line. I recognize that it is somewhat irregular, and I merely bring it before the committee for its consideration, as a substitute for the section in the printed Bill. If we agree to it, we may not be able to make the substitution to-night. As I have said, the Indian Act, as it now exists, provides for the expropriation of a right-of-way for a railway which has a Dominion charter. The section in the printed Bill extends that principle to the case of a provincially chartered railway. There are other cases

in which the public interest requires that there should be a right-of-way across or through a reserve, for instance, for a public road or a power transmission line. It seems to me that in such cases, where the public requires that private right in private property shall give way to the public interest represented by the enterprise, whatever it may be, it is only reasonable that the Indian reserve should be placed in the same position as private property. For that reason I am taking the liberty of offering to the committee a substitution for the proposed section which would have the effect I speak of. The section has been drafted by the Department of Justice, so that the committee may assume that it is correct and in legal form. The only question is, will the committee be willing to extend the principle beyond railways and to other rights-of-way that may be necessary in the interest of the white people adjacent to a reserve, of course with adequate compensation to the Indians for any detraction from their rights. The proposed substitution is as follows:

No portion of any reserve shall be taken for the purpose of any railway, road, public work or work designed for any public utility without the consent of the Governor in Council, but any company or municipal or local authority having statutory power either Dominion or provincial for the taking or using of any lands or any interest in lands without the consent of the owner may, with such consent as aforesaid, and subject to the terms and conditions imposed by such consent, exercise such statutory power with respect to any reserve or portion of a reserve, and in any such case compensation shall be made therefor to the Indians of the band, and the exercise of such power and the taking of the lands or interest therein and the determination and payment of the compensation shall, unless otherwise provided by the order in council evidencing the consent of the Governor in Council, be governed by the requirements applicable to the like proceedings by such company, municipal or local authority in ordinary cases.

The intention of this section is to place the Indian reserve in the same position as private property when required for the purpose of right-of-way for a railway, Dominion or provincial, a public road, a power transmission line, or other public enterprise, but on the responsibility of the Governor in Council, both as to permission to exercise the right of expropriation and as to the conditions upon which that right may be exercised. I think those members of the committee who reside or have interests adjacent to Indian reserves, have found in many cases that the public interest is being seriously hampered by the inability to get right-of-way across or through a reserve, and it seems to me that this is a proper extension of the principle that has already been established, and it would seem to me that in the terms laid down the interests of the Indians are absolutely safeguarded while the interests of the public are given due consideration. I have no wish to force the amendment on the committee at all, and if it is not considered desirable to deal with it to-night, I would like to have the Bill reprinted with this section substituted for the printed section.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention of the hon. minister in the later clause to enact that all lands shall be sold at public auction, and that three months' advertising shall be given?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the suggestion a very fair and reasonable one, but I would suggest that it only be made applicable to the lands affected by this Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why not to all Indian lands?

Mr. OLIVER. I would be quite willing if we were dealing with the general question, but we are now dealing with a special question and conditions and should restrict our enactments to these.

Mr. STAPLES. I notice that in section 2, 49a, this Bill is restricted to incorporated cities or towns with a population of not less than 10,000. In former sessions I endeavoured to have the hon. minister open up a certain Indian reserve located near a village in the constituency I represent, the village of Swan River. According to this section, this Bill will not apply to that reserve. The people of that particular district are very anxious to have this reserve opened up. A portion was opened up a little over a year ago, and sold by auction, and in so far as that particular reserve was concerned, everything was perfectly fair and straight. In my opinion this Bill should cover such a case as I have cited. The citizens of that town are very anxious to have that valuable land brought under cultivation. I, therefore, would suggest that the Bill not only apply to incorporated cities and towns with a population of 10,000, but to such cases as I have brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that in view of the very strong position taken by some prominent members of the House—and I think quite justifiably taken—as to the radical departure from the usual practice of Indian administration that is embodied in this section, I do not think that the committee would care to go further than we are now doing. We are only making this departure under the absolute stress of circumstances, such as every one admits, prevail where an Indian reserve abuts upon a town or city

of 10,000 population. We desire to have the principle involved, put outside of argument as to its merits, and for that reason I would not like to carry the principle further than it is in this Bill. While I do not wish to carry this principle further, I want to justify it as applied in this case, on the ground of absolute right. I wish to be distinctly understood that the last thing the government wishes to do is to depart from the traditionary policy of Great Britain and Canada, of absolutely fair dealing with the Indians in every particular. When the Indian is given land for occupation, or a reserve is set apart for him, that land is given him, not for speculation but for use and occupation. It is given him so that he may be afforded the opportunity of earning his livelihood; but it was never contemplated that a reserve should be held for the speculative value, which it is bound to have by reason of its being in the immediate vicinity of a town of 10,000 inhabitants. The Indian land gains its speculative value through causes which did not enter into consideration when the reserve was set apart; and we think that this new and unexpected condition coming into the question alters the case very materially from what it originally was when the land was deeded to the Indian and declared absolutely inalienable. The Indian having, for reasons over which he had no control, come into property which has a large cash value, it is the duty of his guardian to see that he gets the benefit of that increased value, and that benefit he does not get by simply occupying the land. I want to deny the suggestion that in the proposition we have placed before the House there is anything but the fullest and most complete regard for the rights and the interests of the Indians. I submit to the committee that if a band of Indians is living in poverty on land that is worth a large amount of actual money, it is not fair to the Indian that he should continue to live in that condition when, by a proper sale of that property, he could realize an amount of money which, even if it would not support him in comparative comfort, would at least put him in a position in which he could use the remainder of that particular reserve or reserve land in some other place to his own greater advantage. That has been the object which has guided our action in bringing this proposition before the House. The object is not to derogate from the right of the Indians in any way, but to secure to the Indians the benefit of the rights which have been given to them. And, inasmuch as these rights have come to the Indian, not by his own action, not as contemplated by the treaty, we believe that we are justified in taking extraordinary means in order that he may get the benefit on the one hand and that, on the other, the progress of the white population shall not be unduly impeded. To repeat, as to the suggestion of my hon. friend, while I think this is a sound principle, it is only sound when it is supported by absolutely incontrovertible facts and by extreme conditions. That being the case, I would not feel that we were warranted in dealing with the case which my hon. friend mentioned, which is the case of agricultural lands, not lands of special value because of the proximity of towns.

Mr. STAPLES. I have listened carefully to what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has said. He proposes to make the Bill applicable to Indian reserves adjacent to cities or towns of ten thousand population. No doubt the citizens of these respective towns wherever they may be, are jealous of their position. I want to tell the minister and the committee that the citizens of Swan Lake and Marieopolis, between which this Indian reserve lies, are quite as zealous, and quite as anxious to develop their localities as are the people of cities that wish to extend their boundaries. That reserve is the most fertile land in the province of Manitoba. The citizens of the towns I have mentioned have petitioned the government, and I presented the case to the minister, and have succeeded in getting a portion of it opened up. If you are going to make this applicable to towns and cities, then I say that the smaller places are as much entitled to the same consideration. While I agree with the minister that the Indians should be dealt with in a lenient manner, and should get full value for their land, yet I claim that if we are going to make such legislation as this, you should make it apply to all the cases brought to the attention of the committee as well as to cases affecting a population of ten thousand.

Mr. MAGRATH. Legislation of this kind, it seems to me, is along right lines. We must not, of course, overlook the fact that the Indian is our ward, and we have to look after his welfare. The reasons why legislation of this character is necessary are two. The first is that it may not always be desirable to have masses of white people thrown up against the boundary of an Indian reserve. It is not good for the Indian physically or morally. The second reason is that the situation frequently precludes the settlement immediately adjoining the reserve from expanding. I think the attitude taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is fair and right. Treaties are sacred, and I believe that the only tribunal in this country that should have the power to do away with them is the people themselves through their accredited representatives in parlia-

ment. The machinery in the Bill appears to me to be satisfactory. I cannot see any reason why it should not be added to, so as to provide that where the Act is enforced, each case dealt with must be finally ratified by parliament. I do not think it would delay matters very much, and it would be a safeguard. I see the force of the remarks of the Minister of the Interior in reference to fixing a limit of ten thousand people. But if the presence of ten thousand white people are not good for the Indian, it seems to me that the same idea holds as to a smaller population, say two thousand people. The situation, however, that the two thousand people find themselves in, is that they have to remain there until they have increased to ten thousand before this feature of the law can be put into effect. I think the difficulty could be overcome in this way by providing that the value of the land to be taken from the Indians must be based upon the prices that would prevail should the population be ten thousand. If the two thousand people are prepared to pay such prices, I do not see why that should not be satisfactory. To settle the thing in that way would enable the two thousand people to develop as they would like to, and it would equally protect the Indians, and give them the enhanced values created by the larger population. I throw that out as a suggestion for the consideration of the minister. He knows that in my own constituency there is a town that is suffering for want of adjoining Indian territory needed in its development. That town will grow in time to ten thousand. Then why hold them back from a privilege which will be theirs at a later time, and the enjoyment of which now will greatly help them in their development?

Mr. OLIVER. The question is a very involved one; and I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Magrath) did not pay as strict attention to the remarks of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and his colleague from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as I did. But I may say that I did not need their remarks to impress me with the truth and weight of everything they said as to the vast importance of a departure of this radical character; and I would caution everybody concerned that in making such a radical departure, we must be very careful and not allow to be created in any way the impression that the Indian's rights are made, or are to be made, the subject of what you might call speculative transactions. The suggestion that my hon. friend made that wherever the land would bring the ten thousand population price that would be a sufficient justification for the expropriation of the land is all right in theory, but I do not know any way in which we could satisfy the world at large that we are getting for the Indian the full value for his land except a sale by auction after advertisement. Then, if a large population is not there, I do not know how we are going to get the price, I do not know any way to fix it.

Mr. MAGRATH. Sell by auction at an upset price.

Mr. OLIVER. That hardly meets the case. We fix an upset price, that is true, but there must be an actual pressure of population in order to justify this very drastic action we propose to take. I am not insisting upon the number of 10,000, but I would be willing to shade it only a very little. I do not see how we could, in administration, meet the suggestion my hon. friend has made. I think at any rate, in putting this departure from traditional usage on the statute-book, it would be far better not to carry the principle too far, but to keep within a limit that every body will have to admit to be perfectly justifiable. I would ask my hon. friend to consider all sides of the question, and if he is willing to endorse the radical proposition that we place before the House, then, in view of the expression of lack of confidence in the righteousness of the administration, if at a later date another House has greater confidence in some other administration, it might be right to push the principle a little further.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was impressed with the reasonable character of the amendment of the minister. If we are to exercise the powers of expropriation it seems to me that the safeguard he has suggested is a reasonable one; that is to say, you are to extend to an Indian reserve the same principle of expropriation which is applicable to the private property of any man in this country, but you are not to do that unless the Governor in Council shall have first investigated the matter and given consent to the adoption of that course. I would suggest that the Bill be reprinted with that amendment, and that section 1 shall stand in the meantime. The proposal does not seem to me to be unreasonable.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand that in the Pas Mission reserve a grant has been given for railway purposes, and I would like to know under what Act that was given. The Canadian Northern railway has right of way through the Indian reserve at the Pas Mission, to the west end of the island. A road that is being built to the bridge, I presume, has another right of way. Under what Act is that done?

Mr. OLIVER. The existing Railway Act gives the power that I have already explained, the power of expropriation through an Indian reserve to a railway under a Dominion charter. But it is not given to a

railway holding only a provincial charter. The provision of this Bill is to give that authority to a railway holding a provincial charter. In the case of the Pas Mission, the Canadian Northern railway holds a Dominion charter and, therefore, had a right to make an expropriation.

On section 2,

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). My remarks will apply to the working out of this Bill. In section 2 there is an important reference made to the judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada. He has to inquire and report, first, as to the expediency of removing the Indians; then in another section, machinery is provided for this inquiry, and after that again, he has to fix the compensation. Now a reference like that would be a lengthy one and somewhat tedious. Now we have one judge of the Exchequer Court, and his time is pretty well occupied with his present duties, this new duty might be the cause of very serious delay at times. If it were provided that the reference should be to the judge of the Exchequer Court or the judge of any superior court in the province in which the reserve is situated, I think the working out of the Bill would be facilitated. We all know the work that is thrown on the judge of the Exchequer Court now through the Department of Railways and Canals and other departments. and it might entrench upon his present duties to have a few of these references thrown upon him. The reference might take weeks, it might take months. We know how tedious it would be. I think that consideration is worthy of the minister's attention.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a good deal to be said in favour of my hon. friend's (Mr. Haggart) suggestion. But on the other hand, this is not a thing to be done hurriedly. It seems to me that, until we find that the judge of the Exchequer Court is not able to attend to the work, it would probably be better to accept the Bill as it is. The proposition to employ the judge of the Exchequer Court is made by reason of the position he holds as independent of any local consideration. Of course, we assume that every judge, once he ascends the bench, is absolutely independent of all considerations; but every one recognizes that the judge of the Exchequer Court is undoubtedly independent because his jurisdiction extends all over Canada. We are anxious that the operation of this Act should be relieved from any suspicion, or even the possibility, of any consideration other than the actual merits of the case.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Does not the minister know that the judge of the Exchequer Court has a great deal to do now?

Mr. OLIVER. That may be. I am not really familiar with the circumstances, but still I do think that, given sufficient time to the judge of the Exchequer Court, it would be more satisfactory to all parties if he were appointed, and I suppose that if one judge of the Exchequer Court is overworked it would be possible to appoint another. I think that objection, while it is to be considered, might, for the present at any rate, be allowed to await developments.

Mr. STAPLES. No doubt the minister's attention has been called to different cities and towns of 10,000 population adjacent to Indian reserves. To what localities, towns and cities is this legislation especially intended to apply? What cities and towns of 10,000 population are adjacent to Indian reserves? The minister speaks about obtaining the real value of Indian lands that are sold. As regards the land adjacent to Swan Lake and Marieopolis, the sale of this land was properly advertised, the minister having promised me, when I asked to have that reserve opened up to have it advertised in the Winnipeg and local papers, and the result was that the land was sold and its value was obtained. The price was as good as that paid for any land in that particular vicinity. When the minister says that all this is to be guarded there is no reason why it should not be guarded just as well in the case I have cited as in the case of a reserve adjacent to a city of a population of 10,000. I do not see any reason why, if you are making this applicable to the case of cities and towns, you should not make it applicable to that of an agricultural district. An agricultural district or town will never grow so long as these conditions exist. I am not discussing the principle, or the justification of passing such legislation, but I say that if you are going to deal with one case you should deal with a case such as that I have mentioned. What cities and towns do you propose to apply this legislation to?

Mr. OLIVER. At the moment I think I would be justified in saying that the city we have in mind is Vancouver. Hon. gentlemen from British Columbia will know the circumstances there. There is a reserve in Vancouver that only differs in degree from the case of the Songhees reserve in Victoria.

Mr. STAPLES. Is that the only one that the minister has in mind?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the only one that has been pressing upon our attention very strongly.

Mr. STAPLES. Have you had applications from any other cities?

Mr. OLIVER. I think we have, but I cannot just give the definite facts. There is no doubt that there is no other case on an exact par with the cities of Vancouver and Victoria, where the Indian reserve occupied a very important part of a very large and progressive city and where property is at a very high value. I do not think there is any other case that is nearly so extreme as in these two cities, and we are only providing this Bill for extreme cases for the good reasons which have been placed so ably before the House by the hon. leader of the opposition and his colleagues

Mr. BURRELL. Mr. Chairman, the minister says that this is a new principle for which there should be the fullest justification and that its application should be limited to cities of 10,000. Of course the principle is new, but if it is justified at all I do not quite see why it should be confined to such arbitrary limits as 10,000. I can quite conceive that there might be a case where there would be a fuller justification for 4,000 or 5,000 than there is for 12,000 or 15,000. If I understood the minister aright he did not believe that the lands of the Indians were meant to be given in such a way that the Indians should get the speculative value, that is that they were not supposed to get the unearned increment, because they allowed their land to remain unused while it acquired great value, and at the same time retarded the progress of the adjoining community. The minister knows that in our province there are a great many districts where there are towns, not of 10,000 perhaps not half of 10,000 because the growth is not often so great in the towns as it is in the territory closely adjoining them in a country of this description. Take the country from the boundary line up the Similkameen, Okanagan and Kamloops valleys, and there you will find a lot of these reserves pressing upon the thickly settled communities where the land has increased tremendously in value in contiguity to these Indian reserves, the value of which has become very great. This, it seems to me, would justify the application of the principle of this Bill. If there is any justification for its embodiment in the Bill I am inclined to think that the minister might very well reconsider the limitation of it to 10,000 so that it would at least give a discretion under proper circumstances to apply the principle in cases where it would be just and fair to apply it.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not wish to be thought unreasonable in this matter, and I do not even wish to be thought overcautious, but the committee will realize that with the form which the Bill takes there must be a line somewhere. I struck the line at 10,000 because it was in my mind that in some of the provinces a town that has a population of 10,000 becomes entitled to be called a city, and it seemed to me that the round figures would be satisfactory. It is not that 10,000 is a magic amount. If the committee would be agreeable I would be willing to move to reduce it to 8,000 but I only do so because I do not wish to appear to be unduly adhering to a certain fixed number. I am sure the committee will agree that there must be a line, that the line must not be too low, and that we had better, upon the introduction of this measure err on the side of safeguarding the interests of the Indians than err on the side of possibly trespassing upon their rights. I will accordingly move that 8,000 be the figure instead of 10,000, and I would urge upon hon. members not to press the reduction further.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Chairman, if the principle of the Bill is good when applied to a population of 8,000 in towns and cities, it is equally good for towns of 2,000 or up to 8,000. I beg to state that I live in a town of 2,000 population and that the limits of that town adjoin an Indian reserve. Some of the ratepayers of Edmundston recently interviewed the minister and represented that we cannot extend the limits of our town in any way without taking some of the Indian lands. In order to help the progress of the town, we need some of that land and if a city of ten thousand inhabitants is to be enabled to get Indian lands to extend its boundaries, the same principle should apply to smaller towns. I ask the minister to place the limit at 2,000 instead of 8,000.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I cannot see the object of using the words 'city, town or village' in the clause, because there might be just the same reason for removing an Indian reserve if it were surrounded by one municipality or two or three thickly populated municipalities. I think the principle should be defined in some other way.

Mr. NESBITT. I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart). For instance, it would be a great hardship to remove the Six Nation Indians from the reserve, some of whom are very good farmers and keep their lands practically as well as the white settlers. I contract with them and employ them more or less, and I find them very good workers and decent chaps all round. They do their work well, and I have no fault to find with them any more than I have with the white people. The principle of applying the law to large towns is that in such cases there is more temptation to immorality and drink, but in an agricultural section, no matter how thickly

settled, Indians may make very good citizens. We want to be decent with the Indians and if any special circumstance should arise not covered by the Bill, I have no doubt that parliament will deal generously with them, but so far as I am concerned 10,000 is the proper limit and I would not even reduce it to 8,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. The discussion is proceeding along the line that the principle of the Bill is fair, but I reiterate my objection to the principle, because you are asking this parliament to over-ride the treaties which Great Britain has made with the Indians and I do not think you are justified in doing that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does not the hon. gentleman think that the principle should have been discussed on the second reading, rather than in committee?

Mr. BRADBURY. I was about to point out that under the existing law the Indian has to be consulted before you can take away from him one acre of his reserve but by this legislation you deprive him of the opportunity he should have as a citizen of this country to say whether he will consent to the surrender or not. I read to the House a petition from the Six Nation Indians asking me to draw the attention of parliament to the fact that their reserve would come under the operation of this Bill, because they are living within ten miles of the city of Brantford.

Mr. NESBITT. It does not apply to them.

Mr. BRADBURY. They think it does. At any rate we should be as careful of the rights of all other Indians in Canada as we should of the rights of the Six Nations.

Mr. NESBITT. Certainly.

Mr. BRADBURY. The minister left the impression on my mind that his opinion was that when these lands were given to the Indians there was no intention that they should enjoy the increased value of the lands.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say that. I said it was not contemplated at the time that there would be such abnormal increase of value and that an unexpected condition had arisen.

Mr. BRADBURY. When these treaties were made Indians were powerful in this country, and the government of England undertook to protect them in these lands and surely they are entitled to every dollar of the increased value. Surely it is the duty of the government to see that the fair value of the lands is secured to the Indians in every case. I admit frankly that there is room for some legislation to make it possible to secure a surrender, but I cannot agree that the Indians should be ignored and not consulted in any way. Speaking from my own knowledge of the Indians in Manitoba, I think it fair to say that the average Indian is intelligent enough to discuss, to some extent anyway, whether he wishes to sell his land or not. I admit frankly that they are not competent to decide what is a fair value for their land; I admit they are not competent perhaps to be placed in a position in which they could themselves sell their land, because they are not trained in a business way, but the minister is the guardian of the Indians and it is his duty to look after that feature of it. This legislation ignores the Indian, and it practically violates a sacred treaty that was made with these Indians without giving them a voice in the matter. I believe that principle of the Bill is wrong.

Mr. OLIVER. I have to repeat what I have already said, that we object altogether to the contention that in dealing with the Indians as we propose we are violating the rights intended to be conveyed to them by the treaty. It is true that the treaty guaranteed to them a certain area of land; but the principle of the treaty was that they were guaranteed the benefit and advantages of that land, and I maintain that their mere occupation of lands worth large amounts of money is not a beneficial occupation, and that the government is not seeing that they get their full benefit of their treaty right if they are left in the mere occupation of lands the value of which would either maintain them in comfort or assist them in carrying on their avocations in a proper way. Let me bring a concrete case. I speak of the Piegan reserve, near the foothills of the Rocky mountains, occupied by a branch of the Blackfoot Indians. They were making no progress in agriculture, their cattle were limited in numbers, their condition was anything but progressive or prosperous. By selling a portion of their reserve at a very good price they were enabled to secure a traction engine for breaking purposes, threshing implements, stock, and all the necessaries of farming; so that they were in a position to take advantage of the balance of the reserve and to turn it to good account. Now, I do not think it would have been to the advantage of those Indians to have remained in mere occupation of a large tract of valuable land which they were not turning to good account.

Mr. BRADBURY. Was not that done under the Indian Act?

Mr. OLIVER. That was done under the Indian Act by surrender of the Indians in the ordinary form; but my point is that it

was to the benefit of the Indians that the surrender should be made. Where abnormal conditions exist, as, where the Indians are in occupation of land which has town-site value, the Indians, whether they think well of the project or not, should, under the guardianship of the government, having the authority of parliament, get the benefit of that town-site value, and if parliament is not prepared to authorize the government to take such action as will secure it for them, I do not think parliament is doing fairly by the Indians or carrying out the original intent of the treaty.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not desire to enter into a discussion as to what the theory was on which the Indians were granted these reserves, nor do I want to question that the desire of the government is to do what is good for the Indians in this matter; but we have to face the fact that whatever may have been in the people's minds as to the interests of the Indians, the Indian Act gives to the Indian tribe the ownership of the reserve, and as things stand to-day they cannot be compelled to part with it except by the consent of a majority of them. It is in that state of the law that we have this amendment introduced for the purpose of providing machinery for taking people's property away from them against their will. I lay that down only as a preliminary to a practical suggestion which I want to make with regard to setting this machinery in operation. You have to take as a starting point the fact that there will never be occasion to apply this law except where a majority of the Indians are convinced that they ought to keep the land, because whenever a majority of the Indians are willing to part with it, you will get the surrender. So that the situation being provided for is one where the minister as the guardian and the Indians as his wards are at loggerheads as to what is best for them, and the provision is to enable the will of the wards to be absolutely overridden. That being the case, it seems to me that some preliminary proceeding should be required before the minister sets this machinery in operation. I quite understand that there may be an interest in the public to have this machinery set in operation, and there may be an interest in the Indians to have it set in operation. It seems to me that there should be some requirement that the adjoining town or some proportion of its population should have to make some request in the matter, or that some proportion of the Indians should have to make some request in the matter. If an entire Indian tribe were determined that they wanted to keep their reserve, and if there were no demand from any other source for the expropriation of the reserve, I cannot see that it is incumbent upon this government, as the guardian of the Indians, to proceed to expropriate that reserve. It is, on the other hand, putting into the hands of the Superintendent General a power which he may exercise in a very arbitrary way. I am willing to admit that that would not be done by the present Superintendent General, but there might come a day when we would have a bad government that would have a superintendent not worthy of such large powers, and it seems to me that it would be only reasonable to provide that either the adjoining town, or some proportion of its population, or some class of people who could be said to represent the interest of the public as distinct from the Indians, or some proportion of the Indian tribe who might be supposed to form some judgment as to what the Indians' interest was, should make some motion or petition as a preliminary to the minister starting in to set this machinery in operation.

This would provide some means of proving the representations made by the different interests concerned. The initiative is taken by the Superintendent General on his own motion. When he has made up his mind that a reserve should be opened up to the public, and the Indians removed, the Governor in Council may refer the matter to the Exchequer Court. The Exchequer Court must give notice, and make an investigation, but there is only one party who comes before the court, and that party is the guardian of the Indians. The Indians have an adverse interest, because this proceeding can only be taken when the majority of the band do not want to give up the reserve. The Superintendent General, however, makes up his mind that it is expedient that they should, and he is the only one before the court. There is no one to represent the Indians who want to keep the reserve, and you have the court practically proceeding ex parte to determine the question. In the province of Quebec, when the interests of the ward are adverse to those of the guardian, the court appoints a special guardian to represent the ward. Something of the kind ought to be done here so that you would have the case of the Indians properly put before the court.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection, whatever, to meet the suggestion of my hon. friend regarding the initiation of the proceedings, but I cannot see that there is any necessity for it, because when an Indian reserve is situated near a city or town, it is inevitable that the latter should urge that the reserve be thrown open to the public. My experience in the position I happen to hold, leads me to believe that there is no danger of the Superintendent General acting without due pressure from an outside source.

Mr. DOHERTY. I would like to have it made quite clear what the outside source is from which the pressure comes. In that conceivably unfortunate time when we might have another Superintendent General, there might be people who would suggest that it was political friends who were bringing the pressure for their own benefit. My suggestion would provide a means of obviating that; and it is not asking a great deal that the people who want the law applied should come out and say so before it is put into operation. You do not enforce people's rights until they ask you to.

Mr. OLIVER. The great danger will not be that there will be a lack of representation, but a deluge of representation. I have no objection to the amendment suggested, but I cannot agree as to its necessity. Later on there will be certain amendments moved to other parts of the Bill, and we might then consider any suggestion my hon. friend may choose to make. His suggestion as to the appointment of counsel for either one party or the other is a fair one. I would hardly think that was necessary, but if my hon. friend thinks it is, I am quite willing to agree that the judge would have the right to appoint counsel for the Indians. While the Indian Act provides that the consent of the Indians to a surrender must be obtained, the House is aware that the Indian is not considered able to manage his own property. For that reason the responsibility is put on the department. There are many members who know of instances in which the Indians are unquestionably not getting value out of their property just the same as they would not get value out of any other kind of property they might hold, and it is the duty of the department to see that the Indian, who is not capable of managing his own property, should get full value for it. This Bill is rendered necessary by special conditions. We only ask parliament to authorize it under the most extraordinary conditions. Hon. members know that a large number of the committee wish to carry the principle very much further. I think the interests of the Indians are thoroughly safeguarded, and there is no trespass, absolutely no trespass, upon their rights.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). My limited experience with Indians leads me to conclude that what is required is machinery to protect the Indian from himself, and I believe that this Bill tends towards that end. What else would you do in a case of this kind?—I have in mind a reserve on which there is no game and, therefore, no means for the Indian to gain a livelihood, for on that reserve not one of the Indians can be induced to engage in cultivation of the land. They have been living in comparative poverty. Is it right to allow them to do so any longer? I think they have been that way already too long. These Indians are not business men. If you required a right of way over their land, they would not know whether they should get one thousand dollars or a hundred thousand dollars for it. Therefore, I claim it is the duty of the government as guardians of the Indians to do something in the manner proposed by the Minister of the Interior. If the land is put up to public competition it will bring all that it is worth, and that is all that can be expected on the part of those who act on behalf of the Indians. I claim that if this law had been in force before, the Indians I have in mind, would be very much better off than they are to-day. The only amendment I would like to see to this section is with respect to the limit of population that is fixed. I assume that to meet the condition fixed in the Bill there must be on one side of the reservation a city with a population of ten thousand. I would like it worded in such a way that if there are ten thousand people surrounding the reserve, the Bill should apply.

Mr. NESBITT. How far would you make the 'surroundings?'

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). I mean, adjacent to it. There will be cases, and the case I have in mind is one of them, in which the town is not up close to the reserve. In this case one of the towns is within a couple of miles. But in that case to leave the reserve in the hands of the Indians means injustice not only to the Indians but to the people in surrounding country. Had it been opened up some years ago it would have been many thousands of dollars more for the Indians than will be realized now, because about two years ago a fire swept over that part of the country and did a great deal of damage to the standing timber. I think that many persons living in the vicinity of a reserve cannot but be of the opinion that if they can be released in some way out of the hands of the Indian it will be much better for them and much better for the people who live in the surrounding territory. I trust that if any amendment is made it will be in the direction I have suggested.

Mr. MAGRATH. As I understand the minister, the justification for this legislation is to give the Indian the value of the land, that is, when the land reaches a certain figure it is time that it should be sold and the money put to more beneficial use for the Indian. And he said he wanted to get the town lot value of the property. Suppose we have a reserve, as happens to be the case in my own constituency, 300,000

acres. We have 800 Indians on that reserve, roughly speaking. Suppose we have a town of ten thousand against that reserve, we are not going to get townsite figures for that entire property. The land values produced by ten thousand people are only felt within a reasonable distance from that town. I do not wish to press the minister too strongly. This matter I feel might largely be left in the hands of the judiciary. As I understand it this Act is only to be employed in emergency cases where it is absolutely impossible to deal with the Indians. And I think that when we are prepared to trust the Exchequer Court I think we ought to trust them to investigate the need of selling lands adjoining towns regardless of the extent of the population, and I do not see why that court cannot provide that land prices will be fixed that will be equivalent to those that would exist should ten thousand people be residing adjoining the reserve instead of a leser number. I do not wish to press the minister, as I say, but he knows that there is an urgent case in my own constituency that should have his attention.

Mr. BRADBURY. Just before six o'clock I drew attention to two or three questions that the Six Nation Indians requested me to ask, among them being the question whether this legislation would affect the Six Nation Indian reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. Not so long as the position remains as it is. It would not affect the Six Nations, because this section provides that it shall only apply where an Indian reserve adjoins or is partially contained within the limits of a town, and the Six Nation reserve does not touch any such town.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. BARNARD. In this section I observe that the only value which the judge is expected to find is the value of the buildings and the improvements on the land. Is it not the intention of the Act that the judge should also report upon the value of the land itself? I understood the minister to say that he proposed to insert an amendment which would provide for the sale of the land by public auction. In that case, I assume there would be an upset price, and that upset price should be the value of the land as found by the judge as well as the value of the improvements. It surely is not the intention to sell the lands of the Indians at a less value than they are found to be worth by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. OLIVER. I hardly think the judge of the Exchequer Court is the proper person to fix the value of the real estate. The value of land must always be a matter of uncertainty, a matter of estimate. The value of improvements is a fixed value which can be arrived at by evidence before a court, the value of the land can only be an estimate. It is hardly proper to put that responsibility upon a judge. The provision we propose to insert later on as to the sale by public auction will, I think, cover all the requirements. There is a provision that the judge should report upon any of the other facts or circumstances of the case which he may deem proper and material. He may give his views in regard to the value of the land, but I think it would be hardly fair to hold a judge of the Exchequer Court responsible for the valuation.

Mr. BARNARD. Somebody must value the land before you can fix an upset price, and who is better able to do it than the man who takes the evidence as to the condition of the land and the surrounding circumstances?

Mr. OLIVER. While a judge might be able to do it, it is hardly a thing that we should require him to do. He may report his opinion, but I do not think we should place the responsibility upon him. The fixing of an upset price is a necessity of the auction sale.

Mr. BARNARD. Who is to fix the upset price?

Mr. OLIVER. We would have to have the land surveyed into town lots, if it was found to be town property, before it could be sold; and as it would not be so surveyed at the time the judge was holding his investigation he would not be in a position to give the valuation of these lots. After these lots were surveyed, the surveyor or some other competent man would be called upon to make a valuation.

On section 5,

Mr. OLIVER. In deference to the views that have been expressed as to the propriety of throwing upon parliament the responsibility in connection with any surrender. I move that after the word 'council,' in the third line, the following words be added:

Shall lay a full report of the proceedings of the evidence and findings before parliament at the then current or next ensuing session thereof, and upon such evidence being approved by resolution of parliament, may thereupon give effect to the said findings.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. I move to insert the following words as a proviso at the end of the section:

Provided that in the event of a resolution being passed by parliament, said lands shall only be sold by public auction after three months' advertisement of the sale thereof in the public press.

Mr. DOHERTY. I understand that the effect of the amendment will be that a property is to be sold by auction only if a resolution of parliament requires it.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not the intention.

Mr. DOHERTY. Then there is a contradiction between these provisions.

Mr. OLIVER. The wording may have been hastily drawn. I will have a proviso drawn that will meet the views of the hon. member for East Lambton in words that will correspond.

On subsection 6: disposition of proceeds.

Mr. DOHERTY. I see it is provided that in case a part of a reserve only is taken the Indians shall not be removed till a new reserve is obtained. If merely part of a reserve is taken will it be necessary in every case to get a new reserve for the Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. It might or it might not; it would depend on circumstances, but we might assume that, generally speaking, it would not be necessary.

Mr. DOHERTY. Under this section you could not move them from a part of the reserve until you had a new reserve, whether it was necessary to get a new reserve or not.

Mr. OLIVER. I notice the difficulty that my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall subsection 6 stand?

Mr. OLIVER. Stands.

On subsection 7: expropriation of lands for new reserve.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the reason for conferring all these powers on the Superintendent General?

Mr. OLIVER. In securing a new reserve or a new location for the Indians it may not be possible to deal with the white people any more than it was to deal with the Indians, and it is assumed that the urgency of the case is such as to warrant the use of the powers of the Expropriation Act in order to secure a due and proper settlement of the question that is at issue.

On section 3: payment of Indian annuities.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 3 involves another principle altogether and has nothing to do with section 2. I will be able to offer the amendments to section 2 in a few minutes, but in regard to section 3, it deals with the question of annuities. For the information of the committee I may say that at the first session of the Dominion parliament an Act was passed, chapter 33, 'respecting the Governor General, the civil list and the salaries of certain public functionaries.' An item in this Act under the heading 'miscellaneous' was 'Indian Annuities—Quebec and Ontario—$26,664 per annum.' These were the annuities for the payment of which the province of Canada was responsible, and by the Act they were charged upon the consolidated revenue. Almost immediately after an amount sufficient to produce these annuities was capitalized at five per cent and was charged as part of the debt of the province of Canada. This amount is standing in the books of the Department of Indian Affairs, and the annuities have been, since the capitalization, paid from the interest. As further Indian territory was brought in, provision was made for the payment of annuities by vote of parliament. So that up to the present time we have one part of the annuities paid without the vote of parliament and the remainder paid with the vote of parliament. As every one knows, Indian treaty payments are an absolute charge upon the revenue of the country, and it is considered to be right and proper that they should not be subject to the vote of parliament, that the whole of the annuities should be in the same position as part of the annuities now are and as contemplated by the whole nature of the arrangement with the Indians; that is to say, they are a charge upon the revenues of the country and not subject to the vote of parliament. This section is a recognition in the statute of the right of the Indians to his treaty money and we ask the authorization of the committee to it on that ground.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is simply taking away the power from parliament of voting this money, and the government will practically say that this money shall come out of the consolidated fund?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That in other times was voted by parliament?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; part of it was under the Act that was passed by the first parliament of Canada. Part of it has always come out of the consolidated fund, and it is only under the additional treaties that the annuities are paid by vote. We think it is only right that the whole treaty payment should be brought under the one provision which is unquestionably the legal and constitutional provision.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the minister give us about the proportion of treaty

moneys that are or have been paid in this manner?

Mr. OLIVER. The amount that has been paid in this way is $26,000 per year. These old Ontario and Quebec treaties are the only treaties that were extant at the time of confederation, and when we took over these treaties provision was made that these payments should be made out of the consolidated fund. Then, other treaties were added, but the Act was not amended accordingly, and we are asking for this amendment now to bring all under the one heading.

Mr. DOHERTY. I understand that all annuities are an absolute obligation, so that if parliament did not vote them, parliament would be refusing to do its duty?

Mr. OLIVER. Absolutely.

On section 4, subsection 5,

Mr. DOHERTY. What is the change effected in the law by this section?

Mr. OLIVER. This is a substitution for 37a which was the principal amendment of the Act of last session. Possession is nine points of the law, and it was found that previous to the passing of this provision there was serious difficulty in removing trespassers from Indian lands. This legislation made it possible to facilitate the removal of settlers from lands that were held as Indian reserves. We have found, however, that Indians in occupation of lands that are not specially reserved have not the protection it is desirable they should have. In the Yukon there are no reserves, and the efforts of the missionaries and others are directed to getting the Indians to enter on the permanent occupation of the land, and we think it is right they should have that protection which this amendment proposes to give them.

Mr. DOHERTY. I understand the minister to say that this extends to land which the Indians claim.

Mr. OLIVER. Exactly.

On section 2, subsection 5,

Mr. OLIVER. Reverting to this section, I would move to amend it by providing that no sale of such lands shall take place except by public auction after three months advertisement thereof in the public press.

Mr. DOHERTY. You still have power to alienate and lease the land and if you make special provision with regard to the selling, it might be nullified by disposing of the land in the other ways indicated. I understand that 'aliened' implies the disposal of ownership, and the minister would be empowered to alien the property by lease as well as by selling.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is a good suggestion. I move to strike out the word 'aliened' and there will be no question about it.

Mr. BARNARD. The effect of the section as it now stands is that if there is a sale it must be by public auction, but the Governor in Council has power to lease on any terms it sees fit.

Mr. OLIVER. The Act says on the best terms obtainable, and that is about as definite as you can make it.

Mr. BARNARD. I recollect that an island in the harbour of Vancouver was leased for a long term of years at a very small annual rental, and the value of that lease is almost fabulous now. Such a case as that might happen with an Indian reserve, and by retaining that power to lease without restriction, you do away with all the protection that the sale by public auction gives the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. The intention was to secure the best terms possible for the Indians, and that if leasing was more in their interest than selling we should have power to lease. However, I am not anxious to assume any more responsibility of administration than is absolutely necessary, and I would be willing on the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Barnard) to provide that the land could only be sold by public auction, and that there should be no leasing about it. At the same time it might be more advisable under certain conditions to lease than to sell.

Mr. BARNARD. You can get bids for leasing as well as for selling.

Mr. OLIVER. That's a good idea.

Mr. NESBITT. You can put in that it shall be leased by public auction as well as sold by public auction.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think the simplest way would be to say that it shall be sold or leased by public auction, instead of saying that it shall be sold or leased on the best possible terms.

Mr. OLIVER. I move to amend the sertion so as to make it read that it shall be sold or leased by public auction after three month's advertisement in the public press.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for St. Anne raised a question in regard to the proviso in paragraph 6. If the words, 'or portion thereof,' in lines 36 and 37 were struck out, I think this would meet his criticism, because then the Indians would not be removed from the reserve if only a portion of the reserve were dealt with.

Mr. DOHERTY. That would leave the government in the position of taking only

a portion of the reserve. In that case it is possible that the remainder of the reserve might not be large enough for all the Indians, and the government might have to provide another place for those removed from that portion.

Mr. OLIVER. While that is conceivable, I think it is scarcely necessary to make any amendment to the Bill to provide for it.

Amendment agreed to, and section 2 as amended agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill now stands to be reprinted for the consideration of the first section, to which I offered a proposed substitute as an amendment. If the committee will agree to allow that section to be amended as I proposed, and let the Bill be printed as having passed the committee, I will agree, when the Bill comes up for its third reading, if there is anything requiring criticism, to refer the Bill back to the committee. I suggest this so that we need not delay the Bill to have it reprinted and brought back again to the committee.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think there is no objection to passing the proposed substituted section for section 1, if it is desired. Do I understand that the minister quite passes over my suggestion with regard to the first paragraph of section 2, that is, that the machinery should be set in motion at the instance of some outside party, and that provision should be made for representation of the Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. I would think it was not necessary to make provision for instituting the proceedings; but if the wording of subsection 3 does not provide adequately for the representation of the Indians at the instance of the judge, then I would ask my hon. friend to suggest some words that would meet the case, and I would be very glad to move their adoption.

Amendment to section 1 agreed to, and section 1 as amended agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY. Possibly the hon. minister might be willing to let that amendment be made at the third reading. I am not prepared to say that possibly the words 'give directions,' might not be sufficient to meet the case.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection.

Bill reported.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT.

Bill (No. 147) to amend the Chinese Immigration Act—Mr. Oliver—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill is rendered necessary by the conditions found to exist at the ports of Victoria and Vancouver. There is no serious change in principle, but the privilege of admission without payment of the head tax is extended to wives and children to a degree that did not prevail in the previous Act. That is an important amendment. The other amendments are amendments of detail intended to make more effective the principles already adopted.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Will the hon. minister tell us what progress has been made with the report of the commission dealing with the subjects that gave rise to this Bill, and whether he does not think it advisable we should have that report before proceeding further?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot at the moment give any information as to what progress the commission has made. I quite see the force of my hon. friend's suggestion, and if he thinks proper to insist, I would feel bound to ask that the consideration of the Bill stand over. But I do not see any objection to giving the Bill some preliminary consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would suggest that the matter is of sufficient importance for every member of the government to know something of what that commission has been doing, because from the newspaper reports of the proceedings at Vancouver, which are the only information I have, it seems to me that there has been disclosed a condition of affairs which calls for amendments to the Chinese Immigration Act much more important and significant than the clause now put forward as the most important amendment. So far as I recollect from these reports, there were no irregularities in connection with the admission of Chinese wives, but there were very serious irregularities in connection with the admission of so called merchants, and irregularities to a lesser extent in connection with the admission of supposed students. The provisions allowing the admission of these were inserted in our present law a few years ago without any good reason why such amendments should be made, but possibly at the instance of the persons who contemplated the very frauds which have occurred. At the time of their insertion, no reason appeared on the surface why the Act should have been amended in that way. The door was opened voluntarily by this government without, so far as I know, any representation from any proper quarter that it was necessary to bring in a large body of students or merchants. Chinese business in British Columbia was being efficiently carried on by the merchants there and there was no demand for others. We in British Columbia recognize that there

was not likely to be any considerable number of bona fide Chinese students wanting to enter Canada, but it was plain that any Chinese boy who had the intention of going to night school for one year might call himself a student and thus gain admittance. We protested that any one who came to Canada with the intention of peddling swill, would be, under that Act, a merchant, and might come into Canada, and that is precisely what happened. The door was thrown wide open to unlawful Chinese immigration—the immigration of merchants who were not merchants at all—to the profit of officers of this government and their associates in Vancouver. We are aware that a Royal Commission has been appointed to investigate this matter, and I submit that, as this is of the utmost importance, we must be fully informed by that commission as to the nature of the subterfuges employed to evade the intention of the Act which we now propose to amend before it is competent for us to consider these amendments. I do not see how we can intelligently amend the Act and remove grievances unless we have a report as to what those grievances are. I appeal to the minister whether it does not occur to him as a fair thing that he should be posted as the minister responsible to this House, and should learn just what that commission found out in its inquiry, that he may understand the conditions with which he is called upon to deal.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no question that the report of the commission if in the hands of the House would be of very considerable assistance in dealing with the question brought up under this Bill. As I said, I would not wish to push the Bill through the House without the fullest consideration or without the knowledge of the contents of the report if that report is available within a reasonable time. But, as I understand it, this Bill has been prepared with a view to meeting the difficulties which my hon. friend mentioned. While I concede that the addition of the wives and children was what might be called the new principle of the Bill, the important feature of the Bill is dealing in detail with the various classes of Chinese immigrants who are entitled to exemption from the head tax; and I simply invited the attention of the committee to its provisions so that we should have what might be considered a preliminary understanding as to what the Bill was trying to reach, so that we should be in better shape to deal with it later when we had the report of the commission, if that report is available in time.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster).

Mr. BARNARD. As I understand it, and as we are all aware from reading the newspaper reports of the proceedings of the commission that has been sitting in Victoria and Vancouver within the last two months, there are certain grievances with regard to the admission of immigrants, particularly Chinese, into these ports. Just what is the nature of the deceptions and frauds practised on the department it is impossible to say. For my part, I cannot see how the Senate could have intelligently considered the matter and framed this Bill without having the facts before them. It seems to me that, while we are all anxious that this matter should be set straight, and that the Bill should be put into effective shape, it is idle to endeavour to do so until we know what abuses we have to correct, and that, the minister admits, he does not know. No man can tell that until the report of the commissioners is made and the evidence taken is communicated. Of course, it is very pleasant sitting here in the evenings, but if you are going to do something that has to be done over again, you might as well leave it alone and do something else.

Mr. OLIVER. In view of the contention of my hon. friends, who are certainly deeply interested in this question, and the suggestion that the Bill should not be proceeded with to-night, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BLAIN. When is the report expected?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry to say I am not able to give that information. As my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) is aware it is under another department, the head of which is not in this House.

Mr. BURRELL. The commission has finished its work, has it not, and is waiting for the report of the judge?

Mr. OLIVER. So I understand.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DOHERTY. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The privileges and elections report on the Richelieu case.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

INDEX

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1910-1911.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2° 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider, Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., Northwest Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ALLEN, Mr. H. E., *Shefford.*

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9619 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7661 (iv).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

Aliens Naturalization, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2666 (ii).

Australian and Can. Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900 (M. for stmt.*) 1501 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2440 (ii).

Charing Cross Bank, and Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co. (M. for cor with Govt) 1726 (i).

Chemin Gouin, Postmastership, Name of, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).

——— Postmaster A. C. Miquelon, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c. (Ques.) 1280 (i).

Customs Tariff with Foreign Countries, Arrangements by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 981 (i)

G.T.P. Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalty *re* (Ques.) 1492 (i).
See 'N. T. Ry.'

Half Breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes (M. for copy*) 1912 (i).

Harbours and Rivers Expenditures by Public Works (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).

N. T. Ry., Changes in Original Specifications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Change in Structures to the amount of $10,000 (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Commission, List of Members of Engineering Staff who have resigned, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Construction Work, Change in Concrete used, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1499 (i).

——— Contractors, Amounts paid on Force Account, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Contracts, Estimated Quantities *re* (Ques.) 1491 (i).

——— Moncton and Winnipeg Contracts, Original Estimates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Shops, Plans and Specifications for Machinery (Ques.) 1569 (i).

——— Shops, Specification *re* Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press (Ques.) 2157 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure to 31st Dec., 1910, Estimated Cost of Completion of Winnipeg and Moncton Section (Ques.) 1497 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1727 (i).

——— Train Hauled Filling, Payments *re* (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

North Shore Taxpayers and Voting at Federal Elections (Ques.) 1082 (i).

Post Office Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Concessions granted to G. B. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge and Labour Organizations (M. for cor.*) 7039 (iv.)
——— Fair Wage Clause for Bridge Workers (Ques.) 6757 (iv).
——— Payment of $100,000 to Phœnix Bridge Co. (M. for cor.*) 981 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4083 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6786 (iv).
See 'Australia.'
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5051 (iii).
St. Johns Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir' (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Six Nation Indian Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1863; (Montreal, P.O., alterations) 1862; (Montreal postal station) 1861 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Interest paid, &c. (Ques.) 814 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6293 (iv).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1947 (i).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of (M. for cor.*) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ques.) 2371 (ii).
Banking and Commerce Com., Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2364 (ii).
'Canada Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing (Ques.) 2885 (ii).
Canada-Japan Trade Treaty, Expiration of (Ques.) 5638, (iii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).
——— Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8805 (v)
Canned Pease, Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases (Ques.) 3279 (ii).
Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 8994 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9046 (v).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com., 8970 (v).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6206 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2513 (ii); in Com., 8677 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
——— (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8908, 8924 (v).
Copyright Act B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8899 (v).
Coronation Stamps, Inquiry *re*, 9247 (v).
Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of location (Ques.) 4669 (iii).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re* (Ques.) 662 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Ice Breaker, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6475 (iv).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 799 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number established in the past year (Ques.) 656 (i).
——— Number operated, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Farmer's Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5453 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 7560 (iv).
Favoured Nation Treaties before Imperial Conference, Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (remarks) 5292 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4367 (iii).
Franking System, for Private Business (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Grand Bend, Ont., Right of Way, Purchase of (Ques.) 1287 (i).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).
Indian Act (Treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7828; in Com., 7848 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8744 (v).
King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 804, 1349 (i).
Live Stock Industry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1200 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2894 (ii).
Mail Delayed and Mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c. (Ques.) 2371 (ii), 4667 (iii).
Mails, Illegal Use of for Fraudulent Schemes (Ques.) 802 (i).
——— remarks, 1356 (i).
See 'Sheldon, C. D.'
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re* (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Montreal Govt. Weir, Inquiry for Ret., 2065 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Naval Service, Number of Battle Ships withdrawn from Canada by G.B., during the past five years (Ques.) 1092 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8963 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re* (Ques.) 5934 (iv).
Parcel Post Service between Canada and G.B., Colonies, &c., Loss *re* (Ques.) 805 (i).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design, Refusal of Imperial Design (remarks) 6908 (iv).
See 'Coronation.'
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Short-Date Newspapers, &c. (remarks) 10340 (v).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to, Classification of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5934 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8070 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Money Orders, Printing of (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Post Office Estimates, Objection to Passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Public Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 5541 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, 3072 (ii).
——— Supervision, Expenditure (remarks) 6672 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
——— Names of those compensated for Accidents (Ques.) 9537 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3737 (ii).
Reciprocity—British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Mins., 6200 (iv).
——— Britain's Demand from U.S. for Tariff Concessions (remarks) 6574 (iv).
——— Dairymen's Association of Western Ont., Denial of Stmnt. of Min. of Customs, 4570 (iii).
——— Papers, Comparative Prices, Printing of (remarks) 10469 (v).
——— Res. of Toronto Anti-Reciprocity League *re* Annexation (read) 4141 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, 6802 (iv).
'Review of Reviews,' Collection of Extra Postage (Ques.) 2371 (ii).
Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 8969 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards manufactured, &c. (Ques.) 806 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery Routes, Number in Operation, &c. (Ques.) 983 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 10365 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, &c. (remarks) 1364 (i).
——— Action of Government *re* Returning to Canada (remarks) 6200 (iv).
See 'Mails:.
Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm (read) in Com. of Sup., 5965 (iv).
Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 806 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5964; (dairying) 6249 (iv); (exhibitions) 9079 (v).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1051; Mines (salaries) 1480; Post Office (contingencies) 6068 (iv); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 6457 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subsidies (Canada and Australia) 8765; (Canada and Cuba) 8778; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 8786; (Canada and G.B.) 8775; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784 (v).
Post Office (Curren ,R. C., gratuity) 4283; (mail clerks) 4281 (iii), 6082 (iv); Outside Service (magazines) 6080; (mails) 6077 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ontario (Brantford drill hall) 2098 (ii); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv); (Printing Bureau) 2362 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8877 (v); Ontario (Peterborough) 2608 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ontario (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—Intercolonial Railway (freight service) 5988 (iv); (Halifax) 5924 (iii); Miscellaneous (official cars) 6447 (iv).
United States Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations re (Ques.) 984 (i).
See 'Review.'
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

ARTHURS, Mr. J. E., *Parry Sound.*
Callender Lighthouse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6498 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7220 (iv).
Explosives Importation, Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8457 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5155 (iii).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8965 (v).
North Bay, Burk's Falls and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c., (M. for ret.*) 981 (i).
Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

ARTHURS, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 9695 (v).
Port Perry Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).
Reciprocity with United States, Resolutions *re*, M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 9646 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Mines (salaries) 1479 (i).
Immigration (agents) 5195 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses &c.) 6455, 6497; (Midland and Tiffin) 6502 iv).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B., K. C. M. G. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*
Address, The, 664 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2168 (ii).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., ref. to Justice Department. (Ans.) 926 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7578 (iv).
C. P. R. Land Tax, Decision of Privy Council (remarks) 2992 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Investigation Commission, on Inquiry for Judge's Rep., 9594 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4582 (iii).
Clarry, L. F., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 813 (i).
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions heard, Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 982 (i).
Convicts liberated from Kingston Penitentiary without Clothing or Means (remarks) 1913 (i), 2067 (ii).
——— (statement) 1986 (ii).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10352 (v).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary (Ans.) 8582 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
——— Royal Commission re Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5498 (iii).
Fedorenko, Extradition of (remarks) 10 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use of by Americans (Ans.) 7804 (iv).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8971 (v).
Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Fundy Bay) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 4593, 4603 (iii).
——— (explanation) *re*, on M. (Mr. Jameson) 4683 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B.—*Con.*
Hague Arbitration, Counsel, Names, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 797 (i).
——— Fisheries Regulations with U. S., Conference *re* (Stmnt) 1988 (ii).
See 'North Atlantic,' 'Supply—Justice.'
Hudson's Bay, Position *re* Hague Award (remarks) 673 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 970 (i).
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9158 (v).
See 'Waterways.'
Judges appointed since 1896, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 8095 (v).
Judges in Yukon Ter., Annuities (M.) for Com. on Res., 8790 (v).
Justice, Deputy Minister acting as Counsel in outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 1014 (i).
Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 469 (i).
Juvenile Deliquents, Act 1908, (B. 189) 1c*, 8187 (v).
Legal Agents appointed for Govt., Precautions *re* acting for private Parties (Ans.) 813 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3256 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 4209 (iii), 6761 (iv).
Marriage Laws in prov. of Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church (Ans) 7208 (iv).
Marriage Laws, Parliamentary Powers, Govt.'s intention (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Marriages, Power of Parlt. to Legalize (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
Masonic Property stolen, Verdict of Montreal Jury (Ans.) 7207 (iv).
Ministers, Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7441 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Land Damages, Fiats *re* Land Damages, Compensation (remarks) 3949 (iii).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriages.'
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10489 (v).
New Westminster Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor, 2186 (ii).
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Arbitration at The Hague, on Address, 664 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor, 4337 (iii).
——— Distribution of copies (remarks) 8094 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Offensive Weapons, Pets. *re* Legislation (Ans.) 3064 (ii).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8331 (v).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 2740 (ii).
Pecuniary Claims *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c. (Ans.) 803 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7899 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 963 (i).
Reciprocity and North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7223 (iv).
Sand supplied to Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 111 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 3184 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Action of Govt. *re* Returning to Canada (remarks) 6200 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Justice (contingencies) 1020; (salaries) 1014 (i).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161; Exchequer Court (contingencies) 6160; (printing reports) 6161; Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).
The Hague: *See* 'North Atlantic.-
U. S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, Subjects of Extradition (Ans.) 708 (i).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9906 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10144 (v).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 908 (i), 9158 (v).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5572 (iii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7471 (iv).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. as Immigration agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5192 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8850 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9050 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9610 (v).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Fishery Inspectors, Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10251, 10272 (v).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9519 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550 (v).
G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5795 (iii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9305 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude May, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8974 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Conditions *re* Public Health (remarks) 5535 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10101 (v).
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society (B. 172) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
I.C.R. Renewal Equipment, Cor. &c. with Aud. Gen., Stmnts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 784 (i).
Military Adviser to Imperial Conference, Apptmt of Mr. S. Hughes (remarks) 9072 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8521 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6147 (iv).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages, &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8593 (v).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons imported (Ques.) 1721 (i).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8070 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 961 (i).
Railway Act (telegraph, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9315 (v).
Reciprocity Statistics, Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6860 (iv).
——— Ques. *re* Vote of Member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8578, 8967, 9575 (v).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3349 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coins) 6061 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3812 (ii); Ont. (inspectors) 6631 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5192 (iii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5583 (iii).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161; Exchequer Court (printing reports) 6161; Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6166 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (sessional clerks) 6168 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8528 (v).
Post Office—Outside Office (mail service) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3201 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
Unprovided Items (generally) 6160 (iv).
Unorganized Districts, Deferred Elections (remarks) 10101 (v).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B.C.*
Alien Labour Law, Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts Works (remarks) 10367 (v).
Babcock, Mr., Payments *re* Extra work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
Beddington, Mr., Pension to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10433 (v).
Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities (M. for reps.*) 785 (i).
Customs Free Goods entered at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co. (M. for copies) 931 (i).
See 'Vancouver.'
Esquimalt Guns, Removal of (Ques.) 3220 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (compensation for injuries) Amt. (B. 25) 1° m., 663 (i).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) 9005 (v).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8458 (v).
Fisheries Act (salmon licenses) Amt. (B. 58) 1° m., 1343 (i).
Fish Poachers on Pacific Coast, Protective Service *re* (remarks) 2080 (ii).
——— Par. in Victoria 'Daily Colonist' (remarks). 1458 (i).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8631 (v).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 2879, (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7863 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9470 (v).
Jardine, Mr. John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Daily Times' *re* Claims on Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
——— Payment by Govt. in excess of Work (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Shipwrecks on B. C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading, &c. (remarks) 7257 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7251 (iv).
See 'Indian Act.'
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6108 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6491; (buoy steamers) 6550; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (pensions to pilots) 6534 (iv).
U.S.. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington (remarks) 9247 (v).
Vancouver Customs Entries, by Robt. Kelly, &c. (M. for copies) 713 (i)
See 'Customs.'
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. res. (Mr. Meighen) 1946 (i).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8936 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1312 (i).
Coronation Day in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers, &c. (Ques.) 9989 (v).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 10351 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) (personal explanation) 5316 (iii).
Flags, Regulations by Govt. *re* Flying with Foreign Flags (prop. res.) 4347, 4379 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1438 (i).
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 1277 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181, 3389 (ii).
Newspaper Trains, Cost of Operation *re* Special Trains (Ques.) 9982 (v).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9925 (v).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmnt, (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5119 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res. (Mr. Fielding) 10535 (v).
—— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10042 (v).
Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4311 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6629 (iv); Post Office (mail clerks) 4281, 4284 (iii).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Census Taking System, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4341 (iii).
Civil Service Act (garnishee) Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 195 (i).
—— Garnishee of Salaries, on M. for Sup., 4571 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Compensation to (Ques.) 658 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7450 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3793 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1697 (i).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Address, The, 172 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election (remarks) on Address, 172 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, *re* Statements in 'Le Devoir,' 146 (i).
Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada (remarks) 7427 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 3389 (ii).

BEST, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Aud. General, Cor. *re* over-payments by Govt. (remarks) 1010 (i).
Census Enumerators, Pets, in Favour of Reciprocity, Circulation of (remarks) 6507 (iv).
Eucharistic Congress, Number of Buildings decorated by Govt. (Ques.) 4667 (iii).
—— Reception to by Federal Govt., &c., (Ques.) 5935 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Stock *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1528 (i).
Mica Exports, 1900 to 1910 (Ques.) 5290 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of, Members paying for Speeches, &c., 1355 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 9885, 9891 (v).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8367 (v).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6812, 6828 (iv).

BEST, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6190 (iv).
Shelburne Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3795 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6069 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Combines Investigation Act) 4280 (iii).
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6166 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8691 (v).
Post Office (rural postmasters) 4281 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3159 (ii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt (B. 39) 1° m., 924 (i).
—— Discussion *re* (remarks) 4383 (iii).
La Banque du Canada incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 4109; on M. for Com., 5631; in Com., 5776 (iii), 6120 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 3180 (ii), 7720, on M. for 3°, 7717 (iv).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1453 (i).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 8187; in Com., 8969 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 214) 1°*, 8955; in Com., 9167 (v).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*
Canada Medical Act Amt. (B. 15) 1°m., 309 (i); 2° m., Ref. to Special Com., 2253 (ii); in Com., 6067 (iv).
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8048 (v).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8048 (v).
Fruit Duties *re* Reciprocity (remarks) 3377 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1134 (i).
Medical Council Bill, Par. in "Globe," Correction *re*, 2991 (ii).
See "Can. Medical."
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2533 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, Dufferin Res. *re* (remarks) 5547 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8756 (v); Post Office —Outside Service (magazines) 6080 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa, Pollution of the City Water, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4475 (iii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*
Typhoid in Ottawa, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' 4656 (iii).
—— (explanation) 4720 (iii).
Ventilation of the House of Commons (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).
Windsor Letter Carrier, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 355 (i).
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
See "I.C.R."
Agricultural Expenditures in Ontario, for 1910 (Ques.) 6668 (iv).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6311 (iv).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181 (i).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3600 (ii).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 201) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8828 (v).
Casualty Co. of Can. incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8568 (v).
Cattle Exports to the U.S., bonded to G.B. (remarks) 7426 (iv).
—— Reshipped to G.B. (remarks) 7558 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Apptmt. by Liberal Associations (remarks) 7021 (iv).
—— Apptmt. of (remarks) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).
—— Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9053 (v).
—— Enumerators in Peel County, Number, Apptmt. &c. (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Census Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9725 (v).
Census, System of Taking, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4341 (iii).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8717 (v).
Civil Service Appointments from South Grey since 1904, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1912 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 2555, 3059 (ii).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4659 (iii).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4043 (iii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3504 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8121 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8996 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5431 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8215 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Freeman, Cecil Ernest Relief (B. 143) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10252 (v).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5127 (iii).
Govt. Goods purchased in U.S., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
G.T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5796 (iii).
—— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to (remarks) 1805 (i).
—— Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1073, 1507 (i).
—— Settlement *re* (remarks) 9692 (v).
—— Status of men Reinstated (remarks) 3377 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1409, 1545, 1729, 1746 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6938 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2962 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8744 (v).
I.C.R. Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
—— Working Operations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1295 (i).
Justice, Deputy Minister, acting as Counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Labour Strikes, Conflict *re* (remarks) 6366 (iv).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. res. (Mr. Sproule) 1239 (i).
Lunenburg Tower Clock, Specification *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2359, 2578 (ii).
Matches, Phosphorus, Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2023 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ontario, Accommodation *re* Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
National Battlefields in Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9498 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5947 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8965 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6133 (iv).
—— on M. to introduce, 2829 (ii).
Opium Importation of, Prohibition of Sale B. 22 (Mr. King) on M. for 1°, 468 (i), in Com., 2539 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re* (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2271, Neg. (Y. 61; N. 104) 2358 (ii).
Peel County Mail Service (Ques.) 7247 (iv). *See* 'Postal.'
Pork Packing Industry Delegation, Inquiry for Rep. 3530 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
Port Credit Public Works, Expenditures for 1909-10 (Ques.) 5638 (iii).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of certain Newspapers (remarks) 10341 (v).
Postal Service in Peel County, Rural Mail Delvery (remarks) 10355 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Advertisements for Tenders, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).
Printing Bureau Irregularities, Money Loss *re* (Ques.) 794 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen's. Rep., 831 (i).
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1639 (i).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt), to sit during Sittings of the House, 10190 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Railway Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4167 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) 7550 (iv); Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7618 (iv); Original Resolution (remarks) 7668 (iv).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8369 (v).
—— Berlin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5728 (iii).
—— Letter from the 'Globe' Reporter on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7677 (iv).
—— Negotiations, Letter of J. A. Macdonald in Stratford 'Herald' *re* visit to Washington (remarks) 4299 (iii).
—— Oleomargarine, Admission of (Ques.), 6668 (iv); (remarks) 6504 (iv).
—— Protests *re*, Inquiry for, 3951 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of, (remarks) 5951 (iv).
—— Special Interests in Can., (remarks) 3058 (ii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6812, 6892 (iv).
—— Statistics, Accepting as read and Printing in 'Hansard)' (remarks) 6859 (iv).
—— Statistics, Reply of Trade and Commerce Dept. *re* Return (remarks) 6514 (iv).
Returns, Notice to Members *re* Bringing Down (remarks) 5938 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery: *See* 'Postal,' &c.
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2662, 3844 (ii).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iv).
South Grey Govt. Appointments, Inquiry for Ret. 3344 (ii).
See 'Civil Service.'
Speeches of Ministers distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
Springhill Mine, N. S., Strike, (remarks) *re* Militia, 2641 (ii).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price paid, &c., (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Supply, Schedule of Votes, Proportion, &c., (remarks) 9567 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (dairying) 6243 (iv); (exhibitions) 3776 (ii);, 9078 (v); (seeds) 6221 (iv); (tobacco production) 6262 (iv); Quarantine (animals health) 5960 (iv); (public health) 5979 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (tugs) 6388 (iv); St. Peter's (improvements) 6419 (iv); Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6392 (iv); Welland (Jane St. bridge) 6425 (iv); Williamsburg (machinery) 6426 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1475 (i); Customs (salaries) 5992 (iv); Justice (salaries) 1018 (i); Labour (salaries) 1484 (i); Militia (salaries) 1029 (i); Mines (salaries) 1476, 1478 (i); Public Works (salaries) 1033 (i).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6617 (iv); (legal expenses) 6661 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5168 (iii).

Indians—Man. (annuities) 8886 (v).

Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6162 (iv).

Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3801 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6549; (maritime road) 6543 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8770 (v).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6570 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 3211; (fire escapes) 3160 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157; (immigration buildings) 3157; (sundries) 3161 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton pavement) 1614 (i); (Hampton) 1615; (Hartland) 1620; (Hillsborough) 1622; (Moncton armoury) 1623 (i).

Public Works—Buildings— N.S. (Lunenburg) 1592; (Parrsboro) 1598, 1629; (Wolfville) 1599 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2604; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2627; (Tilbury) 2627; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wallaceburg) 2633; (Waterloo) 2634; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 3164; (heating, &c.) 2590, 3162; (H. of C. improvements) 2592; (lighting) 3202 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv); (pavements) 2594 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8872 (v); (steel cases) 2582 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1666; (Aylmer) 1673; (Grosse Isle) 1675 (i); (Montreal barracks) 2575 (ii); (Napierville) 1866; (Quebec immigrant) 1887; (Rigaud) 1888; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1893; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Three Rivers) 1902 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 9556 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9502 (v); Ont. (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R (air brakes) 5913; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (rolling stock) 5927 (iii); (working expenses) 6340 (iv)

Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry, Commissioners) 6428 (iv)

Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6559; (meteorological service) 6563 (iv)

Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9706 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3188 (ii).

See 'Supply—Public Works—Ottawa.'

Wentworth, Number of Govt. Appointments since 1904 (M. for ret.) 2162 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2557 (ii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

Address, The, 169 (i).

Arthabaska and Drummond Election, *re* Disloyal Speeches (remarks) on Address, 169 (i).

——— Statements in 'Le Devoir,' Denial, &c., 145 (i).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 471 (i).

Lanctot: *See* 'Richelieu.'

Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).

Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot, on Amt. (Mr. Monk), on M. (Mr. German), to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8027 (v).

Richelieu, Member of, Charges *re* Emplymt. of Govt. Work men from Sorel Ship yards, Ques. of Priv., 4645 (iii), (M.) for Com., 4654 (iii).

St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2674 (ii).

Sorel Naval Shipyards, Investigation, Dismissal of A. Senecal (remarks) 5732 (iii).

Thibodeau, Mr. Frank, Salary as Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 8100 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia), *Kings, N.S.*

Alberta Rangers, Macleod, Squadron, Capt. D. J. Campbell's connection therewith (Ans.) 7341 (iv).

Annual Drill, Number of Men, Officers, &c. (Ans.) 8700, 9353 (v).

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Baby Farm, Sale of, Competition *re* (Ans.) 2155 (ii).

Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3606 (ii).

Bliss, Lt. Col. D. C. F., Emplymt. by Govt. &c (Ans.) 8100 (v)

Canadian Veterans at Coronation (Ans.) 3608 (ii).

Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9997 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4660 (iii).

——— Canadian Cadets, &c. (Ans.) 706 (i).

——— Names of Officers, Cadets, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Coronation Contingent, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3277 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Selection (Ans.) 3220 (ii), 4464 (iii).
——— Selection of Officers (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Esquimalt Guns, Removal of (Ans.) 3220 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress and Guards of Honour (Ans.) 704 (i).
——— Militia Officers at Reception, Uniform, &c. (Ans.) 707 (i).
——— Attendance of Militia, Authority for (Ans.) 3219 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Compensation to (Ans.) 658, 1089 (i).
——— Number surviving, Pensions, &c. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
See "Veterans."
Flags Flying on Military Buildings (remarks) 4725 (iii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re* Purchase by Man. Govt. (remarks) 4470 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6055 (iv).
French, Gen.'s, Report (presented) 76 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Rep., 10 (i).
Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c. (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Militia and Agriculture Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ans.) 9371 (v).
Militia, Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910 (Ans.) 8700 (v).
Militia Dept., Showing of Passes by Members of Parliament (Ans.) 1003, 1090 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation (Ans.) 3467 (ii).
——— Regiments, Number in Montreal, Quebec, &c. (Ans.) 7595 (iv).
——— Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1003 (i).
——— Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4667 (iii).
——— Surveys, Expenditure in last five years (Ans.) 1102 (i).
——— Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Montreal and Mar. Prov. Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
N.B. Artillery Regiment, Annual Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Associations, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7340 (iv).
Petawawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training (Ans.) 4465 (iii).
Porcupine Fire Sufferers, Request for Tents, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 9984 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Boston Speech (remarks) 5751 (iii).
——— Kentville Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5548, 5750 (iii).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own Regiment while in England (Ans.) 1088 (i).
——— Number issued to Queen's Own (Ans.) 9781 (v)
Ross Rifles loaned by Canada to G.B., Use at Bisley, &c. (Ans.) 1087 (i).
——— Recommendation to British Govt. (remarks) 7553 (iv).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price paid, &c. (Ans.) 8583, 10335 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia—(salaries) 1021 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8758 (v).
Militia (allowance) 8514, 8528 (v); (customs duties) 6054; (R.M.C. maintenance) 6054; (Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 3156; Que. (Montreal barracks) 3145 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of (remarks) 7558 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site (Ans.) 2154 (i).
Veterans, Grants to by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5214 (iii).
See 'Fenian.'
Veterans of 1866, Compensation *re* (remarks) 9999 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax, N.S.*
Address, The, 22 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Naval Policy, 218, (amt.) 228 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, Member asked to apologize for using word "liar," 463 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2173, 2183 (ii).
Agricultural Implements, Valuations for Duties, Manipulation of, &c. (remarks) 1360 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Elections, Cartoons used by Min. of Marine, published by "Le Canada" in 1904 (remarks) on Address, 223 (i).
See 'Drummond.'
Atlantic Mail Contract, Question *re* (remarks) 2373 (ii).
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, rumours *re* (remarks) 9373 (v).
Bank Act, Consideration by Govt. (remarks) 6674 (iv).
Bank Curators Reports (remarks) 4569 (iii).
Birthday of Prime Minister, Congratulations, &c., 8 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
British National Songs in N. W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
Budget, The, (remarks) 6439 (iv).
Business of the House, Inquiry, 4117 (iii).
—— Adjournment for Coronation (remarks) 9310 (v).
See 'Coronation.'
Cable, G.B. and Canada State-owned, Proposal *re* G.B. and Can. (Ques.) 1905 (i).
See 'Telegraph.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8804, 8813, 8841; in Com., 9256 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re* Mr. Oliver on Proposed Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8191 (v).
See 'Oliver.'
C. P. Ry. Reduction of Rates, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com., 1848 (i).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7219 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Apptmt. of Enumerators (M. for copy*) 9994 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9056 (v).
Census, Inquiry for Information, 9694 (v).
—— Progress *re* (remarks) 9594 (v).
Census Omissions in Enumerations, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9717 (v).
—— Further information *re*, 9897 (v).
Census, Systems of Collecting (M. for papers, &c.) 4337 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (remarks) 6669, 7556 (iv).
China-Japan SS Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10401, 10450 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9838-9 (v).
—— Discussion *re* Rep., 9929 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8723 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com on Res., 8906 (v).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re* (M. for cor.) 2218 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 7553 (iv).
—— (notice of motion) 1912 (i).
Coal Strikes, Settlement of (remarks) 6914 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7808 (iv); in Com., 8896 (v).
Copyright Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 9595 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8711 (v).
—— Definite Date (remarks) 9090 (v).
See 'Business,' 'Imperial Conference.'
Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1896 and 1910 (Ques.) 801 (i).
See 'Duties.'
Customs Officer at Ingram Dock, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Elections (M. for O. Cs. &c.) 2218 (ii).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7017 (iv).
Deptl. Expenditures of Public Moneys, Investigations *re* (remarks) on Address, 37 (i).
Dog Fish Industry, (remarks) in Com., 8044 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, O. Cs. in Com., 8087 (v).
Drummond, &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 476 (i).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of articles in Schedules of Customs Act (M. for ret.) 1105 (i).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3480 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8111 (v).
English Mails to Mar. Provs.: *See* 'Mails.'
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Fanny Louise Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2191 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2251 (ii).
—— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5387 (iii).
—— Proceedings *re* Commission, Inquiry for, 10471 (v).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, Control of Rates, &c. (remarks) 1598 (i).
—— (remarks) *re* Printing of Speeches, &c., 1454 (i).
—— Stmt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Grain Growers' Guide (remarks) 1575 (i).
Fedorenko, S., Extradition of (remarks) 10 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9627 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, Speech of P.M.G. at Montreal (remarks) 2269 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044 (v).
Fisheries, Newfoundland: *See* 'Hague.'
Fishery Officers in Victoria Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 6672 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Seizure by 'Rainbow' (remarks) 4208 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8501 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4352 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8086, 9346 (v).
French, Gen., Rep., Inquiry for, 9 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4115 (iii).
—— Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Grain Act Amt. B., 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9514 (v).
Grand Falls and St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5705 (iii).
G.T.R. Trainmens Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1071 (i).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B., 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8978 (v).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Agreement *re* (remarks) 1725 (i).
—— Bay of Fundy, on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Sup., 4614, 4701 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Speech on Address, 24 (i).
—— Fisheries Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1804 (i).
—— Stmt. *re* (remarks) 1913 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Halifax Customs Officials, Complaints *re* Treatment *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com., 8723 (v).
Halifax Pier at Cunard Wharf, Construction of (remarks) 2150 (ii).
Halifax Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.), 653 (i).
Homestead Regulations in B.C., on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Ret., 2861 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1411, 1536, 1739, 1765 (i).
House of Commons Appointments (remarks) on M., 5288 (iii).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1564 (i).
Imperial Conference, Attendance of Prime Minister, Position of the Opposition, Compromise, &c. (remarks) 8033 (iv).
—— Cor. with Mr. Harcourt, &c. (remarks) 10340 (v).
—— Precis *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9693 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference, Precis Rep. and Verbatim Rep. (remarks) 9783 (v).
—— Printing and Distribution in Canada (remarks) 9691 (v).
—— Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10114 (v).
Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7020; on M. for 2°, 7825, 7832; in Com., 7852 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2956 (ii).
I.C.R., Construction at Grand Narrows, O. Cs, &c. *re* Claims of Contractors (M. for copies*) 5640 (iii).
—— inquiry for ret., 10470 (v).
—— Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1179 (i).
—— Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings, (remarks) 3000 (ii).
—— Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent at Moncton (Ques.) 653 (i).
—— Halifax Terminals, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham 2647 (ii).
—— Terminals, at Halifax, Dock Accommodation (remarks) 2376 (i), 9561 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 1301 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 971; in Com., 976, 1295; in Order for Com., 1407 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 871 (i); on M. for 2°, 9132; in Com., 9157 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations B. 224 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9452; on M. for 3°, 9533 (v).
See 'China and Japan.'
Japanese Treaty, Action *re* (remarks) 9076 (v).
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Prime Minister's Birthday, Congratulations, &c., 8 (i).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Speech at Montreal. *See* 'Fiscal.'
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop, Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1199 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).
—— Cor. between Govt, and British Ambassador, Inquiry for 3530 (ii)
—— Rep. of American Commissioners, Canada's action, &c., (remarks) 1651 (i).
See 'International Waterways Bill,' 'St. Lawrence.'
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., English Mails, &c., (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9543 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Mail Service to Maritime Provinces, Representations by Board of Trade at Halifax (remarks) 2376 (ii).
——— (remarks) 8794 (v).
Mails, Illegal Use of, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* M. to adjn. hse., 1358 (i).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6202 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c., (remarks) 6764 (iv).
Matches, White Phosphorus Manufacture, Prohibition B. 10 (Mr. King) on M. for 2°, 1576 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
See 'Business,' &c., 'Govt. Business.'
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9498 (v).
N. T. Ry., Eastern Div., Total Cost up to 31st Dec., 1910 (Ques.) 2434, 3064 (ii).
——— Land Damages, Delay *re* Fiats for Compensation (remarks) 3949 (iii).
——— Payments *re*, on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— St. Lawrence and Moncton Div, Completion of (Ques.) 1711 (i).
Naval Defence, Government Proposals (remarks) on Address, 34 (i).
Naval Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Address, 218 (amt.) 228; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5947 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) for Com., 782 (i).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Treaty Obligations, &c., Par. in Press (remarks) 8791 (v).
——— Power, Regulations, &c., (remarks) 8893 (v).
See 'International.'
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration at The Hague, (M. for cor.) 4337 (iii.)
——— Hague Award (remarks) 689 (i).
——— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 8093 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 8309; (amt.) 8314, Neg. (Y. 69; N. 102) 8347 (v).
——— Inquiry for Meeting of Com., 9899 (v).
See 'Can. Northern,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill (Mr. Conmee) on M. to introduce, 2831 (ii).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2344 (ii)
Oyster Culture, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. (remarks) 725 (i).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c., (remarks) 9917 (v).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8591 (v).
Perley, Mr., Cor. *re* Riordan Paper Co., (remarks) 10201 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9579 (v).
Prime Minister's Tour Through the West, (remarks) on Address, 25 (i).
P. E. I. Judicial Vacancy, Apptmt. of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 69-8, 7428, 7803 (iv); 8[illegible]5 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission 7698, 7794 (iv).
——— Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Murphy) to print (remarks) 8 (i).
Privileges and Election Com., Charges *re* (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 7884 (v).
Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Lake) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5746 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Aud. Gen's. Rep., 860 (i).
——— (remarks) 309 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection, &c. (M.) to discharge Order, 4319 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Contract, Advertisement *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 1497 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman (remarks) 4205 (iii)
——— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
——— Information *re*, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4334 (iii).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 700 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 966 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9331, 9391 (v).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Railways, Transportation Problem in Canada on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5044 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2497 (ii), 4830; (amt.) 4844; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 111) 4875 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. of Res., 3294 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4058 (iii).
Reciprocity, British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, &c. (remarks) 7210 (iv).
——— Articles *re* Obstruction (remarks) 10004 (v).
——— Free Trade Offer by U.S., Speech of Presd't Taft (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 5293 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2990 (ii).
——— Fruit Duties in B.C. (remarks) 3771 (ii).
——— Importations into Canada from Favoured Nation countries, Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets, 4134 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 2555 (ii).
——— Manufactured Products and Agricultural Products (stmnt) *re* Mr. Clark's Speech *re*, 4196 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Best) to adjn. debate, 9886 (v).
——— Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1506 (i), 2271 (ii).
——— Negotiations with U.S. and Can. (remarks) on Address, 32 (i).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (Mr. Fielding) on M. to adjn. debate, 9886 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 4125 (iii).
——— on Question of Order referring to previous debate, 8256 (v)
——— (remarks) *re* Better Order, 3705 (ii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (i).
——— Statistics of comparative prices, 6807 (iv).
——— Statistical Tables, Inquiry for 2985, 3059 (ii).
——— Statistics from U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 4931 (iii).
——— on handing in Statements (remarks) 6955 (iv).
——— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2643 (ii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7672 (iv).
——— letter from 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7676 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 5733 (iii), 8093 (v).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
R.N.W.M. Police, Death of Inspectors on Northern Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at public function (remarks) 938 (i).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service (remarks) 9995, 10095 (v).
St. John Valley Ry: *See* 'Grand Falls,' &c.
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault (M. for cor. pets, &c.) 3228 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
See 'Long Sault.'
St. Peter's Canal Construction, Answer to Question (remarks) 8355 (v).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv).
Senate, Cost of, amended Motion (Mr. Foster) 1453 (i).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7825 (iv).
Springhill Coal Strike, Information *re* Present Situation (remarks) 6362 (iv).
Statutes, French Edition, Correction in Translation (remarks) 8088 (v).
Supply for Public Works, Objection *re* Vote in full, 9554 (v).
Supply, Schedule of Votes, Proportion, &c. (remarks) 9567 (v).
Supply B. 225 on M. for 3°, 9580 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9080 (v).
Interior (boundary surveys) 9546; (Dom. Lands surveys) 9547; (seed grain) 9551; (water investigations) 9551 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8753; (Baddeck and Iona) 8763; (Bonaventure River and N.B.) 8764; (Canada and Mexico) 8781 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 1592; (Halifax post office) 1583; (Lunenburg) 1595 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8872 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9501, 9507 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9561 (v).
R.N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Tariff Negotiations, &c., Prime Minister's remarks in the West (remarks) on Address, 26 (i).
See 'Reciprocity.'
Taylor, Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip (remarks) 6 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9644 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Trade, Imports and Exports, between B.N.A. Possessions and U.S. (M. for ret.°) 4383 (iii).
U.S. Warships in Great Lakes, Armament of, &c (Ques.) 7026; (remarks) 6362 (iv).
—— Information from Official Sources, Delays, (remarks) 6611 (iv).
—— Manœuvres at Chicago, Permission of Can. Govt. *re* passing through Canadian Canals, 6116 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, on Stmnt. of Sec. of State (remarks) 10455 (v).
—— Inquiry for Stmnt., 10096 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods Act Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9348 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to refer Complaint to Com. on Marine and Fisheries, 6905 (iv).
'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation by Customs (remarks) 5627 (iii).
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6387 (iv).
Whips, Chief, Retirement of Mr. Geo. Taylor (remarks) 6 (i)
Waterways Treaty Bill: See 'International.'

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*
Algoma, Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
Alien Labour Law, Administration at Sault Ste. Marie, on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
—— Emplmnt. of Foreigners on Public Contracts (remarks) 10372 (v).
See 'Sault Ste. Marie.'
Electricians Protest *re* Dismissals at Sault Ste. Marie, Alien Labour Law Administration, on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigatin *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5322, 5508 (iii).
Farm and Garden Products, Imports at Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 7034 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9621 (v).
Fishery Inspectors, Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6646 (iv).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull,' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1559 (i).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10350 (v).
Lt. Governor, N.S., Apptmt. of, Cor. *re* Director of N.S. Steel and Coal Co. (Ques) 2670 (ii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, Acceptance of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2747; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 118) 2826 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order, 2768, 2814 (ii).
—— (explanation) 2438 (ii).
—— Notice of Discussion, 2150, 2254 (ii).
Obabikong and Sabiskong Indian Reserves, Tenders *re* Burned Timber (Ques.) 1344 (i).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6121 (iv).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10011, 10026 (v).
Reciprocity Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6782, 6900 (iv).
—— Trade and Commerce, Reply to Ret. for Statistics (remarks) 6511 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Labour Strike, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in 'Sault Express', 6359 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Cor., 6365 (iv).
See 'Alien.'
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1400 (i).
Steel Wire, &c., Bounties, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (concrete walls) 6358; (mooring posts) 6397; Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6646 (iv); Public Works--Buildings--Sask. (Battleford) 3001 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Completion of Work (remarks) 1661 (i).
Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5214 (iii).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date (remarks) 9900, 10142 (v).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 880 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6329 (iv).
Carillon Canal, Water Powers, Names of Lessees, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4578 (iii).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of, &c. (Ques.) 2852 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin (Ques.) 2852 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*
Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Product (Ques.) 6756 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9286 (v).
C.P.R. Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision, 2992 (ii).
Census Enumerators for Man. and N.W. on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9029 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8928 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3506 (ii).
Fish Poachers in Lake Superior, Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 1459 (i).
Fishery Regulations, Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).
See 'Lake Winnipeg'; 'Manitoba,' &c.
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4372 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8608 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9530 (v).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 1722 (i).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1545 (i).
Immigration—Farmers sent to G.B. from Man. (Ques.) 1489 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7833 (iv); in Com., 8404 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 796 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re* Res. from Board of Trade (read) 4217 (iii).
Light-House Keepers Salaries, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 773 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 4207, 5035 (iii).
New Westminster Employees, Increase of Salaries, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2185 (ii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8596 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5068 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 6680 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Pets, &c., 3057 (ii).
——— Letter from Market Gardeners (read) 4130 (iii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., Stmnt. of Mr. Clark *re* Opposition to, Ques. of Priv. 4227 (iii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Fishway, Correction in Stmnt. *re*, 1650 (i).
——— Fish Ladder &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3033 (ii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).
——— Sums for Completion (remarks) 1508 (i).
St. Peters Indian Reserve, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5837, Ques. of Order, 5865 (iii).
——— Amounts received from Sales, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 787 (i).
——— Chief Justice Howell's Commission (M. for copy of evidence*) 7039 (iv).
——— Investigation by Rev. Dr. John McDougall (Ques.) 787; (M. for copies) 1292 (i).
——— Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).
——— Original Documents &c. (remarks) 8192, Cor. *re* Original Documents &c. (read) 8109; on Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8478 (v).
——— Rep, in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3841 (ii).
——— Request by Commission for Official Documents (remarks) 9899 (v).
Selkirk Postoffice Box (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. of (Ques.) 6272 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3789 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6059 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5175 (iii); (agencies) 6047 (iv).
Indians, N.W.T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6036, 6039 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9549 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (pavements) 2593 (ii); (Sussex Street Block) 3172; (water supply) 2586 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).
R.N.W.M. Police (subsistence) 8600 (v)
Whitemouth River Fishway (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Winnipeg River Water Powers, &c., Inquiry for Ret. 3955 (iii).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1944 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can, Valuations &c. (remarks) 1362 (i).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Dairy Industry, Memorials *re* &c. (Ques.) 2671 (ii).
Elevator Terminals &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2390 (ii).
Elevator Terminals &c., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1497 (i).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240 (v).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1559 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1221 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2846 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6739 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6414 (iv).
Sheet Steel Co., Emplymt. of men *re* ice blockades (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Rapide Plat (dredging) 6413; (iv) Williamsburg (electric power) 6396; (iv); Public Works—Buildings, N.B., (Fredericton pavement) 1613 (i).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7210 (iv).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Rouville.*
Address, The, 135, 152 (i).
Aids to Navigation *re* St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c., (Ans.) 800 (i).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4240 (iii).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c., (Ans.) 1909 (i).
'Arctic' Rep. of Capt. Bernier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Barrington Passage Bait Freezer, on Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Fishing Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* new House (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
—— Salary, &c., (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
B. C. Fisheries Regulations (M. for Com. on Res.) 4201 (iii).
See 'Fisheries Act,' 'Govt. Steamers.'

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3859 (ii).
Canadian Naval Service, Boot Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1723 (i), 2675 (ii).
—— 'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c. (Ans.) 1279 (i).
—— Building of Cruisers, &c. 197 (i).
—— Cruisers, Article in Naval Annual *re* Scrapping (remarks) 931 (i).
—— Coal Consumption by Niobe, (Ans.) 7209 (iv).
—— Cruisers manned by Canadians, Names, &c., (Ans.) 805 (i).
—— Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt., in the 'Navy' (Ans.) 793 (i).
—— Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' (Ans.) 1091 (i).
—— Fisheries Protection Service, Seizure by 'Rainbow,' (remarks) 4117, 4208 (iii).
—— Loan of Cruisers by Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 983 (i).
—— Names of Employees, Duties, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmnt., 935 (i).
—— Naval Expenditures Return (remarks) 4659 (iii).
—— Navy Regulations, Printing, &c., (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Approximate Cost, &c., (Ans.) 7210 (iv.)
—— 'Niobe,' Contracts *re* Provisions (Ans.) 794 (i).
—— 'Niobe,' Date of laying keel, Repairs in England, &c., (Ans.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Speed, Result of Official Trials (Ans.) 7209 (iv.)
—— 'Niobe,' Wages of Seamen, Discontent, &c., (remarks) 531 (i); (stmnt. read) 664 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c., (Ans.) 792 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c., (Ans.) 788 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' listed as ineffective (remarks) 1071 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' struck off Effective List, (Ans.) 1081 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Total Cost to date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance (Ans.) 791 (i).
—— Recruiting by Postmasters (remarks) 7262 (iv).
—— Recruiting Regulations, O. C. *re* Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7804 (iv).
—— Roper; *See* 'Roper.'
—— Ships ordered by Govt., Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 867 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Canadian Naval Service, Tenders for Cruisers, &c., (Ans.) 8700 (v).
—— Total Cost of Cruisers (Ans.) 791 (i).
—— Total Expenditure since October 31, 1910 (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (registration) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 6112, 2° m., and (M.) to ref. to Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6675 (iv).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4581 (iii).
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930, 5039 (iii).
Coronation, Naval Cadets, Methods of Selection (Ans.) 9986 (v).
'Crissie Toomey,' Purchase of, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re* (Ans.) 9374 (v).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7018 (iv).
Dog Fish Industry, (remarks) 8044 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Speeches *re* Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 135, 152; Cartoons displayed to House (remarks) 146 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Str.. Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 1972 (ii).
—— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters (Ans.) 1080, 1092 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 799 (i).
Falconer System of Bookkeeping, Adoption of by Depts. (Ans.) 1904 (i).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt (B. 185) in Com. on Res., 8043; in Com., 8419 (v).
Fisheries Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret 5836 (iii).
Fisheries of Can., Extent in Marine Miles, Amount realized, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. Wilcox) to Com. of Sup., 5224 (iii).
Fisheries Officers in Ontario, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6158 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Number of Vessels (Ans.) 805 (i).
—— Control by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Taylor) 8484 (v).
—— on Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).
—— Date of Operations *re* (Ans.) 3465 (ii).
B½

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Fisheries Treaty, Penalties *re* Violation of, on Inquiry for Ret., 1806 (i).
—— Printing of Documents (remarks) 4207 (iii).
—— Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).
—— Trap Nets (remarks) 2070 (ii).
Fishery Regulations, Violation of by C. K. Golden, &c. (remarks) 2368 (ii).
Fisheries Treaty, 1908, Non-fulfilment by U.S. (remarks) 6531 (iv).
Fishery Commission *re* Saskatchewan and Alberta, Interim Rep. laid on Table, 10590 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Applications *re* Fish Fry (Ans.) 1494 (i).
Fish Hatcheries in East Elgin, Construction *re* (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Fishing Bounties in Kings Co., P.E.I., Names of persons receiving Pay (Ans.) 7246 (iv).
Fish Poachers on Pacific and Lake Superior Coasts (remarks) 1460 (i), 2085 (ii).
Fishing by Steam Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Fish Transportation, Expenditure annually, Value, &c. (Ans.) 6271 (iv).
—— Amounts paid out of Aiding Fund, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) 6506 (iv).
Fish Transhipment from Mar. Provs. (remarks) 6092, 6102, 7106 (iv).
—— Statement (read) 7259 (iv).
Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations Bill, on Request (Mr. Jameson) to place on Govt. Orders, 3374 (ii).
Fish Wardens in Victoria, N.B., on Inquiry for Ret., 5629, 5732 (iii), 6672 (iv).
Fishways on Pembina River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
—— Placing of Ladder (Ans.) 1090 (i).
Glace Bay Bait Association, Amounts paid from 1906-10 (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
—— Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Govt. Goods purchased from U.S., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Weir Licenses &c. (Ans.) 2367 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock (Ans.) 1976 (ii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries, Regulations, Papers laid on Table, 2365 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Hague Tribunal, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Bay of Fundy) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Sup., 4593, 4678 (iii).
Herring Traps, Close Season (remarks) 2086 (ii).
Immigration Officers of U.S. residing in Canada (Ans.) 1724 (i).
Imperial Defence Conference Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 2216 (ii).
—— Premier's Reception from Conference, Amount expended (Ans.) 9781 (v).
See 'Laurier.'
Imperial Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).
International Fisheries Commission, Regulation *re* (remarks) 7260 (iv).
—— Regulations, Mess. from Washington (remarks) 6504 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
'Iroquois' Str., Report *re* Wreck (remarks) 7104 (iv).
James Bay Fishing Lease to Ach. McNee, Duration of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).
'John B. Young' Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re* (Ans.) 2368 (ii).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections (Ans.) 1907 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries, Investigating Fisheries, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 797 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Icebreaker (remarks) 4223 (iii).
Lanctot Charges: *See* 'Privileges,' &c.
Laurier Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure (Ans.) 9982 (v).
See 'Imperial Conference.'
'LeDevoir,' Quotations from *re* Drummond Election, Ques. of Priv., 469 (i).
Life Saving Awards, Names of Recipients (Ans.) 3849 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Date of Appmt. &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 772 (i).
Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table, 529 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Manitoba Fisheries Commission, on Inquiry for Rep., 4207, 5035 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re* (Ans.) 1318 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
—— Investigations, Prosecutions, &c. (remarks) 10243 (v).
—— Purchase of Ships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 4208 (iii), 6763 (iv).
—— (remarks) on Inquiry for Ret., 6120 (iv).
Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c. (Ans.) 2376 (ii), 5637 (iii).
Menzie, Wm., Payments to *re* Meteorological Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9-10 (Ans.) 817 (i).
'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 1724 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 48) 1° m., 1070 (i); in Com., 8451 (v); on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services (Ans.) 984 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B 45 (Mr. Ecrement) on M. for 3°, 7718; in Com., 7723 (iv).
Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Navigation Licenses, on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington (Ans.) 2376 (ii).
Navy of Canada: *See* 'Can. Naval Service.'
Negroes in Govt. Employ: *See* 'Civil Service.'
Northwest Fishing Co., on Inquiry for Ret. 5630 (iii).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper (Ans.) 5832 (iii).
—— Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3465 (ii).
Oyster Culture, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. 760 (i).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew, &c. (Ans.) 3605 (ii).
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 9782 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3908 (ii).
—— Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7979 (v).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Emplymt. of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection (Ans.) 6663 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Members *re* (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
Reciprocity, Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6670 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5737 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Rhodes) 1001 (i).
Revised Statutes—Chapter 142, French Version, Correction (B. 136) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 799 (i).
——— Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval by Govt. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
——— (remarks) 935 (i).
——— Meaning of Word 'Faction,' Incomplete Answer (remarks) 1353 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth of Water at Low Tide below thirty feet (Ans.) 1718 (i).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c. (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name (Ans.) 1491 (i).
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
Shipwrecks on B.C. Coast, Inspection *re* (remarks) 7258 (iv).
Sick Mariners' Funds, Amount in Trust, Investment &c. (Ans.) 9993 (v).
——— Law *re* Payment of Dues (Ans.) 1904 (i).
Smelt Fishing in Nova Scotia, Pet. *re* Change of Open Season (Ans.) 9984 (v).
Sorel Marine Shops, Complaints *re* Thefts (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Sorel Shipyards, Official Inquiry, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6758 (iv), 9995, 10096 (v).
——— Charges *re* stealing Buoys (Ans.) 7026; (remarks) 7217 (iv).
——— Dismissal of A. Senecal (remarks) 5732 (iii).
——— Instructions to Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 7039 (iv).
See 'Privileges.'
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 1910 (i).
Steam Trawler, Application *re* Fishing Bounty (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3118 (ii).
Steam Trawlers, 'Wren' and 'Croquette,' Registration in Canada (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1463 (i).
Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 6661; (fish transportation) 6092, 6102; (fishways) 6659; (legal expenses) 6661; (modus vivendi licenses) 6160; (Ont. inspectors) 6613 (iv); (overseers) 3809 (ii); (oyster culture) 6661 (iv); (protection service) 3807 (ii); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6105, 6159 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, (Agencies, rents, &c.) 6454; (aids to navigation) 6455; (Barret, M., payments to) 6091;
BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(buoys in Bay of Fundy) 6458; (Eureka) 6503; (Harling, Mr. Thos., compensation) 6092; (Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, compassionate allowance) 6091; (lighthouses, repairs) 6455; (lightkeepers salaries) 6454; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (maritime road) 6542; (pensions) 6091; (pensions to pilots) 6533, (signal service) 6502; (steamers) 6546; (telephones, life stations) 6539; (Thunder Bay) 6500; (wharfs) 6538; (wireless stations) 6457 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (shipwrecked seamen) 6572; (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6554 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic) 6089 (iv); (cattle inspection) 5828; (Govt. steamers maintenance, &c.) 5811; (masters and mates) 5821; (life saving awards) 5822 (iii); (life saving stations) 6090; (Moodie, Maj. J. D., compensation) 6090 (iv); (obstructions in navigable waters) 5826; (patrol boats in North) 5829; (registration of shipping) 5826; (schools of navigation) 5823; (winter mail service) 5828; (wrecking plant subsidy) 5829 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks 3152 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6557; (meteorological service) 6561, 6564 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 6572 (iv).
Telegraph Act (wireless) Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 3453 (ii).
Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway (Ans.) 7807 (iv).
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal (Ans.) 2367 (ii).
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling'.
Treaty of 1871, *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters (correction) 7023 (iv).
Vessels Registered in Canada, List (presented) 9690 (v).
Vessels transferred between Canada and Newfoundland, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3464 (ii).
'Wanda' Yacht, Change from American to Canadian Register, &c. (Ans.) 4301 (iii).
——— Motive Power, &c. (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Complaints *re*, Investigation by Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6905 (iv).
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 812 (i).
Westport Signal Stations when and where Erected, &c. (Ans.) 1092 (i).
Whitemouth River Fishway (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
See 'Telegraph Act.'
Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 3225 (ii).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6818 (iv).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8460 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9525 (v).
Immigration Act Amt B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2008 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1512 (i).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9219 (v).
Miner, Bill, Capture of (remarks) 4384 (iii).
Railway Act (accidents) Amt B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1890 (i).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1382 (i).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 303, 311 (i).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7255 (iv).
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1315 (i).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10376 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) 8999 (v).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8105, 9251 (v).
Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 3283 (ii).
Fruit Duty, Res. from B.C. Inland Board of Trade (read) 3377 (ii).
Fruit Growers from B.C., Report, Inquiry for, 6120 (iv).
See 'Reciprocity'.
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1418, 1793 (i).
Immigration into Western Can., Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1555 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7855 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9433 (v).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2456; in Com. on Res., 3579, 3611 (ii).
—— Editorial in 'Summerland Review,' and Res., from Fruit Growers in Okanagan Valley (read) 4126, 5549 (iii).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., Negotiations, Minister's Visit to Washington, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 4566 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5949 (iv).
—— Statistics *re* Prices, Information *re* (remarks) 6518 (iv).
—— Tel. from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B.C. (read) 3770 (ii).
—— *See* 'Fruits.'
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., Quarantine (animals health) 5968 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 5206 (iii).
Postoffice (postmasters salaries) 4289 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Grand Forks) 3015 (ii); (Greenwood) 3015 (ii); (Vernon) 3018 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 6563 (iv).
U. S.—Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7256 (iv).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 886 (i).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L., *Dauphin.*
Address, The, 640 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083 (iii).
Aylwin Irrigation Co.'s Grant, Inquiry for Papers, 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).
See 'Percy.'
Canadian Navy *re* Home Rule (remarks) 1461 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re* (Mr. Oliver) Personal Explanation, 8188 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man., and N. W., Apptmt. of, on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9032 (v).
Clock in Tower of Parlt. Buildings, Complaint *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3510 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8126 (v).
Fish Hatchery at Snake Island, Winnipegosis, Apptmt. of Keeper (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors, Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6642 (iv).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4368 (iii).
Fort Churchill and Nelson River Survey, Inquiry for Ret., 5954 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9529 (iv).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*
Homestead Entries, Irregularities *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5587 (iii).
Homestead Infractions, Punishment *re*, on Ques. of Order, 'Liar,' asked to withdraw, 5561-2 (iii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7852 (iv).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet., *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iv).
Leach, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Lethbridge Speech of Member for Pictou, Denial of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res., (Mr. Sproule) 1270 (i).
Man. Swamp Lands, Concession to Province, (remarks) 6759 (iv).
Markey Fishing Rights on Nelson River, Extension of, Cancellation of, &c., (Ques.) 4664 (iii).
—— O. Cs., &c., (M. for papers) 4382 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5630, 5954 (iv).
—— (remarks) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).
Militia Dept., Showing of Passes by Members of Parlt., (Ques.) 1090 (i).
Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10528 (v).
Northwest Fishing Co., Inquiry for Ret., 5630 (iii).
Oliver Charges: *See* 'Can. Northern Land Grant.'
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c., (remarks), 9924 (v).
Percy Aylwin Irrigation Grant, O.Cs. &c., (M. for cor.*) 6158 (iv).
Railway Rates in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Railway Shelters for Workmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup. 5058 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6916 (iv).
—— Assurance of member for North Oxford *re* Farmers' Interests (remarks) 5541 (iii).
Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5952 (iv).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3044 (ii).
Saskatchewan Capital City, on Ques., of Priv. (Mr. Neely) 5561, 5622 (iii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9077 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1403 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6241 (iv); (exhibitions) 3785 (ii), 9077 (v); Quarantine (animals health) 5974 (iv).
Canals—Williamsburg (iron mooring posts) 6426; (machinery) 6426 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (contingencies) 4725; Interior (salaries) 4727 (iii).
Fisheries (fishways) 6660; (legal expenses) 6661; (Ont., inspectors) 6642 (iv).
Indians—N.W.T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6040 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5556, 5582 (iii).
Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3802 (ii).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8692 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers) 3212; Ont., (Mitchell) 2147; (Peterborough) 2608; Sask. (Battleford) 2971, 3006; (Humboldt) 3007 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6563 (iv).
Swan Creek Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Address, The, 512 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5571 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9271 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Com. of Sup., 4588 (iii).
Civil Service Act, (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8937 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5481 (iii).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 9371 (v).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1528 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 150; 2° m., 1300; in Com., 1526 (i); on Senate Amts., 3460, 3845 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1147 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 969; in Com., 979, 1515 (i).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9482 (v).
Naval Policy, on The Address, 512 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8961 (v).
Ontario Northern and Timagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 4109 (iii).
Potato Barrels; *See* 'Inspection,' &c.
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7783 (iv).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1° m., 4110 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 564 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9329, 9391 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4496 (iii).
—— Dufferin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5547 (iii).
—— Treaty Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6805 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5646 (iii); in Com., 8413 (v).
Saskatoon & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 111) 1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184 (ii).
Saunderson, Pauline Winslow Relief (B. 181) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2658 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3447 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Hartland) 1618 (i).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Canadian Northern Branch Lines incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1640 (i); on Senate Amts., 6468 (iv).
Elevators, Terminal &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3494 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9525 (v).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1°*, 376 (i).
Reciprocity wih U. S., in Com. on Res., 6952 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*
Otter, Beaver or Steam Trawling in Northumberland Strait (M. for cor*) 980 (i).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiation *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3112 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron East.*
Address, The, 246 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1363 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3514 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Representations to Fin. Dept. *re* Stability, &c., (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Food Supplies and Cold Storage B. 112 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 2985 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S, in Com. on Res., 7517 (iv).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10131 (v).
Small Pox Epidemic, Condition of House of Commons, (remarks) 7255 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6407 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic, and Prorogation &c. (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Wingham Public Building Clock, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 6664 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*
Conciliation Board *re* Strikes, Remarks of Judge McGillivray (remarks) in Com of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4378 (iii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps. 3904 (ii).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6904 (iv).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3089 (ii).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *Waterloo South.*
Three Rivers Post Office, Temporary Building (Ques.) 8934 (v).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex South*
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 187) 1°*, 8187; in Com., 8969 (v).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7563 (iv).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 1°*, 8582; in Com., 8971 (v).
Conduits Co. Limited Patent Relief (B. 43) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 121) in Com., 5127 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 55) 1°*, 1277 (i).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s. (B. 223) correction of clerical error (M.) 9305 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co. Ltd., incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8547 (v).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1513 (i).
Négro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N.W. (remarks) 5911 (iii).
Oliver, Hon. Frank, Charges *re*, Meeting of Com. (remarks) 9900 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6144 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 829 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9403 (v).
Revillon Frères Trading Co., Limited, incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7148 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6616 (iv).
Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
Trussed Concrete Steel Co. Patent Relief (B. 188) 1°*, 8308; in Com., 8970 (v).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 297 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8713 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3496 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4376 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1754 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1561 (i).
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1009 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S. in Com. on Res., 4143 (iii).
Reciprocity, *re* Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) on U.S. Manufactures &c., 4197 (iii).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T. *Yukon Territory.*
Beatty, Mary Jane Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 6756 (iv).
British Columbia and White River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Crothers) for Royal Commission, 7765 (iv).
Reciprocity Treaty, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7624 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2731 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2174 (ii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3028 (ii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2223 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (ry. trainmen) Amt. (B. 38) 1° m., 924 (i).
Electricity, &c., Exportation Act Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 2254 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2415 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184 (ii); in Com., 6121, 6124 (iv).
——— M. to introduce, 2828 (ii).
——— Documents *re*, placing on Hansard, 2829 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com of Sup., 2275 (ii).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1640 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2621; Ottawa (water supply) 2589 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver.*
Chinese Investigation Commission, Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9864 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9456 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9574, 9576 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9388 (v).
Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6795 (iv).
———Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10063; Ques. of Order, 10008 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3201 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Bathurst, N.B., Dredging Total Quantity and Cost (Ques.) 803, 1285 (i).
Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extensions (M. for cor.*) 6158 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8805 (v).
Census Commissioner for York County, N. B., (Ques.) 8704 (v).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re* (remarks) 9247, 9374 (v).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for current year (Ques.) 814 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting Contracts to (Ques.) 813 (i).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, (Amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).
Grand Falls Ry: *See* 'St. John Valley Ry.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1777 (i).
I.C.R., Moncton Extensions, Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworking Co., (Ques.) 6157 (iv).
See 'Builders.'
——— Moncton Station, Site purchased, &c., (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2026 (ii).
Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official, Dalhousie, N.B., Member of Town Council, (Ques.) 4044 (iii).
Miramichi Bay, N.B., Dredging Contract, Specifications, Cor. &c., (M. for copy*) 1340 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2556 (ii).
N. T. Ry., N. B. Section, Standard, Estimated Total Cost (Ques.) 4047 (iii).
Ottalie Stream, N.B., Public Works, Construction, &c., (Ques.) 1287 (i).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of, &c., (Ques.) 2852 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur, I. C. Ry., Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ques.) 6156 (iv.)
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April 1910 (Ques.) 6267 (iv).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 120 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 1°, 4110 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 4523 (iii).
——— Boston Speech of Minister of Militia (remarks) 5751 (iii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10010 (v).
St. Croix River, N. B., Construction of Public Works, Proposal *re* (Ques.) 1348 (i).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, Completion, &c., (Ques.) 814 (i).
——— Rental of Office, &c., (Ques.) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5644 (iii); in Com., 8413 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Fergus) 2111 (ii); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv.); (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers —N. S., (Argyle Sound) 9505 (v); (Cribbons Point) 6029 (iv); (L'Ardoise) 6029 (iv); (Margaree) 6029 (iv); (Upper Prospect) 6030 (iv); (West Dublin Bay) 6030 (iv); (Yarmouth) 6031 (iv).
Public Works —Harbours and Rivers — Ont., (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R., (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
Victoria Electoral Division, Convictions, Fines, &c., (M. for ret.*) 7602 (iv).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 869 (i).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8843 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9066 (v).
China-Japan S.S. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2517 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8729 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8947 (v).
Coasting Trode Act, Changes *re* (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
'Crissy Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5833 (iii).
Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8044 (v).
East Chezzetcook Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
English Mail Service to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 8793 (v).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2995 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044; in Com., 8419 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie), 4373 (iii).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 5833 (iii).
Grand Trunk Strike, Payment to Judge Barron (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Conference re (remarks) 2002 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1439, 1772 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Repeal of (remarks) 6934 (iv).
I.C.R., Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5832 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Dismissals from Nov. 1908, Number reinstated (Ques.) 3666 (ii).
——— Eastern N.S. Extension, on Prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1170 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2058 (ii).
Militia Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4667 (iii).
Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse. (remarks) 2261, 2265 (ii).
Naval Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 9375 (v).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Names of Officers (remarks) 9090 (v).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper (Ques.) 5832 (iii).
——— Pet, *re* Light (Ques.) 3465 (ii).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew, &c. (Ques.) 3605 (ii).
Post Office Act (stamp vending machines) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 8068 (v).
Railways-Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5091 (iii).
Reciprocity—Kentville Res. *re* (read) 5548 (iii).
Springhill Mines Strikers, and Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept. (remarks in Com. of Sup.) 4236 (iii).
Steam Trawling, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3108 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1052; Public Works (salaries) 1045 (i).
Fisheries (fishways) 6660; (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4236 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6548; (maritime road) 6544; (pilots) 6538; (wharfs) 6538 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Anapolis and London) 8751; (Baddeck and Iona) 8764; (Canada and Cuba) 8777 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Ocean and River Service—('Earl Grey') 6481 (iv); (life saving awards) 5822; (maintenance, &c.) 5812; (masters and mates) 5821; (obstructions in navigable waters) 5827; (schools of navigation) 5823 (iii).
Post Office (ry. mail clerks) 4285 (iii).
Public Works--Building--Alberta (Macleod) 3003, 3005; Ont. (Athens) 2089; (Chesley) 2104; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2134; Ottawa (telephones) 3170; (Woods Building lighting contract) 3175 (ii); Que (Montreal barracks) 1864; (St. Lambert) 1901 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 3002 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers--N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9504 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446 (iv); I.C.R. (Halifax) 5920 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Vessels transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3464 (ii).
West Indies and Halifax SS Service, Arrangements *re* Contract (Ques.) 4674, 4925 (iii).
Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3175, 3192 (ii).
Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 1981 (i).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *Elgin West.*
Address, The, 462, (M.) to adjn. debate, 468, rsmd., 491 (i).
Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 51) in Com., 3024, 3181, 3391 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836 (v).
Canadian Railways, Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3940 (ii).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9050 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8737 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8944 (v).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission re Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5377 (iii).
——— Treasury Board, Ret., Ques. of Priv., 5552 (iii).
——— Mr. Calvert's Connection *re*, Ques. of Priv., 5730 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1766 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com. 1516 (i).
Lethbridge Speech of Member for Pictou (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on the Address, 492 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Royal Commission, 7751 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7943 (iv).
Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7077 (iv).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5873 (iii).
South Grey Appointment, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3347 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6493 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Fredericton pavement) 1614 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax post office), 1588 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2098; (Chesley) 2104; (Dresden) 2108; (Dundas) 2109; (Elora) 2109; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2134, 3156; (Midland) 2145; (Tilbury) 2627 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3162; (pavements) 2602; (water supply) 2589 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Aylmer) 1674; (Napierville) 1866, 1873 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2974 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (tobacco curing stations) 3161 (ii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.,*Simcoe, North.*
Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date (remarks) 9090, 9311 (v).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3460 (ii).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1360 (i).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re* (remarks) 10350 (v).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1342 (i).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2430 (ii).
Business of Private Members, Thursdays Routine (remarks) 1550 (i).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co..'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3458 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com., 9223, 9279 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2513 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10438 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9840 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8941 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Regulations *re* Selection (Ques.) 4464 (iii).
—— Selection of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).
Coronation of King George V., Invitation to Members of Parlt., (remarks) 1580 (i).
See 'Adjournment.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Estimates of Depts., Procedure *re* Discussing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8467 (v).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel.'
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt, (Mr. Crocket) 10229 (v).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1488 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff). in Com., 3024 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1545, 1731 (i).
Hydro Electric Power Connection across McGann Property, Decision of Minister (remarks) 1598 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amt., 3460 (ii).
I. C. R. Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton, &c. (Ques.) 5129 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 876 (i): on M. for 2°, 9093 (v); in Com., 9157, 9172 (v).
'Labour Gazette' Names on Mailing List, (M. for copy) 1727 (i).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2893, 2916 (ii).
See 'International.'
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c (Ques.) 5637 (iii).
Newmarket Canal Rep. and Cor. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10491 (v).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9916, 9930 (v).
Penny Bank Act Amt. B. 221 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9221 (v).
Pollution of Navigable Waters (B. 178) 1°*, 7339 (iv).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10341 (v).
Potatoes: *See* 'Inspection.'
Printing Bureau Investigation, Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 1364 (i).
—— Printing of (remarks) 1351 (i).
Pure Foods (B. 35) 1° m., 865 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9314, 9317 (v).
Ry. Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Railway Rates, &c., Treaty *re* Control of (remarks) 8357 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2461 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4771 (iii); remarks *re* Pulp in Com. on Res., 3322 (ii).
——— Discussion by reading Extracts, Ques. of Order, 4124 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Ques. of Order, 4055 (iii).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9889 (v).
——— Submission to House for Ratification (remarks) 1805 (i).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt, (remarks) 7612 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 9165, 9167 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9167, 9168 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9563 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1475; Militia (salaries) 1022 (i).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8825 (v).
Public Works—N.B. (Fredericton pavement) 1612; (Hartland) 1617; Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (Tracadie) 1625 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax Citadel) 1582; (Lunenburg) 1595; (Parrsboro) 1629 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (pavings) 8883; (Rideau Hall) 8876 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9506 (v).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).
Vessels transferred between Can. and Newfoundland (remarks) 3464 (ii).
Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5215 (iii).
Waterways Treaty, Inquiry for Plans, 3681 (ii).
See 'International,' 'Long Sault.'

CURRIE, Mr. M., *Prince Edward.*
Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s (B. 88) 1°*, 1710 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*
Absence, Emoluments for (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s 'Arctic,' Rep. of Mr. Vanasse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6542 (iv).
Canada and S. America SS. Service, Subsidies to (Ques.) 5290 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).
Census System of Taking, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4340 (ii).
Chatham Public Building, Purchase of Site, Name of Owners (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8911 (v).
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930, 5038 (iii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2229 (ii).
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S. (remarks) 4470 (iii).
See 'Negroes.'
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues (remarks) 9374 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4354 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4724 (iii).
Fredericton Pavement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Conferences *re* (remarks) 2002 (ii).
Halifax and St. John Wharfage, &c. (Ques.) 7807 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2019 (ii).
Immigration into Eastern Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
I. C. R., Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
——— Branch Lines Bill, (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9583 (i).
——— Mileage, Value of Rolling Stock, &c. (Ques.) 3668 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 868 (i).
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders re (Ques.) 5132 (iii).
Match Factories, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1976 (ii).
Match Factories, using Phosphorus, Number, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1717 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2061 (ii).
N. T. Ry., N. B. Section, Pusher Grade (remarks) 4051 (iii).
Naval Boots for Marine Dept., Specifications, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 1723 (i).
N. B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5945 (iv).
"Negroes": *See* "Coloured Aliens"; "Civil Service".
Ottawa City Health Conditions, on Amt. (Mr. Lewis) to Com. of Sup., 6370 (iv).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1101 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contract, Contract *re* Lowest Tender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Post Office Estimates, Objection *re* passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5054 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 4501 (iii).
——— Dufferin Board of Trade Res. (read) 5547 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Fish Ladders &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3033 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5129, 5631 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5695 (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5974 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville) 6357 (iv); Lachine (tugs) 6388 (iv).
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coins) 6062 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 4725 (iii); Interior (salaries) 4726 (iii).
Dom. Lands—Miscellaneous (parks) 6049 (iv); (Banff water works) 6052; (Buffalo) 6049 (iv); (Forestry Convention) 6052 (iv).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6092 (iv); fishways) 6660 (iv); (inspectors) 6658 (iv); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6109 (iv).
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174 (iv); (committees) 6471 (iv); (electric attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6173 (iv); (sessional clerks) 6168 (iv); (stationery) 6176 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5169 (iii); (seed grain) 6048 (iv).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6162 (iv).
Labor Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii), 6057 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6496 (iv); (buoys in Bay of Fundy) 6458 (iv); (buoy steamers) 6549 (iv); (Eureka) 6503 (iv); (Harling, Mr. Thos., compensation) 6092 (iv); (Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, compassionate allowance) 6091 (iv); (Lime Kiln Crossing 6546 (iv); (maritime road) 6542 (iv); (pensions, pilots) 6533 (iv); (shipbuilding) 6488 (iv); (telephones) 6542 (iv); (Thunder Bay) 6500 (iv); (wharfs) 6538 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8764 (iv); (Canada and Cuba) 6058 (iv) 8775; (Canada and Newfoundland 8783 (v).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8517, 8528 (v); R.M.C. (maintenance) 6054 (iv); (Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Ocean and River Service (Moodie, Maj. J. E., compensation) 6090 (iv).
Post Office (clerks) 4292 (iii); (railway mail clerks) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3003 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Nanaimo) 3016 (ii); (Prince Rupert) 3016; (Vancouver) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax post office) 1590 (i); (Lunenburg) 1597 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3173 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv); (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1688 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford 2980 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9506 (v); (Yarmouth) 6032 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (B.C. (Okanagan Valley) 6033 (iv); Sask. and Alberta (Maintenance) 6034 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6338 (iv).
Senate (casket for address) 6167 (iv).
Scientific Institution (magnetic observatory) 6557 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 6659 (iv).
Water Supply for Parliament Buildings, *re* Typhoid Epidemic (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 3224 (ii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*
Bank Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 148 (i).
Ques. of Priv., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Apptmt. to Bench, 271 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
E. B. Eddy Co.'s (B. 54) 1° *, 1277 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5149 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1433, 1749 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2011 (ii).
Imperial Conference, Rep. *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10109 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com., on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., Ques. of Order 7977 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10191 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7064 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4082 (iii).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8370 (v).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Revillon Freres Trading Co. Ltd. incorp. (B. 158) 1° m., 6439; 2° m., 7147, 7590 (iv). in Com., 8577, 8966, 9165, 9575 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, &c. (remarks) 1367 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Aylmer) 1672 (i).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal (St. Anne).*
Bank Act Amt B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9222 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8856 (v).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9722 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8738 (v).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7820 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act. O. Cs., in Com., 8087 (v).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir, 475 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8452 (v).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8421 (v).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8660 (v).
Guarantee Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 3453 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2007 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7859 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8403 (v).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 921 (i); on M. for 2°, 9127; in Com., 9193 (v).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3259 (ii).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B. (remarks) 9375 (v).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2055 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8451; on Senate Amts, 9535 (v).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2530; on M. for 3°, 2742 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8091 (v).
Priv. and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. and Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7912 (v).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J.—*Con.*
Railway Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9316, 9385 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5891 (iii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1380 (i).
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections, &c. (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8687 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1864 (i); 2568, 3144 (ii); (Maisonneuve) 1686 (i).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *Bruce South.*
Farmer's Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5461 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1409 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c., (Ques.) 3278 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. Fielding) 10456 (v).
Supply—
Public Works—Buildings— Ont. (Chesley) 2103 (ii).
Walkerton & Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 817 (i).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr McCarthy) in Com., 5080 (iii).
Pacific and Peace Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1710 (i)
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (seeds) 6230 (iv); Public Works — Buildings — Alta., (Strathcona) 3011 (ii).
Western Alberta Ry Co.'s (B.135) 1°*, 4740 (iii).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B.186) 1°*, 8187 (v).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*
Census Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c., (Ques.) 659 (i).
Commercial Relations, &c., Translations of Documents (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Number of Copies printed (Ques.) 660 (i).
Industrial Training, Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting (Ques.) 3463 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 1069 (i); in Com., 3180, 3389 (ii); 3° m. 7560, 7717 (iv).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of Living, &c. (Ques.) 3065 (ii)

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*
Agriculture, Govt., Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv)
Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce, Quantity and Value imported from U. S. (Ques.) 9991 (v).
Armouries, &c., in Canada, Inquiry for Ret. 1460 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 24) 1° m., 530 (i).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaint *re* (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8938 (v).
Convicts liberated from Penitentiary at Kingston, without clothing or means (remarks) 1913 (i), 2065 (ii)
Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U.S., 9361 (v).
Drill Halls, Generally, Construction &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of (Ques.) 8993 (v).
Elevators, Terminal &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3511 (ii).
Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-1911, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 9369 (v).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5412 (iii).
Farm Products imported from U. S. into Kingston Quantities &c. (Ques.) 3668 (ii).
Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U. S. (Ques.) 1496 (i).
Fish Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Location, Applications for Fish Fry, (Ques.) 1494 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4359 (iii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value &c. (Ques.) 8984 (v).
Horses admitted into Canada with U. S. Settlers &c. (Ques.) 8987 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1546, (i); on M. for 3°, 3527 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8749 (v).
I. C. R., Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, from whom purchased (Ques.) 7033 (iv).
Kingston Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

EDWARDS. Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c. (Ques.) 2886 (ii).
Mica Imports, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-1911, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).
Milk and Cream, Value of Export to U. S. for March and April, 1911 (Ques.) 8790
Postal Service, Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 10356 (v).
Post Office Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i)
Post Office Revenue and Expenditure, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7774 (iv).
Public Buildings, Cost of for several Years (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7393 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10065, 10090 (v).
———Names of Favoured Nation Treaty Countries (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, (remarks) 6902 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7632 (iv).
Revenue and Expenditure, Total from 1890 to 1911 (Ques.) 9992 (v).
Rideau Canal, Lockmen, Pets. *re* increased pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
——— Removal of Stumps (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery: *See* 'Postal.'
Sand supplied Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Sharbot Lake Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
Sheep and Lambs imported in Canada from U. S. &c. (Ques.) 8987 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6258; (farm bulletins) 6186; (tobacco production) 6263 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6412; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6413; Miscellaneous (lockmen) 6453; Rideau (bridges) 6413 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1050; Militia (salaries) 1020 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
House of Commons (stationery) 6177 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (pilots) 6537 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8756; (Canada and Australia) 8766, 8772; (Canada and Cuba) 8776; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784 (v).

EDWARDS. Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8692 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 6027 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax postoffice) 1589 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2093; (Brantford) 2098; (Dresden) 2105; (Goderich) 2115; (Harriston) 2115; (Kingston) 2130; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2131; (Mount Forest) 2150 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1698 (i).
Public Works—Telegrapn Lines—Sask., &c. (maintenance) 6034 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
U. S. Warships through Canals, Inquiry for Ret., 1571 (i).
Veterans, Grants to, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).
Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1103 (i).
Wolfe Island, Customs Official, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 8099 (v).
——— Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
——— Protection to Road (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex East.*
Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Government. Remedy, &c. (Ques.) 655 (i).
Reciprocity—Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List (Ques.) 6264 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1362 (i).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 220) 1° m., 9224; on M., (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. Orders, 9350 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9260 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup, 1859 (i).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9724 (v).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8118 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10220 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 223, in Com., 9510 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1764 (i).
I.C.R., Branch Lines (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9584 (v).
———Acquisition of (remarks) 6768 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1151 (i).
International Waters Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9095 (v).
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., English Mails, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8792, 9541 (v)
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1009 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 1070 (i); on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 999 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9244 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8960 (v).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newpapers (remarks) 10343 (v).
Post Office Promotions and Salaries (remarks) 10469 (v).
Railway Act (express companies) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. S. Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1299 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9395 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10023, 10033 (v).
Rules of the House, Amendment of (remarks) 10470 (v).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Divorce Bills, Ques. of Priv., *re* Remarks of Senator Kirchhoffer, 4201 (iii).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Investigation *re* Combines Act, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 4300 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W.S., (*Minister of Finance*) *Shelburne & Queen's* (*N. S.*).
Accounts outstanding, (Ans.) 5403 (iii).
See "Government Loans."
Adjournment for Coronation, (M.) 9580 (v).
——— Extension of Time (remarks) 9090, 9566 (v).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5568 (iii).
Alberta Ry and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3392 (ii).
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, Expiry of &c. (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
American Silver Coin, Quantity exported from Canada into United States (Ans.), 6270 (iv).
See 'Gold'.

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6758, 6907 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Copy (remarks) 7256 (iv).
—— Signing of (remarks) 6673 (iv).
See 'Japanese'.
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Banking Act Amt. (B. 50) 1° m., 1340 (i)
Bank Act Amt. (B. 213) 1° m., 8887 (v); 2° m. and in Com., 9221; 3° m., 9334 (v).
See 'Penny Banks,' 'Quebec Savings Banks.'
Bank Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 6675, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6443 (iv).
Bankers' Associations, &c., on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 4116 (iii).
—— Agreement *re* Competition (Ans) 3466 (ii).
Bank Failures, Reps. of Curators by Govt. (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
—— Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govtl. Action *re*, (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
—— Curators Reports, on Inquiry for Ret., 4569 (iii).
—— Statement by Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses (Ans.) 2671 (ii).
See 'Farmers' Bank.'
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, Rumours *re* (remarks) 8956, 9373 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3601 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7475 (iv).
Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c. (Ans.) 4825 (iii).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Budget, The (financial statement) 6577 (iv).
—— (remarks) 6439 (iv).
Business of the House, (remarks) 4117 (iii).
Business of the House, Adjournment of House for Coronation (statmt.) 9309 (v).
See 'Coronation,' 'Adjournment.'
—— Morning Sittings (M.) 8887 (v).
Canadian Currency refused on Pullman Cars, Letter from Vice-President of Co. (read) 8191 (v).
Canada Cement Co., Charges by Sir Sandford Fleming (remarks) 9372 (v).
Canada Medical Act, Order called for Com. on B. 15, 6067 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836; in Com., 9260 (v).
Cattle exports to the U. S., Bonded to G. B. (remarks) 7427 (iv).
—— Re-shipped to G. B. (remarks) 7558 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cement Merger: *See* 'Can. Cement.'
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9059 (v).
Census, Hochelaga Division, Names of officers, &c. (Ans.) 9372 (v).
—— Jacques Cartier Division, Names of officers, &c. (Ans.) 9372 (v).
Commercial Agent for Canada at Washington (remarks) 9512 (v).
Continental Fire Insurance Co.'s of Canada incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v).
Customs Duties, 1906-1910: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Hon. Mr. Foster, 7021 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 6438 (iv).
Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10381 (v).
Estimates (1911) Suppl. (presented) 3068 (ii), 5525 (iii), 8355 (v).
—— (1912) Suppl. (presented) 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).
Estimates, Special Items, reported as passed, &c. (remarks) 9076 (v).
Estimates *to* be voted re Interim Supply Bill (remarks) 9223 (v).
See 'Supply Bills.'
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5306 (iii).
—— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation re Double Liability, &c., (Ans.) 4111 (iii).
—— Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8209 (v).
—— Proceedings *re* Commission, on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 10472 (v).
—— Stmnt. of Warning by Mr. Osler, M.P. (remarks) 5389 (iii); 10473 (v).
—— Treasury Board Minutes (remarks) 4741 (iii).
—— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificates (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
—— Warning to Govt. (remarks) on Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2679 (ii).
See 'Bank Curators.'
Financial Statement—Budget, The, 6577 (iv).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4357 (iii).
Foreign Consuls, Official Status (remarks) 9511 (v).
Germany, Trade Relations with, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8535 (v).
Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U. S. and British, Authority *re* (Ans.) 9985 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
See 'American Silver.'
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3775 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c., (Ans.) 3281 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9524 (v).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9308; in Com. 9510 (v).
Hydro-Electric Co., Water Power Lease, Tenders *re* (remarks) *re* Question, 9352 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).
——— Total Amount paid since 1896 (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
See 'Steel.'
Imperial Conference, Military Arviser to, &c., 9182 (v).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9182 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations (B. 224) in Com. on Res., 9432, 9445; in Com., 9494; 3° m., 9533 (v).
Japanese Treaty, Action *re* (remarks) 9076 (v).
See 'Anglo.'
——— Canada-Japan Treaty, Expiration of (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
La Banque International du Canada B. 123 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 5631 (iii); in Com., 6120 (iv).
Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2765 (ii).
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecremont) in Com., 7722 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on Regularity of Proceedings 9500 (v).
N.T.Ry., Total Cost to Dec. 31st, 1910, inclusive of Quebec Bridge (Ans.) 5130 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10509 (v).
Niobe and Rainbow, Names of Officers ((remarks) 9090 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, on Inquiry for, 3672 (ii).
Penny Bank Act Amt. (B. 221) M. for Com. on Res., 8104; in Com. on Res., 9220 (v).
Pensions to Veterans (remarks) 6915 (iv).
Porcupine Disaster by Fire, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 9636, 9696 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances (Ans.) 7246 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Financial Loan, Interest *re* (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest (Ans.) 2851 (ii).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. (B. 219) 1° m., 9089; 2° m., 9343 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., Statement, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2440; Schedules laid on Table, 2465 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4845 (iii).
——— in Com. on Res., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 3289 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4073
——— Free Trade Offer by U.S., Speech of Mr. Taft (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5294 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper (Ans.) 4468 (iii).
——— British Ambassador's Warning to Mins. (remarks) 6200 (iv).
——— Britain's Demand from U.S. *re* Tariff Concessions (remarks) 6574 (iv).
——— British Preference, Increase of (remarks) 5620 (iii), 7214 (iv).
——— British Tariff Commission, Rep *re* (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
——— Champ Clark, Speech of, *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609; on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3954 (iii).
——— Conference at Washington, Length of Session, &c. (Ans.) 7037 (iv).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 3068 (ii).
——— Cor. marked 'Private,' 2987 (ii).
——— Cor. Giving Names of Writers of Letters, &c. (remarks) 7265 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10007 (v); (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 9885 (v).
——— Debate, Talking of Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7292 (iv).
——— Denial *re* Annexationist, 4054 (iii).
——— Farm products imported from other Countries (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
——— Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6671 (iv).
——— Fruit and Vegetable Growers Representations, French Edition, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v)
——— Importations from Favoured Nation countries (Ans.) 4111 (iii).
——— Importations from Favoured Nations (remarks) *re* Answer, 4114 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Importations from Favoured Nations Countries into Canada, Answer to Questions, 4134 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Pets, &c. (Mr. Bradbury) 3057 (ii).
—— Lord Strathcona's Telegram, Mess. from Associated Press (read) 5292 (iii); on Explanation (Mr. Goodeve) *re* Lord Strathcona's Telegram, 5211 (iii); Tel. from Min. of Fin. to High Commissioner, on Inquiry for, 3274 (ii).
—— Names of Favoured Nation Countries (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
See 'Importations.'
—— North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7222 (iv).
—— Perley, Mr., Cor. *re* Connection with Riordan Paper Co. (remarks) 10198 (v).
—— Protests *re* (remarks) 3951 (iii).
—— Pulp and Paper Duties, Further Information *re* (remarks) 2646, (ii).
—— Resolutions against (remarks) 4121 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
—— Statistics from U. S. (remarks) 4931 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Can., 6780 (iv).
—— Statistics, Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6858 (iv).
—— Statistics, Mess. to Pres'dt Taft *re* (remarks) 4472 (iii).
—— Statistical Tables, on Inquiry for, 2985, 3059 (ii).
—— Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations (Ans.) 7037 (iv).
—— Statistics from U. S. (remarks) 2737 (ii).
—— Statistics, U. S. Govt. Publication *re* (remarks) 6674 (iv).
—— Stmnt. in White Book, &c. (Ans.) 10194 (v).
—— Suppl. Ret. Laid on Table, 4383 (iii).
—— Tel. of Senator Cummins *re* Manufactured Products (remarks) 4115 (iii).
—— Trade with other Countries affected (Ans.) 3667 (ii).
—— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2644 (ii).
—— Wool in the Fleece, omitted from Free List (Ans.) 6264 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8093 (v).
Revenue and Expenditure Total for 1890-1911 (Ans.) 9992 (v).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).; in Com., 8966, 9165 (v); (M.) to ref. to Banking Com. 7590 (iv).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2596, 2649, 3021, 3454, 3845 (ii).
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9078 (v).
Sessional Employees, House of Commons, on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) for Ret., 3471 (ii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3347 (ii).
Speeches by Prime Minister, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9072 (v).
Stamp Contract: *See* "American Bank Note."
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections, &c. (remarks) 8090 (v).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3107 (ii).
Steel Bounties, Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 5937 (iv).
Steel Wire Bounties *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
See "Iron," "Budget, The"
Sterling Trust Co.: *See* "Security."
Supply Bill (No. 128) in Com. 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 4210 (iii).
—— (B. 160), 1°, 6439-40 (iv).
—— B. 225, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 9580 (v).
SUPPLY—
Schedules of proportion of Votes (presented) 9566 (v).
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coins) 6060 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3834 (ii).
Indians—Man. &c. (annuities) 8884 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6497 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Newfoundland) 8784 (v).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8685 (v); (coronation decorations) 9566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3202 (ii); (pavements) 8884 (v); (Rideau Hall) 8875 (v).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 6059 (iv).
Unprovided items (generally) 6160 (iv).
Testimonials to Ministers. *See* "Ministers."
Treasury Board Minutes, *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting (remarks) 5136 (iii).
U.S.—Japanese Treaty, on Inquiry for Copy, (Mr. Foster) 7256 (iv).
U. S.—Warships on Great Lakes, Information *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
Vancouver, Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
Victoria Museum, Cracking of Walls (remarks) 9152 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv).

FISHER, Hon. S. A., (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Address, The, 626 (i).
Agriculture and Experimental Farms Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Agriculture, Expenditure from Confederation (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
——— Expenditure in Ontario for 1910 (Ans.) 6668 (iv).
——— Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Agricultural Imports into Canada, Value &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 5402 (iii).
Agriculture and Militia Expenditures from 1867 to 1910 (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Quantity (Ans.) 6757 (iv).
"Alva" Str., Price paid to Philip & Son. (Ans.) 2438 (ii).
Animal Industry in Can., Reps. Data, &c., on M. (Mr. Magrath) for Copies, 4677 (iii).
Animals transported between Can. and U. S., Disregard of Rules (remarks) 311 (i).
Archives Dept., Commission of Historical Work, Care of Documents, &c., (Ans.) 2156 (ii).
Archives Historical Work, Names of Staff (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re* (remarks) 10350 (v).
Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 655 (i).
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co's. Patent Relief B. 187 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8970 (v).
Cement Production, Total annually since 1900 (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Census Commissioner, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Census Commissioner for York County, N. B. (Ans.) 8704 (v).
Census Enumerators, Apptmt. of by Liberal Associations (remarks) 7021 (iv).
Census Enumerators for Hochelaga, Names, &c. (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Census Enumerators for Man., Recommendations *re* Apptmts. (remarks) 8889 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9016 (v).
Census Enumerators Names, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4465 (iii).
Census Enumerators in Peel County, Names, Apptmt. &c. (Ans.) 10335 (v).
Census Officials, Policy of Appointments (remarks) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure &c. (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Census, Omissions by Enumerators, (Stmt.) 9898 (v).
——— Inaccuracies in Quebec (remarks) 7217 (iv).
——— Omissions in Enumerations, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9714 (v).
——— Omissions in Enumerations in Toronto (remarks) 10099 (v).
Census, Progress *re* (remarks) 9594 (v)
Census Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c. (Ans.) 659 (i).
Census Returns, Method of, on Inquiry for Ret., 6669 (iv), 8193 (v).
Census, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 9694 (v).
Census, System of Collecting, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4338 (iii).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6204 (iv).
Cheese Curing Cool Room, Brockville, Sale of (Ans.) 8096 (v).
Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
Cholera Precautions, &c. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Civil Servants, Appointments from South Grey, on Inquiry for Ret., 2555 (ii).
Cold Storage, Aid to by Govt. (Ans.) 1455 (i).
Cold Storage Depots, Total Amount paid from 1907-10 (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
See 'Live Stock.'
Coloured Persons appointed to Experimental Farm (remarks) 5039 (iii).
Conservation Commissioners' Report, Printed Copies, &c. (Ans.) 660 (i).
——— (presented) 698 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 184), in Com. on Res., 7807 (iv); 2°* and in Com., 8895 (v).
Copyright Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference , Canada's Action *re* (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
Crop Statistics, Method of Collecting, &c. (Ans.) 5937 (iv).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7018 (iv).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re* (Ans.) 663 (i).
Embargo on British Cattle, (remarks) 10344 (v).
Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid *re* (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9001 (v).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Experimental Farms, Number established for past year (Ans.) 656 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number operated in Dominion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1102 (i).
—— Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c. (Ans.) 662 (i).
—— Sale of Eggs, &c. (Ans.) 1283 (i).
Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets for 1910-1911 (Ans.) 8096 (v).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8107 (v).
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale, on prop. Res. (Mr. Stanfield) 3226 (ii).
Fruit Growers, Duty *re* (remarks) 3284 (ii).
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Appointmt, Qualification, &c. (Ans.) 8701 (v).
Horses diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada (remarks) 7428 (iv).
Immigration—Farmers sent to G. B. from Man. (Ans.) 1489 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (bushel and bags) Amt. (B. 153) 1°*, 6035 (iv); in Com., 8078 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9476 (v).
Jacques Cartier, Census Enumerators &c. (Ans.) 9431 (v).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1197 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2809 (ii).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief B. 283 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 8970 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5946 (iv).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 8992 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Rabies, Outbreak, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4409 (iii).
—— Papers Laid on Table, 10590 (v).
—— Speech of Min. of Agr. in Montreal, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv).
—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6811 (iv).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7669 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5736 (iii).
—— Delays in Preparing (remarks) 7554 (iv).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation *re* (remarks) 10095 (v).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. (B. 157) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv); in Com., 8077 (v).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Seed Grain Distribution, Complaints *re* Quality and Price (remarks) 8042 (v).
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9077 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (archives) 6184 (iv); (dairy and fruit inspection) 6234 (iv); (exhibitions) 3775 (ii), 9077 (v); (farm bulletins) 6185 (iv); (Patent Record) 6184 (iv); (seeds) 6213 (iv); (tobacco production) 6262 (iv); (year book) 6184 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5954 (iv); (salaries) 1474 (i); Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1486 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6170 (iv); (stationery) 6177 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157 (ii); N.B. (Tracadie) 1625 (i); Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8879 (v); Que. (Grosse Isle) 1675 (i).
Quarantine (animals' health) 5955 (iv); (public health) 5979 (iv); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6187 (iv).
Senate (address to His Ex.) 6167 (iv); (salaries) 6166 (iv).
Trussed Concrete Steel Co.'s Patent Relief B. 188 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8970 (v).
Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market (Ans.) 6267 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto North.*
Address, The, 60, 531 (i).
—— Correction of Figures by Mr. Guthrie (remarks) 229 (i).
See "Customs Duties" "Govt. Sinking Funds."
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1361 (i).
American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada (Ques.) 6270 (iv).
Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Signing of (remarks) 6673 (iv).
—— Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6907 (iv).
—— (remarks) 2271 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co. and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2161 (ii).
Bahamas and Canada, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8955 (v).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8887 (v).
Bank Act Bill, Delay in Discussing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6444 (iv).
Bank Act, Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govtl. Action *re* (Ques.) 5632 (iii).
Bank Failures, Rep. of Curators by Govt. (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
—— (M. for copies*) 3142 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Bank Failures, Inquiry for Ret., 4569 5038 (iii), 7556 (iv).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
Bankers' Association, Bylaws, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 4116 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2364, 2429 (ii).
Bark Lake Post Office, Cleaning and Opening, &c. (Ques.) 6270 (iv).
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co.'s Patent Relief B 187 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8969 (v).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Budget, The, Reply to Financial Statement, 6588 (iv).
——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 6441 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7575 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836 (v).
Can. Shipping Act (registration) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6115 (iv).
Canada and West Indies SS. Subsidy, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 5936 (iv).
Canadian West Loan Corporation Incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8568 (v).
Census Appointments for East Elgin (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Commencement and Completion of (remarks) 7218 (iv).
Census Taking, System, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4339 (iii).
China-Japan, SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii). in Com., 8677 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8719 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8906 (v).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v.)
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1322 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7819 (iv); in Com., 8898 (v).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v). *See* "Supply—Miscellaneous."
Customs Duties, Average Value for 1896 and 1910 of Units (M. for ret.) 2162 (ii).
Customs Duties 1906-1910, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 7022 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Customs Duties, (correction) 7104 (iv).
See 'Address' &c.
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 8045 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1985 (ii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Cartoons, Telegram, &c. (remarks) 147-156 (i).
———, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations, &c. from "Le Devoir" 472 (i).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William, Investigation *re* Management; on prop. Res. (Mr. W M. Martin) 2379 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8115 (v).
Farmer's Bank Failure, Application *re* Charter, Date and Names (Ques.) 1970 (ii).
———, Incorporation, and Dom. Govt. (M. for cor.°) 1726 (i); 2230 (ii).
———, Inquiry for, 4468 (iii).
———, Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8214 (v).
———, Question *re* Incorp. (remarks) 1904 (i).
———, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5329 (iii).
———, Treasury Board Minutes (remarks) 4741 (iii), *see* "Treasury Board".
——— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 2679 (ii).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8108 (v).
Fisheries Act, (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8045, 8420 (v).
Fisheries Arbitration at Washington, Sir John Thompson's Memorandum, (M. for copy*) 980 (i).
———, Inquiry for Sir John Thompson' Memorandum, 2004 (ii).
———, Regulations, Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8495 (v).
———, Printing of Documents (remarks) 4207 (iii).
———, Trap Nets (remarks) 2070 (ii).
Fish Transhipments from Mar. Provs., Ret. (remarks) 7106, 7259 (iv).
Fish Transportation, Amounts paid out of Aiding Fund. Further Information *re* (remarks) 6506 (iv).
——— Expenditure annually, Value, &c., (Ques.) 6271 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607 (v).
Govt Sinking Fund, Legal Amount required Bounties paid, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).
—— ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6, Ques. of Priv. 3772 (ii).
See 'Address.'
Germany, Trade Relations with Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8403, 8534 (v).
Grain Grower's Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8536 (v).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of Men (remarks) 1507 (i).
Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Bay of Fundy) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup. 4683 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations v. U. S. Conference *re*, on Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1998 (ii).
—— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 8094 (v).
—— Printing of Papers (remarks) 23(. (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3. (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1529, 1747 (i).
House of Commons, Translation Staff, Promotions, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 527 (i).
House of Commons and Senate, Inquiry for Ret., 2556 (ii).
Hudson Bay, Position *re* Hague Award (remarks) 673 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold, re Construction Fund (Ques.) 796 (l).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 2005 (ii).
Imperial Conference, Secretariat Formation, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7352 (iv).
See 'Secretariat.'
Imperial Defence Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 2217 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7837 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8104, 8403 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
I.C.R. Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).
I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Arbitration Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3665 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4205 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9092 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).
Justice, Deputy Minister acting as Counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3061 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1199 (i).
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co.'s Land Grant, Inquiry for O.C. of May 6th, 1907, 6915 (iv).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7447 (iv).
Milk and St. Mary's River Water Rights (remarks) in Com. on Waterways Bill, 9109 (v).
Mint Operations Implementing Information (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, &c., Conditions complied with (Ques.) 3065 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887 (v).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief B. 203 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 8970 (v).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 546 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N.W. (remarks) 5912 (iii).
—— Restrictions re (remarks) 6525 (iv).
Niagara River Water Powers Regulations *re* (remarks) 8892 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police, Loss of Men on Macpherson-Yukon Patrol (remarks) 7254 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8317 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6123 (iv).
—— on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2830 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Apology for using word 'liar' insisted on, 463 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2274 (ii).
Parliament, Opening and Closing, Date of from 1896 to 1910 (M. for ret.*) 786 (i).
——Inquiry for Ret., 1805 (i).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G. B. and U. S., Protection (remarks) 3671 (ii).
Post Office Act (stamp box) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 2736 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7697 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Blocking in Public Accounts Com., 998 (i).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4337 (iii).
Questions, Incomplete Answers (remarks) 1013 (i).
Racial and Religious Prejudices, Liberal Pamphlets, &c., Quotations &c. (remarks) on Address, 531 (i).
Railways and Canals Deptl. B. 156 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8410 (v).
Ry. Commission &c., Agreement *re* Traffic between U.S. and Can. (remarks) 3056 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
'Rainbow' and 'Niobe' Cost to Date, Price, Repairs, and Maintenance &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3327, 3530 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4852 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com, on Ways and Means, 2446 (ii).
——— (remarks) on Address, 72 (i).
Reciprocity, Assurances *re* Farmer's Interests (remarks)) 5543 (iii).
——— Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Mr. J. A. Macdonald's Connection *re* (remarks) 4299 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., Pets. Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 980 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1652 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2439 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Commercial Statistics, 2070, 2555, 2646, 2737, (ii).
——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics (remarks) 4471 (iii).
Reciprocity on Inquiry for Pets., &c., (Mr. Bradbury) 3057 (ii).
——— Trade and Commerce Dept., Reply *re* Ret. for Statistics (remarks) 6510 (iv).
Reciprocity Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5949; Rule (read) 5953 (iv).
——— Procedure in the House, *re* Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 5752 (iii).
Reciprocity, Tabulated Statements, &c. (remarks) 2986 (ii).
——— Tel. from Min. of Fin. to High Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3274 (ii).
——— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2644 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8093 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Revillon Freres Trading Co., incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8577, 8966 (v).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 8969 (v).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function (remarks) 940 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5643, (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5871, 5900 (iii).
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3230 (ii).
Secretariat in London, Inquiry for Papers, 1506 (i); 5836 (iii).
See Imp. Conference.
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2649, 3845 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2722 (ii).
Senate, Cost for each year from 1896 to 1911 (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1805 (i).
Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4316 (iii).
Senate Vacancy in P. E. I. (remarks) 2074 (ii).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7248 (iv).
Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Alterations in Plan (remarks) 2077 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (exhibitions) 3776 (ii), (seeds) 6213 (iv); Quarantine (animals health) 5962 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391; (machinery) 6389; (protection works) 6390 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1474; Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1486; Depts. Generally (cleaning, &c.) 1486; High Commissioner (salaries) 1486; Justice (salaries) 1017; (contingencies) 1020, Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1464; Militia (salaries) 1025; Mines (salaries) 1476; Privy Council (salaries) 1013; Railways and Canals (salaries) 1473; Secretary of State—External Affairs (salaries) 1472; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6625 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8517 (v).
Miscellaneous (Coronation Members and Senators) 8685; Imperial Conference (Ministers expenses) 8679; (pelagic sealing conference) 8679 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax Citadel) 1581 (i); Ont. (Athens) 2089; Que. (Montreal barracks) 2572 (ii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov.-Gen's cars) 6447 (iv).
Tariff Negotiations, &c. (remarks) on Address, 65 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tatamagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway, &c. (Ques.) 7806 (iv).
Treasury Board Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting (remarks) 5136 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4659 (iii).
See 'Bank,' Farmers Bank.'
Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters (remarks) 7022 (iv).
U.S. Consuls, Names, Fees, &c. (M. for ret.) 1727 (i).
U.S. Immigration Agents, and Canadian Travellers (remarks) 6119 (iv).
U.S., Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7256 (iv).
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 6118, 7253 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through canals, Inquiry for Ret., 1571, 1805 (i), 2556 (ii), 5629 (iii).
Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ques.) 3066 (ii).
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion, 6274 (iv).
Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1978 (ii).

FOWKE Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*
Address, The, 254, 271, (i).
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Quebec (B. 152) 1°*, 6439; in Com., 7470 (iv).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. (B. 161) 1°*, 6756 ; in Com., 7560, 7568 (iv).
G.B. and U.S. Arbitration Treaty, Information *re* (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
Naval Policy *re* Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 271 (i).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 4384 (iii).
Reciprocity, Manufactured Articles, (remarks) 5746 (iii).
—— Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'n, Res. (read) 5747 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6824 (iv).
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 6425 (iv).
Whitby Postoffice Site, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1868 (i).

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *King's (P.E.I.)*
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building, &c. (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8932 (v).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractor, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8047 (v).
Fishing Bounty in King's Co., P.E.I., Names of Persons receiving (Ques.) 7246 (iv).
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Appotmt., Qualification, &c. (Ques.) 8701 (v.)
Georgetown Public Building Drainage, &c. (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
Govt. Railways Constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U. S. (remarks) 2003 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Material purchased, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. (B. 153) in Com., 8743 (v).
Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii), 7553 (iv).
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7805 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, Meeting of (remarks) 4048 (iii).
New Harmony Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6084 (iv).
Oyster Industry, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor., 757 (i).
P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).
—— Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks), 6923 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3883 (ii).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorial, &c., *re* Surveys, on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2178 (ii).
—— Winter Service, Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repair, &c. (Ques.) 7344 (iv).
Senate Vacancy from P.E.I., Complaints *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3105 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service—Marine (ice breakers) 6489; Postoffice—Outside Service (mail clerks) 6084 (iv); (postmas-

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
ters) 4295 (iii); Public Works—Buildings — P.E.I. (Summerside Armoury) 1602 (i), (Tignish) 1603 (i), Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira branch) 6352 (iv).
Supreme Court Judgeship in P.E.I. Vacancy, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii), 7553 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) 5777 (iii).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1166 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers, from Quebec to Gulf of St. Lawrence, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret. 774 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Apologies for using word "liar", 467 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 5184 (iii); Railways—I.C.R. (highways protection) 5918 (iii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1069 (i); in Com., 2594-5, 3021 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 1453 (i); in Com., 3060, 3182 (ii).
La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 193) 1°*, 8308 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7938 (v).
Restigouche Riparian Association incorp., (B. 176) 1°*, 7019; in Com., 7589 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Que (Montreal barracks) 3147 (ii); (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895 (i).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M. *Welland.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Par. in 'Globe' *re* commencement (remarks) 2261 (ii).
International Ry. Co. and International Traction Co, &c., (B. 74) 1°*, 1488 (i).
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 377 (i).
Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Ry Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2254 (ii).
Privileges and Election Com., 3rd Rep. of Com. *re* Lanctot Charges, (presented) 6756 (iv); (M.) to conc, 7873, Agreed to (Y. 98, N. 56) 8030 (v).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4482 (iii).
——— Vote re Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden). Personal Explanation, 4929 (iii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8739 (v).
Debates, Official Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 6438 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8236 (v).
Montreal, Govt. Appointments since 1st Jan., 1904 (M. for ret.*) 3225 (ii).
Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re* (Ques.) 1104 (i).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Ltd., incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 1°, 6439; on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

GILBERT, Mr. ARTHUR, *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Address, The, 624 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
——— (notice of motion) 5938 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure from Confederation (Ques.) 4302 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 6158 (iv).
Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation (Ques.) 3467 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, re Telegram delayed, &c., 1456 (i).
Railway Subsidies, Total Amount since Confederation (Ques.) 3467 (ii).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3117 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6239; (seeds) 6232 (iv).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
B. C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B.C. Newspapers, 9248 (v).
Canadian Inter-Mountain Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9063 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8943 (v).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 6912 (iv).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8459 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5399 (iii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8054 (v).
Flag Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4366 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8618, 8650 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1427, 1732, 1756 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6946 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9204 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9472 (v).
Nelson Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blair) to Com. of Sup., 2322 (ii).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4969 (iii).
——— Hamilton Cotton Co., Statement of Employees (read) 5747 (iii).
——— Lord Strathcona's Telegram (explanation) 5210 (iii).
——— Obstruction *re* Debate (remarks) 10043 (v).
——— Res. from Creston Fruit and Produce Association (read) 4119 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7628 (iv).
Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement for Installation of, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6065 (iv).
Fisheries (inspectors) 6637; (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6108 (iv).
Labour Dept. ('Labour Gazette') 4226 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C., (Cranbrook) 3013; (Revelstoke) 3017; Dominion (rents) 3212; Ottawa (lighting contracts) 3186; Yukon (Dawson) 3215 (ii).
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board, Settlement, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9696 (v).
Woods Building, Lighting Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent East.*
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 206) in Com., 8970 (v).
Coal imported from U.S. into Ont., Value of Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Supply—Fisheries (overseers) 3821 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. G., *Nipissing.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).
Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and inefficient Service (remarks) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8615 (v).
French River Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7841; in Com., 7861 (iv).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner at Cochrane, Number of Convictions before (Ques.) 1568 (i).
Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 1495 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8233, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916, 8956 (v).
North Bay Wharfs, Information *re*, 2556 (ii).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of, Govt. Assistance *re* (remarks) 6766 (iv).
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Aid to (remarks) 9694 (v).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10062 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9564 (v); Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6632 (iv); Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3406; Public Works — Buildings—Ont. (Sudbury) 2627 (ii); (Tillsonburg) 2628 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Brockville.*
Accidents, &c. on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3927 (ii). *See* "Ry. Accidents".
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv). *See* "I.C.R.".
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. 5079, 5253, 5630 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3027 (ii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4240 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co. &c. (Ans.) 3853 (ii).
———, (explanation) 4048 (iii).
Baggage Smashing Prevention B. 124 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4199 (iii)
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1713 (i).
———,Privileges, Advertisement *re* Tenders (Ans.) 1712 (i).
———, Grantees, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 1712 (i).
———, Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
———, Total Cost, Revenues from Grantees. Arrears, &c. (Ans.) 1713 (i).
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (B. 211) Guarantee Bonds (M.) for Com. on Res., 8704 (v); in Com. on Res. 8801; in Com., 9222, 9255 (v).
Canadian Northern Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 81) on Senate Amts., 6468 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com. 3454, 3456 (ii).
C.P.Ry., Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction of, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 769 (i).
———, Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3062 (ii).
Canal Reciprocity for American Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
Canal Statistics (presented) 7019 (iv).
Cardinal Canal Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2669 (ii), 8700 (v).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Clarry, L. F., Expenditure *re* Trent Canal Floods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
Electric Railway Charters since 1896, Extensions *re* Constructions, &c. (Ans.) 4043 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractor, Completion &c. (Ans.) 7593 (iv).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts (remarks) 2996 (ii).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 10196 (v).
See 'Parcel Post'.
Fish Ladders on Trent Canal (remarks) 4825 (iii).
Fish Preservation in Trent River, (remarks) 1504 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Commencement *re* (remarks) 2261 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii)
Govt. Railways, constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s inc. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8237, 8922 (v).
Grand Falls Ry.: *See* "St. John".
G.T.Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1079 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3022 (ii).
G.T.P.Ry. Classification, Arbitrators' Report (Ans.) 696 (i).
———, Eastern Division, Overbreak, Agreement *re* (Ans.) 1571 (i).
——— Labourers working at Lafond, Amounts due, &c. (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
——— Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 1493 (i).
——— Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost *re* (Ans.) 1493 (i).
———Pension Fund, Rules and Regulations (Ans.) 2153 (ii).
See 'Nat. Transcl. Ry.'
Halifax and St. John, Wharfage, &c. (Ans.) 7807 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, Material furnished, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7593 (iv).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1425, 1794 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 661 (i).
Hydro-Electric Co.'s Water Power Lease on Ottawa River (Ans.) 9430 (v).
I.C.R., Accidents, Causes of (remarks) 6678 (iv).
——— Accidents, Passes, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
See "Advertising."

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Bell, Mr. G. W., Pass Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
——— Branch Lines Leasing (prop. res.) 9244; in Com. on Res., 9581, 9588 (v).
——— Branch Lines, Acquisition of (remarks) 6769 (iv).
——— Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
——— Dismissals, from Nov., 1908, Number reinstated (Ans.) 3666 (ii).
——— Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1174 (i).
——— Excursion Rates *re* Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 1347 (i); (remarks) 2997 (ii).
See 'Rates.'
——— Freight Rates on Coal, Iron, &c., Classification, &c. (Ans.) 6157 (iv).
——— Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent at Moncton (Ans.) 654 (i).
——— Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriating Scrap Brass, &c. (Ans.) 6664, 7601 (iv).
——— Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton, &c. (Ans.) 5130 (iii).
——— Halifax Terminals (stmnt.) 2647 (ii). 9561 (v).
——— Hawke, Mr. J. T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds (Ans.) 6665 (iv).
——— Hay transported free from Quebec to Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
——— Ice Contract at Riviere du Loup (Ans.) 2438, 3853 (ii).
——— I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Arbitration, Points to be determined, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3665 (ii); (remarks) *re* Answer, 4206 (iii).
——— Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7033 (iv).
——— Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
——— Mileage, Value of Rolling Stock (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
——— Moncton Extension, Acquisition of Land from Builders' Woodworking Co. (Ans.) 6157 (iv).
——— Moncton Station, Site purchased (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray *re* Tickets (Ans.) 7032 (iv).
——— Petit Rocher Spur, Cost, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 6156 (iv).
——— Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
——— Porters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6340 (iv).
——— and P.E.I. Ry. Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Printing, Amounts paid to 'Globe' (corrected statement) 2886 (ii).
See "Advertising."
——— Rates, for Political Picnics at Truro (explanation) 3343 (ii).
See "Excursion."
———Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
International Ry Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c. (Ans.) 4466 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9190 (v).
See 'Long Sault.'
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
See 'International Waterways,' 'St. Lawrence.'
McClary Maufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ont., Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
N.T.Ry., Classification Arbitration, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1490 (i).
——— Completion of Eastern Division (Ans.) 1099; Correction in Figures, 1293 (i).
——— Contracts for Eastern Division (Ans.) 1095 (i).
——— Contracts Estimated Quantities, &c. (Ans.) 1491 (i).
——— Defaulting Contractors, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 1281 (i).
——— Eastern Div., Total Cost (Ans.) 2434 (ii).
——— Eastern Division, Total Cost up to Dec. 1910 (Ans.) 3064 (i); Corrected Answer (read) 3144 (ii).
——— Eastern Div., Question, Overbreak *re* (remarks) 2434 (ii).
——— Estimated Cost and Mileage of Fencing, &c. (Ans.) 1094 (i).
——— Execution of Work under Contract, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 6668 (iv).
——— Expenditure, Difference in Amount in Ret., (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
——— N.B. Section, Pusher Grade (remarks) 4051 (iii).
——— N.B. Section, Standard, Total Estimated Cost (Ans.) 4047 (iii).
——— Over Classification, Reduction *re* (remarks) 6273 (iv), 9899 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
N.T.Ry., Over Classification, on Inquiry for Information *re*, 9995 (v).
——— Payments, on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— Provisions in Contract *re* taking over completed sections (Ans.) 1093 (i).
——— Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Ry. Commission Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— St. Lawrence and Moncton Div., Dat of Completion (Ans.) 1711 (i).
——— Section Houses (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Shops, Specifications *re* Machinery &c. (Ans.) 1569 (i).
——— Shops, Specifications *re* Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press (Ans.) 2157 (ii).
——— Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry Co., Agreement *re* Running Rights, &c (Ans.) 2435 (ii).
——— Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 5135 (iii), 7591 (iv).
——— Total Cost up to 31st Dec. 1910, Estimated Cost of Winnipeg and Moncton Section (Ans.) 1497 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1727 (i).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Newmarket Canal, Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5831 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv)
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) on M. for Com., 8094 in Com., 8234, 8525, 8916 (v).
Parcel Posts System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9923 (v).
See 'Express.'
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for copies, 713; 1497 (i), 3069 (ii).
——— American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys. (Ans.) 697 (i).
——— British Empire Bridge Co.'s Deposit, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 9981 (iv).
——— Caisson, Damage to (Ans.) 4045 (iii).
——— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 1714 (i).
——— Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 4324 (iii).
——— Contract, Advertisement *re*, on M (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 713, 1497 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman (remarks) 4205 (iii).
——— Contract, Plans, &c. (remarks) 7103 (ii).
——— Contract for Reconstruction (remarks) 4740 (iii).
——— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2667 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge, Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c. (Ans.) 3279 (ii), 6268 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigations, &c (Ans.) 8102 (v).
——— Investigations *re* River Bed, Tests &c. (Ans.) 658 (i).
——— Members of Board of Construction (Ans.) 9981 (v).
——— Plans, Contract, &c. (remarks) 6273 (iv).
——— Plans and Specifications, Approval by Chief Engineer of G.T.Ry. Co. (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
——— Superstructure, Contract let (announcement) 6669 (iv).
——— Supervision, Amount expended (remarks) 6671 (iv).
——— Supervision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6450 (iv).
——— Tenders *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for copies of Advertisements, &c., 3069 (ii).
——— Tenders *re* Carriage Way &c. (Ans.) 9980 (v).
Railway Act (accidents) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959, 1798 (i).
Ry. Act. (commutation tickets) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Macdonnell) on M. for 1°, 1551 (i).
Ry. Act (express co.'s) Amt. B. 8, (Mr. S. Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1299 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept. Act (equipment renewal) Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 6188 (iv). 2° m., 8409; in Com., 8409 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Ant. (B. 197) 1° m., 8399 (v); in Com., 9312, 9377 (v).
Railway Accidents on running Trains, Construction Work, &c., on M. (Mr. R. Smith) for Ret. 714 (i). *See* "Accidents.'
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5246 (iii).
Railway Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between Can. and U. S. (remarks) 3055 (ii).
Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Farmer (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of French Canadian (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Railway Express Rates: *See* "Express," "Parcel," &c.
Ry. Rates, Comparison with U.S. Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Railway Rates to Clergymen, Reduction of (Ans.) 2434 (ii).
Railway Sectionmen, Complaints *re* Overwork (Ans.) 9987 (v).
Railway Subsidies, Total Amount paid since Confederation (Ans.) 3467 (ii).
—— Corrected Stmnt., 6196 (iv).
Railway Telegraph, &c., Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8357 (v).
Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Provincial and Ry. Commissioners (Ans.) 697 (i).
Railways, Transportation Problem in Canada, Stmnt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) *re* handing in Statements, 6955 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Rideau River, Removal of Stumps (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt. or N. T. Ry. (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. Branch Line Lease (B. 150) M. for Com. on Res., 4200 ; in Com. on Res., 5641 (iii); 2° m., 8410; in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light, Power, &c. (Ans.) 3468 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Damming, Protest *re* Bill now before U. S. Senate (remarks) 4217 (iii).
See "Long Sault."
St. Peter's Canal, N.B., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8103 (v).
—— Answer to Question (remarks) 8356 (v).
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
Selkirk Route *re* Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration (remarks) 6273 (iv).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3348 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay Dyke) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Cardinal (dock) 6410 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville bridge); 6356; (macadamizing) 6408; (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlarging office); 6409; (lock 17) 6409; (lock 19) 6409; (removing high spots) 6409; (Robertson's Culvert) 6409 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Farran's Point (lower entrance) 6409 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 6410 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358, 6410 tugs) 6359, 6388; (wharf's and basins) 6359 (iv).
Canals—Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412 (iv).
Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 6427; (surveys, &c.) 6452; (working expenses) 6452 (iv).
Canals—Murray (dredging) 6410; (scow) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Que. (dredging) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Rapide Plat (dredging) 6413 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (bridges) 6413 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste Marie (concrete walls) 6358; (lock gates, &c.) 6417; (mooring pier) 6397; (upper entrance) 6416 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6395 (iv).
Canals—St. Peter's (improvements) 6418 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6390; (machinery) 6389; (mooring posts) 6389; (protection works) 6390 (iv).
Canals—Trent (flood damages) 6453; (improvements) 6419; (lift lock) 6398 (iv).
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6404; (Jane St. bridge) 6425; (Port Colborne) 6397; (stone protection) 6425 (iv); (survey) 9563 (v); (widening) 6408 (iv).
Canals—Williamsburg (electric power) 6396 (entrance pier) 6426; (iron mooring posts) 6426; (lockmaster's house) 6408; (machinery) 6426 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (salaries) 1473 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6655 (iv).
Railways—G. T. P. (govt. director) 6449 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes) 5913, 5915; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5914, 5983; (Chatham) 5915; (draw bars) 5915; (facilities and acommodation) 5929; (fire extinguishers) 5927 ; (Fredericton) 5916; (Halifax) 5918 (iii); (Halifax docks) 9561 (v); (highways protection) 5917 (iii) ; 9560 (v) ; (Moncton car shops) 5926 (iii); (operation) 5983; (Pullman berths) 5991 (iv); (rolling stock) 5927 (iii), 8913 (v); (Str. 'Scotia') 5928; (surveys, &c.) 5928; (Sydney Mines) 5929 (iii); (Windsor branch) 6352; (working expenses) 6338 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446; (inspections, &c.) 6452 (iv); (level crossings) 9509 (v); (McGill University) 6445; (official cars) 6447; (Ry. Commissioners) 6427 (iv), 9508 (v).
Ry's. P.E.I., (Harmany-Elmira branch) 6352 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. Eastern Div. Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 9431 (v).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Truro Freight Shed Fire (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7210 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Water Carried Freight, Value, &c. (remarks) 6671 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Douglas) in Com., 6951 (iv).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Address, The, 77 (i).
——— Correction of figures in Hansard, 228 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181 (ii).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 220), (M.) to place on Govt. Bills, 9350 (v).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3456 (ii).
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3774 (ii).
See 'Address.'
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com. 3182 (ii).
Railway Sel. Com. (M.) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3629 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4868 (iii).

HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8840 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8572 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8925 (v).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday, (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8608, 8666 (v).
Fort Osborne, Purchase of Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10251, 10290 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9515 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8549 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 9 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1792 (i).
Immigrants, Money Qualification, *re* Operation of Act (remarks) 150 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7853 (iv).

HAGGART, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Man. Legislative Building, Purchase of Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4469 (ii), 6054 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 6762 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6122 (iv).
Parliament Site, Winnipeg, Reservation in Crown Grants, &c. (M. for papers, &c*.) 7039 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8072 (v).
Post Office Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of (Ques.) 1282 (i).
Priv. and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) Charges *re*, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7888 (iv).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9332 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8389 (v).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10140 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2597, 3021, 3180, 3454, 3842 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3793 (ii); Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5173 (iii).
Indians—Man, &c. (annuities) 8885 (v).
Militia (Winnipeg drill hall) 6054 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3004; Man. (Winnipeg armoury) 3052 (ii); Ottawa (pavements) 8884 (v).
Winnipeg River Water Power Rights, Grants, Leases, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2162 (ii).
Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *North Lanark.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5086 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal Grantees, Rentals from, Sums expended by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2196 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8804, 8818; in Com., 9222, 9259 (v).
C.P.Ry. Reducton of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Copyright Act, B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8899 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1319 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Drummond &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 479 (i).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2388 (ii).
Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2190 (ii).
——— Cancellation of (remarks) 2264 (ii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8559 (v).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1075 (i).
Imperial Conference, Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10120 (v).
I.C.R. Special Trains *re* Monument Nationale, Montreal, Demonstration (remarks) 2999 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9099; in Com., 9156, 9216 (v).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3238 (ii).
Niagara River Water Powers, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8893 (v).
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration (remarks) 672 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 954 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Genl.'s Report, 834 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, 3069 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4334 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 961 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. B. 156 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8409 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9379 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to meet during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).
Railways, Transportation Problem , on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup. (reply) 5103 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8411 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1378 (i).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6216; Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1467(i); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2093 (ii).
Sussex Street, Deptl. Buildings, Alteration in Plans (remarks) 2079 (ii), 4824 (iii).
Yukon, Beer Import Tax Repeal, in Com. on Res., (Mr. Oliver) 1977 (ii).

HARRIS, Mr. Llyod, *Brantford.*
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 4040 (iii).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 106) 1°*, 2828 (ii).
Morrison, Nellie Bridgland Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4877 (iii).
Reciprocity, Berlin Board of Trade Res., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5730 (iii).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2138 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9222; on M. for 3°, 9334 (v).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2431 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Miller) to sit during Sessions of the House, 8355 (v).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7470 (iv).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3859 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3183-3454 (ii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2227 (ii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8953 (v).
Dom. Lands Act (O. Cs.) in Com., 8086 (v).
Elora Postoffice, Site, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8128 (v).
Express Rates, *See* 'Parcel.'
Sheldon, C. D. Illegal Use of Mails (re-M. (Mr. Foster) for copy, 2242 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank, Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability, &c. (Ques.) 4111 (iii).
—— Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8224 (v).
—— Royal Commission of Investigation (amt.) to Com. on M. for Ways and Means, 5295, Neg. (Y. 62, N. 97) 5523 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Forest Reserves B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8084 (v).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of (remarks) 2080 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1419 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6946 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8079 (v).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3182 (ii).
Milton Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1871 (i).
Ministerial Association, Attack *re* by h. m. (remarks) 3372 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3184 (ii).
Parcel Post, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9936 (v).
Postoffice Act, (stamp vending machine) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2° 8069; in Com., 8070 (v).
Public Buildings in former Estimates, given Precedence over new Ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2114 (ii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8401; in Com., 9321 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5063 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7633 (iv).
—— Res. from Fruit Growers' Association, Burlington, (read) 4122 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6517, 6816 (iv).
—— Statistics, &c., Ques. *re* Vote of member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7625 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8579, 9166 (v).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2598 (ii).
Seed Control Act (seeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv); in Com., 8078 (v).
Supply Bill, Interim (B. 160) on M. for 1°, 6440 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6235; (Patent Record) 6184; (seeds) 6217 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (macadamizing) 6408 (iv)
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1049; Mines (salaries) 1477; Public Works (salaries) 1033 (i).
Dom. Lands—Parks (buffalo) 6051 (iv).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6629; (modus vivendi licenses) 6160 (iv); (overseers) 3809; (protection service) 3807 (ii).
House of Commons (committees) 6170; (messengers) 6172; (pages) 6174; (servants) 6175; (sessional clerks) 6170; (stationery) 6178; (telephones) 6171 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5195 (iii).
Indians—N. W. T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6043; Que. (medical attendance) 6035 (iv).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4233 (iii); (technical education commission) 3804 (ii).
Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Campbellton) 1609; (Hampton) 1615 (i); Ont. (Dresden) 2108; (Fergus) 2111; (Essex) 2110 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5996 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (freight cars) 5987 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558; (meteorological service) 6566 (iv).
Senate (stationery) 6337 (iv).
Unprovided Items (generally) 6160 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*
Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date (remarks) 9090 (v).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1966 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181, 3392; (amt.) 3024 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5087 (iii).
Bellevue Mining Disaster, Information *re* (remarks) 1079 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3062 (ii).
Census Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) 9719 (v).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Coal Strike in Alberta and B. C., Conciliation by Labour Dept. (remarks) 6197, 6363, (iv) 9070 (v).
Coal Strikes in West, Information *re* (remarks) 6908 (iv).
——— Present condition (remarks) 7105 (iv).
Dom. Lands in Alberta, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2271 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3508 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607, 8674 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8083 (v).
Land, Timber, Natural Resources, &c., of Alberta, Provl. Control of (M. for cor. *) 1500 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1240 (i).
McLeod Postoffice, Progress *re* (remarks) 9588 (v).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9315, 9416 (v).
Seed Grain, Distribution of, Complaints *re* Quality and Price (remarks) 8041 (v).
Seed Inspection and Sale Act B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8078 (v).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coin) 6062; Dom. Lands—Parks—(buffalo) 6050; Indians—N. W. T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046 (iv); Postoffice (postmasters' salaries) 4292 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3004 (ii).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*
Emo, Matilda Relief (B. 130) 1° *, 4298 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3529 (ii).
Quebec and Great Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 198) 1° *, 8476 (v).
Welland Canal Enlargement, Memorials, Pets, &c. (M. for copies *) 1500 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Naval Policy, 281 (i).
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).
Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organization of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's Connection therewith (Ques.) 7340 (iv).
Ancona Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3601 (ii).
Bermuda, Information *re* Annexation to Canada (remarks) 5216 (iii).
Boot and Shoe Lasts, Names of Manufacturers, &c. (M. for ret. *) 1340 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
British Patriotic Songs in Western Schools and American Pupils (Ques.) 656 (i).
——— Remarks of Mr. Armstrong *re* (remarks) 4931 (iii).
Canal Reciprocity for American Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
Clifford W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9997 (v).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Coronation Ceremonies, and Cadets from Canada (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re* (remarks) 6506 (iv).
——— Names of Officers, &c., Cadets, &c. (remarks) 7105 (iv).
Debates Committee, Status of (remarks) 7015 (iv).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, *re* Speeches (remarks) 153 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Attendance of Militia, Authority for (Ques.) 3219 (ii).
——— Govt. Authority re Decoration of Govt. Buildings (Ques). 925 (i); (remarks) 3369 (ii).
——— Guards of Honour, &c. (remarks) on Address, 289 (i).
——— Mess of Homage from Administrator of Can. Govt. (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— Militia Officers attending Reception, in Uniform (Ques.) 707 (i).
——— Public Procession, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials (Ques.) 925 (i).
See 'Precedence.'
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5496 (iii).
Fenelon Falls Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Flags flying on Govt. Buildings on St. David's Day (remarks) 3671 (ii).
——— Neglect on St. George's Day (remarks) 7553 (iv).
——— Orders *re* (remarks) 2648 (ii).
See 'St. George's.'
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 1641 (i).
G. T. R. Trainmens' Strike, Reinstatement of Dismissed Employees (remarks) 1073 (i).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
Homage: *See* Eucharistic..
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1411 (i).
House of Commons Ventilation, (remarks) 4209 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7020 (iv).
'Iroquois,' Str., Report *re* Wrecking (remarks) 7104 (iv).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3241 (ii).
See '*St.* Lawrence.'
Marriage Laws in Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church (Ques.) 7207 (iv).
Masonic Property stolen, Verdict of Montreal Jury *re* (Ques.) 7207 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Counsel's Action, 7552 (iv).
——— Apology to Counsel, Ques. of Priv. 7873 (v).
Militia Officers: *See* 'Eucharistic.'
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1008 (i).
Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Res. *re* (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Order Ques. of *re* Member asked to withdraw word 'Liar', 5562 (iii).
Oshawa Customs Collector, Mr. G. F. Blamey, Retirement of (Ques.) 3225 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 6768, 7023 (iv).
——— Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 7345 (iv).
Peat Gas Producer, Progress *re* Electric Power (Ques.) 708, 985 (i).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty between U.S. and G. B., Protection *re* (Ans.) 3671 (ii).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10342 (v).
Postmaster General's Mission to Rome, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 955 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
Questions and Answers written, Copies given to Press (remarks) 990 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7126 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10009, 10059 (v).
——— Debate, Ques. of Order *re* Talking' between Ministers, 7292 (iv).
——— Farmers's Interests, &c. (remarks) 5543 (iii).
Reciprocity, Negotiations by Mr. J. A. Macdonald of 'Globe', at Washington (remarks) *re* Speech at St. Catharines, 2560 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity ,Editorial in 'Globe' (remarks) 2743 (ii).
——— Attack of Ministerial Association, Ottawa (personal explanation) 3352 (ii).
Reciprocity, Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3608 (ii).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, &c. (remarks) 6782 (iv).
——— Accepting as read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6840 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, Addressing the Chair, 6890 (iv).
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7670 (iv).
——— Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7676 (iv).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval of Govt. (Ques.) 1288 (i).
——— Meaning of Word 'faction', Preparation of Answer (remarks) 1351 (i).
——— (remarks) 942 (i).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own Rifles while in England (Ques.) 1087 (i).
Ross Rifles loaned by Can. to G.B., Use at Bisley, &c. (Ques.) 1085 (i).
——— (remarks) 7552 (iv).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag (remarks) 7687 (iv).
See 'Flags.'
St. Lawrence River Damming, Diversion of the Channel (remarks) 3058 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U. S. Senate (remarks) 4210 (iii).
See 'Long Sault.'
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Small Pox Epidemic, Sanitary Condition of House of Commons (remarks) 7252 (iv).
See 'House.'
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7249 (iv).
Speaker's Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola (Ques.) 926 (i).
Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen, &c. (remarks) 269 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 6184; (year book) 6184 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville bridge) 6357; (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358, (wharfs and basins) 6359 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396 (iv).
Canals—Trent (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 1021 (i).
House of Commons (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (electric light attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6173; (sessional clerks) 6167; (stationery) 6175; (telephones) 6172 (iv).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5557 (iii).
Justice—Dom (gratuities) 6161 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6455 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and Senators) 8079 (v).
Post Office—Outside Service (mail service) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lavatories) 2583; (water supply) 2583; Que. (Montreal barracks) 2569, 3148 (ii)
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6
P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira branch) 6353 (iv).
U.S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, &c., Subjects of Extradition, &c. (Ques.) 707 (i).
Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Foundation, Inquiry for, 7666 (iv).

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*
Orford Mountain Ry. (B. 100) 1°*, 2254 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7006 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*
Accidents on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).
'Arctic,' Rep. of Capt. Bernier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction (M. for papers*) 3947 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5039, 5293 (ii), 8791 (v).
Bay of Fundy Fishing Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries: *See* 'Hague Arbitration.'
Bear Indian Reserve, Medical Officer, Payments to (Ques.) 3223 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers, in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* New House (Ques.) 4929 (iii).
—— Lightkeeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 492
(iii).
Canadian Naval Service, Applications from Canadians and British Navy (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction &c. (Ques.) 8983 (v).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 2
(Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8725 (v).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 699 (i).
Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re* (M. for cor.*) 4383 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
Digby Public Works, Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8440 (v).
Fisheries Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Fish landed by Canadian Atlantic Fisheries since 1870, Quantities, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).
Fisheries Protection Service, Seizures by 'Rainbow' (remarks) 4116, 4208 (iii).
Fishery Regulations, Complaint *re* C. K. Golden, for Violation of (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington (remarks) 2088 (ii).
—— Changes at Washington (remarks) on motion for Sup., 8502 (v).
Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty (Ques.) 2886 (ii).
Fishing Vessel Licenses (B. 27) 1° m., 698 (i).
Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations, Request to place on Govt. Orders, 3373 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock (Ques.) 1976 (ii).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c., (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Hague Arbitration, Bay of Fundy, 4683 (iii).
Hague Arbitration, North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Production of Papers, on M. for Sup., 4588 (iii).
Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between, &c., (Ques.) 8991 (v).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2018 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9218 (v).
'John B. Young', Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re* (Ques.) 2368 (ii).
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re* (Ques.) 2157 (ii).
Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Condition Ques.) 4043 (iii).
Meteghan Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 4929 (iii).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Montreal and Maritime Provs., Forwarding of Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Payments, Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1283 (i).
N. S. Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction in Digby County (Ques.) 657 (i).
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9782 (v).
Postmasters Association, Pets *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3947 (ii).
Ry. Rates to Clergymen, Reduction *re* (Ques.) 2434 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6966 (iv).
—— Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6670 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Ranges, Additional Land Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 8994 (v).
—— (M. for cor.*) 8994 (v).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c. (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
Seed Inspection and Sale Act B. 167 (Mr. Fsher) in Com., 8078 (v).
Sick Mariners Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c. (Ques.) 9993 (v).
Smelt Fishing in N. S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season (Ques.) 9984 (v).
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections (remarks) 8090 (v).
Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
—— Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3129 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9088 (v); (tobacco production) 6264; (Year Book) 6184 (v)
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coin) 6061 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1054 (i); Postoffice (clerical assistance) 6063; (contingencies) 6070 (iv).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6093; (fishways) 6659; (inspectors) 6658; (oyster culture) 6661 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (maritime road) 6543; (shipbuilding) 6488, 6498; (telephones, life stations) 6539 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers maintenance, &c.) 5815; (life saving awards) 5822; (patrol boats) 5829; (P. E.I. winter mail service) 5828; (schools of navigation) 5824 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Chatham) 1610 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, Dom.) 1592; (Halifax post office) 1587; (Weymouth) 1601 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. |Peterborough) 2616; Ottawa (lighting) 3173; (Rideau Hall) 8882 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Summerside armoury) 1602; (Tignish) 1603 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1863; (Napierville) 1866 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Argyle Sound) 9504 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pullman berths) 5990; (surveys) 5929 (iii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 6565 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (life belts &c.) 6572; (magnetic observatry) 6563 (iv).
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa (remarks) 4723 (iii).
Wesport Signal Stations, When erected, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1091 (i).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, O.*
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6209 (iv).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8953 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com,. 8746 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 10572 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6234; (seeds) 6224 (iv).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G., (Minister of Labour) *Waterloo North.*
Accidents on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re* , on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3933 (ii).
Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
Alien Labour Law on Public Contracts, in B.C. (remarks) 10369 (v).
—— Administration at Sault Ste. Marie, on M. for Sup., 5530 (iii).
B.C. Coal Strikes, (remarks) 6363 (iv).
—— Agreement of Two Years past (remarks) 6366 (iv).
See 'Coal Strike.'
British Patriotic Songs and American Scholars in Western Schools (Ans.) 657 (i).
Cement Merger: *See* "Industrial Mergers."
Coal Strike in B. C. and Alberta, Conciliation *re* (remarks) 6197 (iv).
—— Further Information (read) 6908 (iv).
—— Present Condition (remarks) 7105 (iv).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Coal Strike in B. C. &c., Remarks of Mr. Taylor, M.P., 9721 (v).
See 'Labour.'
Cocaine, Prohibition of Sale (prop. res.) 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 2063 (ii).
See 'Opium.'
Combines Investigation Act, Changes *re* (Ans.) 663 (i).
—— Report *re* (remarks) 1987 (ii).
See 'Cement.'
Conciliation Boards, Principle *re* Actior (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 1302; in Com., 1318 (i).
Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of (Ans.) 8993 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) 9001 (v).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of (remarks) 2080 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron (Ans.) 2158 (ii).
—— Arrangement re Reinstatement (Ans.) 654, 809, 811 (i).
—— (remarks) 1072, 1507 (i).
—— Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
—— Inaction of Labour Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
—— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to (remarks) 1805 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
—— Minister's Efforts a Success (Ans.) 811 (i).
—— Resolution from Order of Conductors (Ans.) 9988 (v).
—— Settlement of (remarks) 9692 (v).
—— Statements by Leaders of Ry. Organization (read) in Com. of Sup., 4246-7 (iii).
—— Status of Men reinstated (remarks) 3375 (ii).
—— Tel. from Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Great Northwestern Telegraphers Co., Request *re* Board of Conciliation (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1534, 1737 (i); on M. for 3°, 2870, (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works *re* Com., Printing of Proceedings (Ans.) 3280 (ii).
—— Representations re I.C.R. Workingmen (correction) 4116 (iii).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Amts. re (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Demand for Repeal (Mr. Rhodes) (remarks) 6931 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2940 (ii).
See 'U. S. Trusts.'
Industrial Training, Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting (Ans.) 3463 (ii).
I. C. R. Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute re Granting (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9176 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9463 (v).
Labour Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Labour Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, on Ques. of Priv., 9721, 9786 (v).
—— Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., re Militia (read) 10344 (v).
Match Factories using Phosphorus, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1717, 1977 (i).
Matches, Manufacture, Prohibition of Phosphorus B. 10 (prop. res.) 1802; 1° m., 104; 2° m., 1576 (i).
—— (B. 96) in Com. on Res., 2021 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Contractors and Labour Conditions (remarks) 8597 (v).
North Atlantic Collieries, Protest re Nomination on Conciliation Board (remarks) 4209 (iii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 97) Prop. Res., 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 1°*, 2062; 2° m., 2518, in Com., 2532; 3° m., 2740 (ii); on Senate Amts, 8090 (v);
—— (B .22) 1° m., 468 (i).
See 'Cocaine.'
Petawawa Military Camp, Damages by Fire (remarks) 9250 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Fair Wage Clause for Bridge Workers (Ans.) 5835 (iii), 6757 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Reciprocity, Res. of Berlin Board of Trade, Ques. of Priv., 5726 (iii).
—— Speech of Member for N. Oxford (remarks) 5545 (iii).
—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6817 (iv).
—— Special Rep. of Comparative Prices, laid on Table, 10468 (v).
—— (M.) to print, 10590 (v).
—— (remarks) 10469 (v).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Additional Land Purchase (Ans.) 8994 (v).
Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 4237 (iii).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Springhill Mines Strike, Information *re* Condition (remarks) 2641, 2740 (ii), 6363 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines investigation Act) 4280 (iii); (conciliation board) 3384, 3393 (ii); (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii), 6057 (iv); (salaries) 1484 (i): technical education commission) 3801 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Progress *re*, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1721 (i).
——— Completion of Work (remarks) 1661 (i).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Mr. Bouley's Apptmt. (Ans.) 8993 (v).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Combines Act (remarks) 4300 (iii).
——— Board of Investigation (remarks) 5954 (iv).
U.S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations, &c, U.S. Courts, on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 4345 (iii).
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Settlement of, Rep. of Conciliation Board, on M. (Mr. Goodeve) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9699 (v).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) 9070 (v).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of living (Ans.) 3065 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1934 (i).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9014 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9034 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9523 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co., incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8918 (v).
Healey, Fanny Mary Relief (B. 199) 1°*, 8476 (v).
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1277 (i); in Com. 3994 (iii); on Senate Amts, 6952 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6151 (iv).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. 8071 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) on Res., 6921 (iv).
——— Res. from Swift Current Board of Trade (read) 4119 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6064 (iv).
Tariff Resolution, Par. in Moosejaw 'News,' Ques. of Priv., 2639 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond (N.S.)*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 369 (i).
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1140 (i).
Lymburner Contracts with Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
Privileges and Elections (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7958 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S. in Com. on Res., 3956 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7632 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS.Subventions (Baddeck and Iona) 8764 (v).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amount realized, &c. (Ques.), 1289 (i).
Militia, Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Quebec Civil Servants, Names of Permanent and Temporary Employees, since 1st Jan. 1905, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2376 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth at Low Tide below thirty feet (Ques.) 1718 (i).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*
Address, The, 615 (i).
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 1710 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8007 (v).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6833 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1892 (i).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1958 (i).
Agricultural Products imported into B. C. from U. S., Australia, &c. (Ques.) 7344 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work remarks) 7219 (iv).
Census Enumerators in Man., Apptmt. of, on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9024 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Dom. Lands. Sask., Gross Receipts, Cost of Administration, &c. (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Dom. Lands, S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Application *re* Entry, &c. (M. for copy*) 1501 (i).
Drummond, &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 472 (i).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3491 (ii).
Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11 (Ques.) 8096 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P. M. G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2268 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9532 (v).
Homestead Irregularities, Cancellation of Mr. John Bradley's Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23 (Ques.) 4112 (iii).
See 'Pre-emptions.'
Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination (Ques.) 814 (i).
Immigration into Western Can., Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions (M.) to adjn., 1551 (i).
——— Notice of Discussion, 1503 (i).
James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians &c. (Ques.) 1082 (i).
Lajord Post Office, Change as Accounting Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).
Natural Resources, &c. in Sask. and Alberta, Provincial Control, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
N. W. M. Police, Coronation Contingent, Number, &c. (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 2004, 3672 (ii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).
Post Office Estimates, on objections to passing (remarks) 4298 (iii).
Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c. (Ques.) 812 (i).
Reciprocity—Opposition to, Ques. of Priv., 5739 (iii).
——— Speech of Min. of Agr. in Montreal, Ques. of Priv., 6199 (iv)
——— Statistics asked from Trade and Commerce Dept.; Reply of Dep. Min. (remarks) 6510 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re* (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c. (Ques.) 1908, (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (postal guide) 4280 (iii).
Immigration (seed grain) 3837 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5583 (iii).
Labour (Labour Gazette) 6057 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8691 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3003; Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).
R. N. W. M. Police—(pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa, Alterations in Plans (remarks) 2075 (ii).
University of Sask., Land Endowment, Res. *re* (Ques.) 4111 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com. 9265 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8719 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8913 (v).
Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c. (Ques.) 3470 (ii).
Dunnville Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5314, 5459 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1434, 1531 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1206 (i).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9916 (v).
Public Buildings, Erection and Construction (prop. res.) 4319 (iii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9390 (v).
Railway Mail Service, Names and Dates of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations (Ques.) 3355 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Statement (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5058 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Res. from Winnipeg Board of Trade (read) 4121 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) *re* Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, 4223 (iii).
Speeches of Ministers distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3786 (ii); (seeds) 6229; (Quarantine, animals) 5963 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1666; (Napierville) 1866 (i).
Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise (Ques.) 7601 (iv).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c. (Ques.) 4825 (iii).
Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 80) 1*, 1640 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7567 (iv).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 201) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9257 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Officials (Ques.) 4672
Census, Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) 9714 (v).
Coroners' Inquests: *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
Elevators Terminal at Port Arthur, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2425 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5399 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8216 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9613 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Croket) 10261 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8237, 8542, 8918 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 223) in Com., 9510 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8977 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1434, 1527, 1738, 1750 (i); on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 2874 (ii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10112 (v).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7810 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B., 9 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 1527 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 977, 1511 (i).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3268 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10523 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8234, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916; (amt.) 8956; 3° m., 8962 (v).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8340 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2849 (ii).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1604 (i).
Public Works—Generally, Objection to Votes in full, 9552 (v).
Public Works Promised during Western Tour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1639 (i).
Ry. Act (accidents, coroners, &c.) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 8; 2° m., 956; on M. for 2°, 1407; Debate rsmd. on M. for 2°, 1797 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9377, (amt.) 9378 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7281 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10016, 10036 (v).
——— Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
——— North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7224 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6781 (iv).
St. Catharines Drill Hall, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate, Abolition of (prop. res.) 2680 (ii).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2600 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1374 (i).
Supply—Schedule of Proportion of Votes (remarks) 9567 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9563 (v).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3440 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Fairville) 1611; (Grand Falls) 1614; (Hampton) 1615; (Hartland) 1617; (Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (Tracadie) 1624 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax citadel) 1582; (Parrsboro) 1630 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2604; (Seaforth) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2627; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 2590; (pavements) 2593; (water supply) 2589 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Tignish) 1602 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1665; (Aylmer) 1672; (Grosse Isle) 1677; (Lévis armoury) 1678; (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1697; (Megantic) 1710, 1860; (Montreal barracks) 1864; (Napierville) 1865; (Rigaud) 1887; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Shawinigan) 1890 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9501; Ont. (repairs, &c.) 9552 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9562; (highway protection) 9561; (level crossings) 9509 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. A., *Richelieu.*
Independence of Parlt., Charges *re* Govt. Employees, painting Private Dwelling, &c., on M. (Mr. Blondin) for Special Com., 4655 (iii).
——— Charges *re* obtaining lumber, &c., from Govt. Store (Ques. of Priv.), 8695 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*
Agriculture. Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup.. 6285 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1879 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Address. The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 16 (i).
Quebec Members, Absence of *re* Extra Session (remarks) 10098 (v).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W., P.C., G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*
Address, The, 44; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 441 (i).
——— Precedence *re* (M.) 5 (i).
——— (M.) to present. 694 (i).
——— Reply from His Ex., (read) 1487 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Address to His Majesty King George, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 7824 (iv).
Adjournment of House (M.) 866 (i).
See 'Coronation,' &c.
Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s Absence in Eng., Emoluments *re* (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Agricultural Implements, resuming adjnd. debate (remarks) 2253 (ii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission's Report (presented) 3952 (iii).
Aliens, Naturalization of, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6907 (iv).
——— Termination of (remarks) 2004 (iv).
——— (remarks) 2271 (ii).
Arbitration Treaty between G.B. and U.S., Information *re* (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5619 (iii).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4115 (iii).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry.: *See* 'Charing Cross.'
Aylmer Post Office, Revenues for 1908-9, &c. (Ans.) 984 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1340 (i).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2131 (ii).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. for Decision (Ans.) 1091 (i).
Bellevue Mining Disaster (remarks) 1080 (i).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. McCarthy) for Ret., 2680 (ii).
Birthday of Prime Minister, Congratulations from Leader of the Opposition (remarks) 9 (i).
Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiations with U.S. (remarks) 1575 (i).
British National Songs in N.W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
British Preference Trade Policy (remarks) 5619 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity,' &c.
Business of the House (remarks) 4117 (iii).
Business of the House for Thursdays (remarks) 1550 (i), 2065 (ii).
Canadian Commisioner to France, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency of, Charge *re* Frauds (Ans.) 1716 (i).
Canadian Light and Power Company, Plans *re* Improvements (remarks) 7261 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*, on Personal Explanation (Mr Oliver) 8189 (v).
—— Proposed Motion, 8191 (v).
See 'Oliver, Hon. Mr.'
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 661 (i).
Canada and South America SS Service, Subsidies to (Ans.) 5290 (iii).
Canada and W. Indies SS Subsidy, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 5936 (iv).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr W. M. Martin) in Com., 8570 (v).
Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sanford Fleming (remarks) 10468 (v).
Census Enumerators, Circulating Pets. *re* Reciprocity (remarks) 6508 (iv).
Charing Cross Bank, Cor. with Dom. Govt. on M. for Copy, 1726 (i).
China-Japan SS Subsidy (B. 103) prop. Res. 1802 (i); M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii); in Com., 8675 (v).
Chinese Immigration, Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).
—— Total Number, Capita Tax, &c. (Ans.) 788 (i).
Chinese Investigation, Rep. of Judge Murphy, Laid on Table, 9897 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9836 (v).
—— Discussion *re* Judge Murphy's Report, 9928 (v).
Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909 (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Christmas Adjournment: (M.) 1453 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Officers (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor. 2220 (ii).
—— on Notice of M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1912 (i).
Cobalt Mail Service, Inefficient Service (remarks) 1663 (i).
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c. (Ans.) 1280 (i).
See 'Imperial.'
Commercial Relations, &c., Translation of Papers (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 5 (i).
—— Lists (presented) 262 (i).
—— (M.) to add Name, 377 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Miller) on M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).
Consuls General, Status at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 952 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1304 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8709 (v).
See 'Imperial Conference.'
—— Invitation to Members of Parlt (remarks) 1580 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Indian Contingent, (remarks) 6507 (iv).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Courtice, Howard, Emplmt. by Liberal Bureau (remarks) 9784 (v).
Customs Official, Halifax, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Office, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2220 (ii).
Dairy Industry, Nature of Memorials *re*, &c. (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
Debates Committee, Status *re* Duties (remarks) 7015 (iv).
Declaration of London, Consideration by Govt. (Ans.) 5935 (iv).
Deputy Governor, Tel. of Mr. Justice Girouard to Cardinal Vannutelli (Ans.) 702 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 54 (i).
—— Quotations from Notary Begin, Ques. of Order, 57 (i).
—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* quotations from 'Le Devoir', Ques. of Order, 472 (i).
Easter Adjournement (M.) 6758 (iv).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8120 (v).
Estimates, 1912 (presented) 695 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials in Procession (Ans.) 925 (i).
—— Mess. of Homage by Administrator (Ans.) 702, 707 (i).
—— Reception by Federal Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5935 (iv).
—— Reception to Cardinal Vanutelli, (remarks), 6522 (iv).
See 'Speaker'.
Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5933 (iv).
See 'Can. Commissioner.'
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5395 (iii).
—— (remarks) 1510 (i), 7560 (iv).
—— Application *re* Charter, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1970 (ii).
—— Assets, Keeley Mine, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2152 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank, Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2247 (ii).
——— Endorsation of Premier, Letters read, 2264 (ii).
——— Question *re* Incorp. (remarks) 1904 (i).
——— Representations to Fin. Dept. *re* Stability, &c. (Ans.) 2151 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation, Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry., Denial of Stmt., 1574 (i).
——— Speeches, &c. (M.) to print, 3054 (ii).
——— Distribution of Copies of Report (remarks) 6908 (iv).
See 'Western'.
Favoured Nation Treaties, Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Abrogation (remarks) 5292 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity, &c.'
Fenian Raid Veterans' Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9605 (v).
See 'Veterans.'
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8108 (v).
Fish Hatchery at Snake Island, Winnipegosis Lake, Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations between Can. and U.S., Proclamation *re* (stmt.) 1725 (i).
——— Modification of (remarks) 1804 (i).
——— Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8512 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcation of Funds, Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 1567 (i).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers, Report of Proceedings (M.) to print, 3952 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk), Objection to motion, 5161 (iii).
——— Estimates *re* (remarks) 2005 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Globe' *re* Commencement (remarks) 2261 (ii).
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings (M.) 10095 (v).
——— Precedence on Mondays (M.) 4114 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Gov. General, Apptmt. of Duke of Connaught (remarks) 1726 (i).
Grain in Fort William and Port Arthur Elevators, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3605 (ii).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8536 (v).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S. (remarks) 1725 (i).
——— Fisheries Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1805 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
——— *See* 'Fisheries,' 'North Atlantic'.
Halifax Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 653 (i).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10102 (v).
Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters (Ans.) 5103 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1436, 1532, 1743, 1754 (i).
House of Commons, Appointments (M.) 5288; (M.) to conc., 5400 (iii).
——— Galleries of H. of C., Applause in (remarks) 4469 (iii).
——— Number of Persons residing in (Ans.) 3848 (ii).
——— Restaurant, Joint Com. (M.) 469 (i).
——— Restaurant and Speaker's Rooms, Number of Employees (Ans.) 1085 (i).
——— Sessional Clerks, Application *re* Increase of Salary (Ans.) 5404 (iii).
——— Translation Staff Promotions (M.) 527 (i); (M.) *re* Apptmt., 7015 (iv).
——— Water Supply for Parlt. Biuldings *re* Typhoid Epidemic (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re* (remarks) 1574 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' Conditions *re*, (remarks) on M. (Mr. Lake) 1566 (i).
Imperial Conference, Attendance *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8034-7 (v).
See 'Coronation.'
——— Questions to be submitted by Canada (remarks) 4299 (iii).
——— Secretariat Formation, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7372 (iv).
See 'Secretariat.'
Imperial Conference, Precis Rep. and Verbatim Rep. (remarks) 9693, 9783 (v).
——— Complete Report presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10111 (v).
——— Cor. with Mr. Harcourt (read) 10338 (v); (M.) to print, 10340 (v).
——— Defence Papers laid on Table, 10467 (v).
Imperial Defence Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 2217 (ii).
Imperial Defence Committee Report, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 948 (i).
Indian Act, (Treaty) Amt. (B. 177) 1° m., 7019; on M. for 2°, 7830 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8105 (v).
I.C.R. Terminals at Halifax, Accommodation *re* (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1524 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex., 377 (i).
International Waterways Commission (prop. res.) 695 (i).
—— Names of Members, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 3861 (ii).
—— Apptmt. of Chairman (remarks) 4741 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 3 (M Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 874 (i).
See 'Long Sault.'
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid (Ans.) 6158 (iv).
Jackson, Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Japanese Treaty: *See* 'Anglo-Japanese.'
Jardine, John, Claims *re* Govt., Par. in 'Daily Times,' (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. *re* (remarks) 7553 (iv).
See 'P. E. I.'
Juvenile Delinquents Act. Discussion *re* (remarks) 4383 (iii).
Kelly, Robt., Employmt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B. C., (Ans.) 2665 (ii).
Langdon Subdivisions of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Mission to Rome, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramways (Ans.) 1104 (i).
—— Superannuation, Amt. to the Act (Ans.) 1488 (i).
Library of Parlt., Joint Com., (M.) 309 (i).
—— Apptmt. of Mr. O. Souliere (M.) 8789 (v).
Lt.-Governor, N. S., Cor. *re* Continuance as Director of N. S. Steel & Coal Co. (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
—— Cor. between Govt. and Brit. bassador (remarks) 3530 (ii).
—— Rep. of American Commissioners, &c., (remarks) 1652 (i).
See 'International Waterways,' 'St. Lawrence.'
Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions *re* (Ans.) 1285 (i).
See 'Rural.'
Mails, Illegal Use of for Fraudulent Schemes (Ans.) 802 (i).
—— Illegal Use of by C. D. Sheldon, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1358 (i).
See 'Sheldon.'
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals, on M. for Sup., 6201 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Man. Boundaries, Speech of Prime Min. at Winnipeg *re*, Cor. &c. (Ans.) 710 (i).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c., (remarks) 6764, 6915 (iv).
Matches, White Phosphorus, Manufacture Prohibition B. 10 (Mr. King) on M. for 2°, 1577 (i).
——B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2052 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates (1912) Presented, 695 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2791 (ii).
—— on Explanation (Mr. Boyce) 2439 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7444 (iv).
Minister of Militia. Absence from Hse., *re* N.S. Elections (remarks) 2265 (ii).
Minority Representation, Intention *re* Redistribution Bill (Ans.) 9998 (v).
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt. (Ans.) 5136 (iii).
Mounted Police, Coronation Contingent (remarks) 5836 (iii).
—— Death of Inspectors, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iv); 8598 (v).
—— Pay and Allowance, &c., (Ans.) 8101 (v).
N. T. Ry., Contracts, Security Deposit, Amount of (Ans.) 1972 (ii).
Natural Resources in Alberta and Sas., Prov. Control, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
Naval Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Protocol. 3074 (ii).
Naval Construction, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8355 (v).
Naval Defence, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 54 (i).
—— Direct Contribution in Resolution (remarks) 548 (i).
Naval Service, 'Rainbow', Type of Guns, (Ans.) 1490 (i).
Netherlands Land Mortgage Co., Investments in Canada, Cor. with W. T. R. Preston (Ans.) 789 (i).
—— Further Cor., Reps., &c. (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
—— on Inquiry for Cor., 7349 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on M. for Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, 778; Letter of Chief Justice Sir Charles Fitzpatrick (read) 779 (i).
—— on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) for Com., 781 (i).
—— Statement by Mr. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification (Ans.) 2669 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Hague Award, Distribution of (remarks) 8094 (v).
See 'Hague.'
North Shore Taxpayers and Voting at Federal Election (Ans.) 1082 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, 1 (i).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 8309 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8315 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv., 8032 (v).
——— (M.) for Com., *re* Investigation, 8791 (v).
——— Information *re* Committee (remarks) 9900 (v).
See 'Can. Northern.'
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6134 (iv).
——— on M. to introduce, 2829 (ii).
Orders Discharged (M.) 4464 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, on using word 'liar', apology insisted on (remarks) 463 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 2004 (ii).
Parcel Post Service, Loss *re* (Ans.) 806 (i).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G.B. and U.S., re Protection (remarks) 3670, 3769 (ii).
See 'Seal.'
Pork Packing Industry, Inquiry for Rep. of (remarks) 3530 (ii).
Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1104 (i).
Post Office Revenue for Tilbury, &c., for 1904-10 (Ans.) 807 (i).
Post Office Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1568 (i).
Post Office Service in N.S., Weekly and Bi-Weekly (Ans.) 982 (i).
Post Office Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of (Ans.) 1282 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 952 (i).
See 'Eucharistic.'
P.E.I., Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks) 6927, 7430, 7803 (iv), 8355 (v).
See 'Judicial,' 'Senate,' &c.
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7688, 7798 (iv).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 309 (i).
Private Bills (M.) to extend time, 1454 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (A. Lanctôt) 3rd Rep. (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) and Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 823 (amt. to amt.) 827; Agreed to (Y. 98; N. 74) 864 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (remarks) 310 (i).
Questions answered Orally (remarks) 700, 990, 1080 (i).
Questions, Incomplete Answers, &c. (remarks) 1013 (i).
Race Track Gambling, on M. (Mr. Miller) to print evidence, 10467 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 967 (i).
——— B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3946; in Com., 3946 (ii).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10193 (v).
Railways, Telegraph Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8357 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4741 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4873 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4057 (iii).
——— Assurance *re* Farmers' Interest (remarks) 5542 (iii).
——— Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Information from Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6509 (iv).
——— Debate (remarks) 3143 (ii).
——— Debates, Articles in Press *re* Obstruction (remarks) 10001 (v).
——— Debate, Resuming of (remarks) 5939 (iv).
——— Farmers and Manufacturers Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt (remarks) 4663 (iii).
——— Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Rep. *re* Delegation (remarks) 3529 (ii).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1654 (i).
——— On Inquiry for Protocols, 2555 (ii).
——— On Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2439 (ii).
——— Lord Strathcona's Telegram *re* Reported Interview (read) 5126 (iii).
——— Negotiations between Can. and U.S. (remarks) on Address, 48 (i).
——— Negotiations with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 1506 (i).
——— Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 2070, 2271 (ii).
——— Negotiations, Mr. J. A. Macdonald's Connection *re* (remarks) 4299 (iii).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Submission to Hse. before Signed (remarks) 1805.
——— Procedure *re* Resolutions, &c., (remarks) 5753 (iii).
——— Protests *re* (remarks) 3952 (iii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties *re* (remarks) 2639 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., on Ques. of Order, *re* referring to previous debate (remarks) 8255 (v).
——— *re* Question (Mr. Monk) 4114 (iii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (ii).
——— Statistics, Accepting as Read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6857 (iv).
——— Trade Statistics with U.S. (remarks) 6675 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7671 (iv).
——— letter from 'Globe' reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5736 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell), 5954 (iv).
Returns, Notice to Members of bringing down (remarks) 5939 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8579 (v).
Rivière des Prairies Dredging Rep., on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Copy, 2163 (ii).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Defense at Public Functions (remarks) 941 (i).
Rosendale Mail Service on C.N.R., Pets. *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Manufacture of Stamps and Postcards &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
——— Number &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rural Mail Routes operating in Man. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service (remarks) 9995 (v).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., on Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) *re* Amendments, 5723 (iii).
St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir' (Ans.) 1090 (i).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault Rapids, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3229 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U.S. Senate (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3058 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* at Washington (remarks) 3283 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix (remarks) 3840 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Mr. Allison's letter, 3769 (ii).
See "Long Sault".

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re* (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
See 'Natural Resources.'
Seal Fisheries Negotiations (remarks) 9594 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 10197 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 10337 (v).
See 'Pelagic.'
Secretariat at London, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Papers, 5836 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 1507 (i).
See 'Imperial Conference,' &c.
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2663 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2709 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate, Reform of, on Prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4314 (iii).
Senate Vacancy in P. E. I. (remarks) 2074 (ii).
See "Judicial."
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1373 (i).
See "Mails."
Small Pox Epidemic, Condition of House of Commons (remarks) 7252 (iv).
See 'Typhoid.'
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7248 (iv).
South African Parlt., Report of P. M. G. (remarks) 1580 (i).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3346 (ii).
Speaker of the House, Wearing of Official Robes, &c. (Ans.) 706 (i).
Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola (Ans.) 926 (i).
——— Purchase of Birds (Ans.) 928 (i).
——— Purchase of Glassware (Ans.) 929 (i).
——— Purchase of Gramophone Records (Ans.) 927 (i).
——— Rental of Piano, &c. (Ans.) 927 (i).
Stamp Cancelling Machine, Cost, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 806 (i).
Supply, (M.) for Com., 695 (i).
Supply, for Public Works (remarks) 10354 (v).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1485; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 1013; High Commissioner (salaries) 1486 (i); Privy Council (clerkships) 8750 (v); (salaries) 1013 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752; (Baddock and Iona) 8763 (iv); (Bonaventure River

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

and N. B.) 8764 (iv); (Canada and Australia) 8764 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 6058 (iv), 8775; Canada and G. B.) 8773; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 8785; (Port Mulgrave, &c.,) 8786; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 8788; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C.) 8787; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).

Miscellaneous—(Coronation, members and senators) 8680 (Imperial Conference ministers expenses) 8679; (Paris agency) 8694; (Pelagic sealing conference) 8678 (v).

Mounted Police (Coronation contingent) 8752 (pay of force) 8598);(subsistence) 8599 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax citadel) 1581 (i).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 6058; (commercial agents) 6059; (inspectors) 6059 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip (remarks) 5 (i).

Trade Commissioners, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 2156 (ii).

Trade Relations with Germany (remarks) 8403 (v).

Typhoid Epidemic, Prorogation of House (Ans.) 4676 (iii).

See 'Smallpox.'

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers (remarks) 6119 (iv).

—— Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re* (Ans.) 984 (i).

—— Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U. S. Courts, &c., on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 4346 (iii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Armament of (Ans.) 7026; (remarks) 6362 (iv).

—— Passing through Canadian Canals, Permission from Govt. (Ans.) 10335 (v); (remarks) 6118, 7254 (iv).

University of Sask., Land Endowment *re*, (Ans.) 4111 (iii) .

Unorganized Districts, Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).

See 'Voters.'

Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

See 'Fenians.'

Voters Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9909 (v).

'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation by Customs (remarks) 5628 (iii).

Water Powers, Conservation of (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Water Powers owned by Dom., Legislation *re* Regulating (Ans.) 7804 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

See 'Long Sault,' &c.

Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 695 (i).

Wentworth, Number of Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret., 2557 (ii).

Westbrook Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1103 (i).

Western Farmers' Delegation, Control of Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).

See 'Farmers.'

Western Tour, and Tariff Promises (remarks) on Address, 45 (i).

W. Indies SS. Service, Specification *re* Contract (Ans.) 4466, 4674, 4925 (iii).

Whips, &c.: *See* 'Taylor.'

Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 708 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1979 (ii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Reciprocity with U. S., Res. from Yarmouth Farmers' Association (read) 4122 (iii).

—— Yarmouth Board of Trade, Res. *re* (read) 5550 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé.*

Arrow Lake Postal Clerk (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of (remarks) *re* Question, 2373 (ii).

Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening (Ans.) 6279 (iv).

Barrington Passage Bait Freezers Ret. (stmnt) 8889 (v).

Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Grantees, Rentals paid, Sums expended by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2197 (ii).

Birch Grove Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).

Cable, G.B. and Canada State-owned, Proposal *re* by G.B. and Can. (Ans.) 1905 (i).

See 'Telegraphs.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8815 (v).

Canso and Guyborough Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 8994 (v).

Chemin Gouin Postmastership. Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 7038 (iv).

—— Postmaster A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c. (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2506 (ii).

Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. (B. 217) in Com. on Res., 8906, 8924 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Cobalt Mail Service to Cochrane (remarks) 1804 (i).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10353 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Apptmt. of Col. Landry (remarks) 8093 (v).
Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of Location (Ans.) 4670 (iii).
Don. Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 9987 (v).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Collections (Ans.) 3470 (ii).
Elora Post Office, Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).
English Mails to Mar. Provs.: *See* 'Mail Service.'
Escott Postmastership, Apptmt of, Charges against late Postmaster (Ans.) 4926 (iii).
—— Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6181 (iv).
—— Postmaster's Salary, Date of Increase (Ans.) 7602 (iv).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Decoration of Govt. Buildings (remarks) 3369 (ii).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, Speech of P. M. G. at Montreal (remarks) 2080, 2268 (ii).
Franking for Fraudulent Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
See 'Mails.'
Fraser River Mail Service, Application *re* (Ans.) 3463 (ii).
Gaspe Mail Service, Revenue *re* (Ans.) 3854 (ii).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders (Ans.) 7038 (iv).
Hall's Prairie Post Office, Pet. *re* Location, &c. (Ans.) 3468 (ii).
Haskett, Havelock, and New Tuskett Post offices, Distances between &c. (Ans.) 8991 (v).
Herron Post Office, Progress *re* (remarks) 9588 (v).
I. C. R. Mail Clerks allowing friends to ride in Mail Cars (Ans.) 8584 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9457 (v).
Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail (Ans.) 9782 (v).
Letter Carriers, New Westminster, Free Transportation *re* Tramways, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2194 (ii).
Mails Delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c. (Ans.) 2372 (ii), 4668 (iii).
Mail Delivery, Free, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 4925 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 9538-9 (v).
Mail Service Estimates, Objections *re* passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Mail Service in Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9544 (v).
—— (remarks) 8794 (v).
Maritime Mail Service, Delay *re*, Representations by Board of Trade, Halifax (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Montreal and Maritime Provs. Mail, Forwarding of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Meteghan Centre Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4296 (iii).
Ministers Speeches, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
Ministers Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7441 (iv).
Mississippi Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9252 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Montreal Letter Carriers, Addition to (remarks) 2647 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec (B. 222) 1° m., 9228; in Com., 9495 (v).
Naval Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 9375 (v).
Naval Service, Medical Examiners for Recruits (Ans.) 8991 (v).
Nelson Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Newspapers, Postal Regulations *re* Distribution of (remarks) 10341 (v).
Newspaper Trains, Special, Cost of Operation (Ans.) 9983 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re* (Ans.) 5934 (iv).
Parcel Post, Express Rates (remarks) 9915, 9937 (v).
Peel County Mail Service (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
—— Rural Mail Delivery, Generally (remarks) 10361 (v).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design (remarks) 7108 (iv).
—— Refusal of Imperial Design (remarks) 6908 (iv).
Postage Stamps, New Issue, Condemnation *re* (Ans.) 9990 (v).
—— Prizes, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 5402 (iii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increases to, Classification *re* Offices, &c. (Ans.) 5934 (iv).
—— Pets. *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (stamp box) Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2736 (ii); 2° m., 8065 (v).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 216) M. for Com. on Res., 8585; in Com. on Res., 8906; in Com., 9567-8, 9577 (v).

Post Office Collections, Revenue in Cities (Ans.) 3862 (ii).

Post Office Dept., Overcrowding in Basement (Ans.) 6667 (iv).

Post Office Matters, Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

Post Office Revenue and Expenditure, Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 10335 (v).

Post Office and Customs, Revenues for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw (Ans.) 4673 (iii).

Pratt's Siding Post Office, Request *re* Establishment (Ans.) 3067 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Sale of (remarks) 7109 (iv).

Railway Mail Clerks, Injuries, &c., Grants *re* (Ans.) 3860 (ii), 9537 (v)

——— Minimum and Maximum Salary, Claims *re* Increase (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

——— Names of Persons not passing Qualifying Examination, Date of Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 3855 (ii).

See 'Post Office, B. 216, 'Supply.'

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4005 (iii).

——— Mr. Bryce's Instructions *re* (remarks) 4141 (iii).

——— Denial *re* Annexationist (remarks) 4054 (iii).

'Review of Reviews' Collection of Extra Postage (Ans.) 2371 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

See 'Mail Routes,' 'Peel,' &c.

Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Sheldon, C. D., Return to Canada (remarks) 6201 (iv).

Sorel Shipyard, Inquiry for Official Rep., 10203 (v).

Stamp Vending Machine: *See* 'P. O. B., 104.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6063 (iv); (salaries) 4280 (iii).

Immigration (agents) 5185 (iii).

Post Office (Curren, R.C., gratuity) 4283; (letter carriers' boots) 4283 (iii); (mails) 6076; (mail service) 6179; (miscellaneous) 6182 (iv); (postmasters' salaries) 4290; (ry. mail clerks) 4281, 4286 (iii), 6082, 6179; (ry. mail clerks, compensation) 6088 (iv); (rural postmasters) 4281 (iii); (salaries) 6178 (iv); (stamps) 4280; (superannuation) 4285 (iii).

Public Works—Building—Ont. (Athens) 2092 (ii).

Tadousac Postmaster, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 5133 (iii).

Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9641 (v).

——— *See* 'Cable.'

Thibodeau, Mr. Frank, Salary as Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 8100 (v).

Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause (Ans.) 3466 (ii).

Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance *re* (Ans.) 3861 (ii).

U.S. Tax on Canadian Shipping (remarks) 9248 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods Act Amt. (B. 212) 1°*, 8887; in Com., 9348 (v).

Windsor Letter Carrier, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe South.*

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 9225, (i).

Aliens outside of Canada, Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9221 (v).

Bank Act, Legislation this Session (remarks) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).

Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3602 (ii).

Barlow, John R., Emplymt. by Geological Dept. (Ques.) 8583 (v).

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c. (Ques.) 4304-5 (iii).

——— Place of Residence (Ques.) 5288 (iii).

See 'Christian.'

Big Bay Point Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 6005 (iv).

Bookkeeping of Depts., Names of Employees in Departments, &c. (Ques.) 1718 (i).

——— *See* 'Falconer.'

Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6120 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8822; in Com., 9258 (v).

C.P.Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1834 (i).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3063 (ii).

Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8569 (v).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9722 (v).
Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question (remarks) 4567 (iii).
——— *See* 'Beauscleil.'
Chrysler, Mr. F. H., Amounts paid by Govt. *re* Legal Service from 1896 to the present (M. for ret.*) 1727 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy re, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2224 (ii).
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services (Ques.) 813 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7811 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt., Legislation *re* (remarks) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Declaration of London. Consideration by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 5935 (iv).
Elevators, Terminals, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3499 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2381 (ii).
Falconer System of Book-keeping, Adoption of (Ques.) 1904 (i).
——— *See* 'Book-keeping.'
Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt., Protection (amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compention, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9617 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6639 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8655 (v).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9523 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
G.T.Ry. Pension Fund, Rules, Regulations, &c. (Ques) 2153 (ii).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Agreement *re* reinstatement, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).
——— Minister's efforts a Success, &c. (Ques.) 810 (i).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— Status of Men Reinstated (remarks) 3375 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Development Co. (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 2666 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re* (Ques.) 1570 (i).
——— Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost *re* (Ques.) 1493 (i).
——— *See* 'Natl. Transcl. Ry.'
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9305 (v).
Holland Peat Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 4303 (iii).
Imperial Conference, Questions to be submitted by Canada, Par. from 'Morning Post' quoted, 4298 (iii).
——— Secretariat, &c., on M for Com. on Ways and Means, 7378 (iv).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 905 (i).
Judges appointed since 1896, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 8095 (v).
Legal Agents, appointed by Govt., Precautions *re* acting for Private Parties (Ques.) 813 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3249 (ii).
Mineral Deposits, Circular *re* Information by F. H. Forchet (Ques.) 4305 (iii).
Ministers, Speeches of, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9254 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9241; in Com., 9496 (v).
N.T.Ry., Classification, &c., Arbitration Rep., *re* Investigation (Ques.) 1490 (i).
——— Completion of Eastern Division (Ques.) 1099 (i).
——— Construction Work, Estimated, Quantity, Cost, Bridges, &c. (M. for ret.*) 785 (i).
——— Contracts for Eastern Division, &c., (Ques.) 1095 (i).
——— Contracts Security Deposit, Amount of (Ques.) 1971 (ii).
——— Customs Duties on Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 8583 (v).
——— Defaulting Contractors, Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 1281 (i).
——— Eastern Division, Expenditure *re* 21 Contracts (M. for ret.) 5136 (iii).
——— Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re* Progress Estimates (Ques.) 2434 (ii).
——— Eastern Division, Section Houses &c (Ques.) 1099 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Eastern Division, Total Cost, to 31st Dec., 1910 inclusive of Quebec Bridge (Ques.) 5130 (iii).

——— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction &c. (Ques.) 9430 (v).

——— Estimated Cost and Mileage of Fencing, &c. (Ques.) 1094 (i).

——— Execution of Work under Contract, Delay *re* (Ques.) 6668 (iv).

——— Expenditure, Difference in Amount in Ret. &c. (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

——— Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg (M. for copy*) 785 (i).

——— Labour Conditions, Charges *re* Supplies (remarks) 8596 (v).

——— Over-Classification, Investigation, Reps. (M. for copy*) 4677 (iii).

——— Over-Classifications, Reduction *re* (remarks) 6272 (iv); 9899, 9995 (v).

——— Provision in Contract *re* G.T.P. taking over completed Sections (Ques.) 1093 (i).

——— Total Cost to complete Construction (Ques.) 5135 (iii).

——— Western Div., Total Cost *re* Construction (Ques.) 7591 (iv).

See "G.T.P. Ry."

Newmarket Canal &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10515 (v).

New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co's B. 170, on M. for Com., 8094 (v).

Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8348, (amt.) 8350; Neg. (Y. 65; N. 99) 8353 (v).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8594 (v).

P.E.I. Judicial Vacancy, Delay in Apptmt. (remarks) 7431 (iv).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2182 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com., 990 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 527, 818 (amt.) 823 (i).

——— Proposed Amendment (notice) 696 (i).

Public Buildings for Post Offices, &c., Number, Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.°) 786 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3954 (iii), 7347 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re* Contract (M. for copies) 713, 1497 (i), 2068 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys. (Ques.) 697 (i).

——— Amount expended *re* Supervision (remarks) 6671 (iv).

——— Construction, Information *re* (prop. res.) 4319 (iii).

——— Contract with M. P. Davis, dated July 27th, 1903, Transfer of Same to Govt. &c. (M. for ret.*) 785 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4567 (iii).

——— Employment of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection (Ques.) 6663 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 8102 (v).

——— Financial Loan, Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4665 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Tunnel Construction (Ques.) 6268 (iv).

——— Plans, Contract, &c. (remarks) 6273 (iv).

——— Plans and Specifications, Approval by Chief Engineer of G.T.Ry. Co. (Ques.) 4826 (iii).

——— Plans and Specifications, Instructions *re* (M. for papers*) 4677 (iii).

——— Remuneration, Supervision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6449 (iv). 6670 (iv).

——— Superstructure Contract (remarks) 6670 (iv).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8400; in Com., 9314, 9379 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. (1903) c. 31, Proclamation *re* (M. for copy*) 786 (i).

Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Comission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

Ry. Shelter for Sectionmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).

Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Provinces and Ry. Commissioners (Ques.) 696 (i).

Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5053 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3681 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Ques. of Order, 7550 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Globe's Report *re* (remarks) 7602, 7671 (iv).

——— British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6268 (iv).

——— Correction *re* Figures in Speech in Hansard, 3770 (ii).

——— Cor. *re*, Inquiry for, 2988 (ii).

——— Denial of Stmnt. *re* Member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) 5029 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Reciprocity with U.S., Farmers' and Manufacturers' Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt, 4663 (iii).

—— French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty &c. (Ques.) 8097 (v).

—— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9887 (v).

—— Ques. of Order, 5030 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order *re* Interruptions, 4451 (iii).

—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5953 (iv).

—— Statistics, Accepting as Read, and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6858 (iv).

—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order, 6892 (iv).

—— Statistics, Question *re* Vote of Member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).

—— U. S., Govt. Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics (remarks) 6673 (iv).

Returns, Delays in Preparation (remarks) 7555 (iv).

—— Inquiry for, 7256 (iv).

—— Notice to Members (remarks) 5939 (iv).

'Rexall', Registration by United Drug Co. ing, &c., (Ques.) 4672 (iii).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9171 (v).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2650 (ii).

Senate Chamber, Expenditure for Decoratting, &c. (Ques.) 1100 (i).

Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4312 (iii).

South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3347 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (seeds) 6223; Quarantine (animals' health) 5976 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6411 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing) 6408 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (enlarging office) 6409 (iv).

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 6410 (iv).

Canals—Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358; (tugs) 6359 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 6427; (surveys, inspections, &c.) 6452 (iv).

Canals—Murray (dredging) 6410 (iv).

Canals—Que. (dredging) 6411 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (lock gates, &c.) 6417; (upper entrance) 6416 (iv).

Canals—Trent (flood damages) 6454; (improvements) 6420 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6399; (stone protection) 6425 (iv).

Canals—Williamsburg (entrance pier) 6426; (machinery) 6427 (iv).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6639; (legal expenses) 6661; (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6197 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3383, 3410; Ques. of Order, 3450 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752 (v).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8681 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Lunenburg) 1595 (i); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500; (Argyle Sound) 9501 (v).

Railways—G.T.P. (govt. director) 6448 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 5916 (iii); (freight cars) 5985 (iv); (Halifax) 5919; (highways protection) 5917; (Str. Scotia) 5928 (iii); (working expenses) 6341 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (inspections) 6452; (McGill University) 6445; (official cars) 6447; (ry. commissioners) 6427; (remunerations) 6449 (iv).

Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7351 (iv).

Water Carried Freight, Value, &c. (remarks) 6671 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, West.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 417 (i).

Baggage Smashing Prevention (B. 129) 1° m., 4198 (iii).

Bank Act Amts. (B. 297) 1° m., 8695 (v).

Business of the House, Public Bills for Thursdays (remarks) 2064 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act (registration) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6116 (iv).

Commercial Agent at Washington (remarks) 9511 (v).

Criminal Code (homicide by hunters) Amt. (B. 40) 1° m., 987 (i).

Daylight Saving (B. 26) 1°*, 663 (i).

Food Supplies in Cold Storage (B. 112) 1° m., 2983 (ii).

Foreign Consuls, Official Status (remarks) 9511 (v).

Gov. General, Duke of Connaught, Rumours *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 1725 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (marking) Amt. (B. 154) 1° m., 6034 (iv).

Load Lines on Ships (B. 98) 1° m., 2063 (ii).

Militia Regulations governing Admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1001 (i).

Offensive Weapons (B. 86) 1° m., 1642 (i).

—— Pets. *re* Legislation (Ques.) 3064 (ii).

—— Sale of, Par. in Montreal Papers *re* (remarks) 2557 (ii).

Ottawa City Health Conditions (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6367 (iv).

Pickford and Black SS. Service between Can. and W. Indies, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4465 (iii).

Poisons (Cocaine) Sales (B. 13) 1° m., 259 (i).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Secret Commissions (B. 87) 1° m., 1646 (i).
Sewage Disposal (B. 122) 1° m., 4039 (iii).
Water for Drinking Purposes (B. 131) 1° m., 4564 (iii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships (B. 41) 1° m., 988 (i).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8447 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10239 (v).
Herring Traps, Close Season *re* (remarks) 2086 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1160 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 863 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) 10084 (v).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*
Canadian Light and Power Co., Lease between Govt. &c. (M. for copy*) 1501 (i).
Reciprocity, Vote *re*, Par. in "Le Canada", Ques. of Priv., 3953 (iii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name, &c. (Ques.) 1491 (i).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted (Ques.) 9780 (v).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *Renfrew, South.*
Bankers' Association, Agreement *re* Competition (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5297 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7186 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Address, The, 567 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2172 (ii).
British National Songs in N. W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
C.P.Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1856 (i).
Dom. Steel Company of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital, &c. (Ques.) 9690 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Ques. of Order, 144 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8464 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P. M. G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2270 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Beattie) 4361; (M.) to adjn., Debate, 4364; Agreed to (Y. 89; N. 49) 4380 (iii).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8975 (v).
Imperial Conference, Secretariat Formation, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7390 (iv).
I. C. R., Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1159 (i).
——— Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute *re* Granted (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9177 (v).
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6527 (iv).
Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c. (Ques.) 2854 (ii).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8594 (v).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3890 (ii).
Public Works promised during Western Tours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1632 (i).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5114 (iii).
Reciprocity, Agricultural Implements (remarks) 5745 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Lighthouse and Coast Service ('Earl Grey') 6485 (iv); Postoffice (ry. mail clerks) 4285 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsboro) 1632 (i).
West Indies Trade, Exports and Imports, Total Value (Ans.) 2854 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, South.*
American War Vessels, passing through Canadian Canals, Request from Washington *re* (Ques.) 10334 (v).
Baby Farm, Toronto, Sale of, Competition *re* (Ques.) 2155 (ii).
See 'Toronto Barracks.'
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7573 (iv).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8566 (v).
Census, Omissions in Enumerations, in Toronto (remarks) 10099 (v).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board, &c., on M. (Mr. Goodeve) 9704 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re* (Ques.) 5134 (iii).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 9595 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Coronation, Naval Cadets, Method of Selection, &c. (Ques.) 9986 (v).

Curran, R. E., Compensation for Injuries *re* Ry. Mail Service (M. for cor.*) 3948 (ii).

Customs Collections in Cities, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 4042 (iii).
See 'Postoffice.'

Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 37) 1° m., 924 (i).

Don Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, &c., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 9987 (v).

Donlands Postoffice, Removal of Site (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff (Ques.) 10196 (v).

Empire Life Insurance Co., of Canada, incorp., (B. 71) 1°*. 1488 (i).

Farm Labourers, O.C., *re* Immigration Regulations from U.S., (remarks) 10099 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr Beattie) 4355 (iii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8664 (v).

Garden Seeds purchased for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1717 (i).

Gas Meters in Toronto, Complaints *re* Excessive Measurements (Ques.) 3280 (ii).

Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U. S. and British, Authority *re* (Ques.) 9985 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550 (v).

G. T. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron as Investigator (Ques.) 2158 (ii).

——— Resolution from Order of Ry. Conductors, (Ques.) 9988 (v).

——— Tel. sent by Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock (Ques.) 1105 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1421, 1548. 1729, 1761 (i).

Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re* (Ques.) 2885 (ii).

Hydo-Electric Power Commission, Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re* (remarks) 1574 (i).

Immigrants, Efficient Medical Inspection, &c., (Ques.) 1716 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1520 (i).

International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 878 (i); in Com., 9193 (v).

International Waterways Commission, Names of Members, Amounts paid to, &c.. (Ques.) 3861 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* (remarks) 7259 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

International Waterways Commission, Inquiry for Ret., 4569 (iii).

Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act (Ques.) 1488 (i).

Levis Dry Dock, Plans Filed by Sir Robt. Perks, Subsidy, &c., (Ques.) 712 (i).

Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re* (Ques.) 9988 (v).

——— Speech of Sir Richard Cartwright (remarks) 9693 (v).

Munderloh and Company Limited Patent Relief (B. 203) 1°*, 8582 (v).

N. T. Ry. and Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry., Agreement *re* running Rights, &c., (Ques.) 2435 (ii).

Naval Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt. in 'Navy,' (Ques.) 793 (i).

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations by U. S. Govt. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).

Orders Discharged (M.) 4464 (iii).

Postoffice Collections. Revenue in Cities, &c., (Ques.) 3862 (ii).

Postoffice and Customs Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910 (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
See Customs.

Printing Bureau, Paper purchased, Inspection of (Ques.) 2373 (ii).

Ry. Act (commutation tickets) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1551 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8402 (v).

Ry. Employees Protection B. 114 (Mr. R. Smith) on M. for 1°, 3219 (ii).

Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10191 (v).

Railway Mail Clerks, Accidents to, Grants *re* Injuries, &c. (Ques.) 3859 (ii).

——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase. &c., (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Railway Sectionmen, Complaints *re* Overwork, &c. (Ques.) 9987 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 9938 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4078 (iii).

———Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10016 (v).

——— North York, Challenge to Contest Riding (remarks) 7220 (iv).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, &c., (remarks) 6791, 6895 (iv).

Roman Catholic Church, Attack *re* by Member, Protest *re*, 3371 (ii).

Steel Bounties. Total Amount paid, &c., (Ques.) 3470 (ii).

Toronto Barracks Site, (Baby Farm) P... Valuations, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 981 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Toronto Barracks Site, (Ques.) 2153 (ii).
—— (remarks) 7557 (iv).
See 'Baby,'
Toronto Federal Buildings, Plan of Erection (remarks) 8479 (v).
Toronto Harbour Consolidation Act Amt. (B. 175) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8235, 8535 (v).
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal of (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re* and Fair Wage Clause (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Change *re* Specifications (Ques.) 805 (i).
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow (Ques.) 3861 (ii).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Members, Reps., O. Cs., &c., (M. for copies*) 1339 (i).
See 'International.'

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York, South.*
Address, The, 98 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1341 (i).
B.C. Ry. Belt and Peace River Water B. 124 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4110 (iii).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).
—— (remarks) 1573 (i).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, &c., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9620 (v).
—— (remarks) 9999 (v).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of (remarks) 1507 (i).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10103 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1425 (i).
Imperial Conference Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10117 (v).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1518 (i).
Mail Service with Allan SS. Co. (remarks) 4428 (iii).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9909 (v).
Questions and Motions proposed to be Introduced, Notice of, 1502 (i).
Ry. Act (commutation tickets) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 1551 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, 5233, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5246 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway Rates in the West (remarks) on Address, 104 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2459 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4856 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4062 (iii).
—— Amendments *re*, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4125 (iii).
—— Announcement *re*, Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2643 (ii).
—— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10020 (v).
—— Notice of Motion, 4049 (iii).
—— Pulp and Paper Duties, Information *re* (remarks) 2646 (ii).
—— Pulp and Paper Duties, Par. in New York 'Herald' (read) 2638 (ii).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2654 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2719 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1372 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Service Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9636 (v).

MacNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2398 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7262 (iv).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnstone before Com. on Ag. (remarks) 2993 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8854 (v).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2700 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6401 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 93) 1°, 1969 (ii); in Com., 5079, 5568, 5630; 3° m., 5252 (iii).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*, 6756 (iv).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.) 2679 (ii)
Dakin, Violet Jane Relief (B. 190) 1°*, 8187 (v).
Elbow and Bow River Water Powers, Aplications *re* (Ques.) 1345 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*
Elbow River, Conserving of Water Flow (M. for cor.*) 1912 (i).
——— Water Power License, Agreements, &c. (M. for copies) 1501 (i).
Grazing Leases in the Foothills, Applications *re* (Ques.) 1492 (i).
Langdon Subdivision of C.P.Ry., Mail Service in Northwest (Ques) 1346 (i).
Manitoba and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).
N.W. Ter. School Lands, Complete Procedure *re* Disposal, &c. (Ques.) 800 (i).
School Lands in Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, Revenues from Sales (M. for ret.*) 1911 (i).
——— Revenues from, &c. (Ques.) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal (Ques.) 1345 (i).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *Kent West.*
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5944 (iv).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland West.*
British Crown Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 1969 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5572 (iii).
British Columbia and Central Canada Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 5127, 5253 (iii).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201 (Mr. W. M. Martin) on M. for 2°, 8581; in Com., (amt.) 8931 (v).
C. P. Ry. (B. 108) 1°*, 2983 (ii).
Canadian Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1°*, 5933 (iv).
Canada West Loan Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 169) 1°* 6906 (iv); in Com., 8563 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3501 (ii).
Hornell, Ethel May, Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 3994 (iii).
La Banque du Canada B. 123 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 5776 (iii).
Reciprocity—Saskatchewan Boards of Trade Res. (read) 5751 (iii).
——— Stmnt, of Mr. Shepherd (remarks) 5752 (iii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*
Regina and Moose Jaw Town Sites, C.P.R.'s Interest *re* (Ques.) 2281 (ii).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount still owing by Farmers (Ques.) 3848 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2703 (ii).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa City.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His. Ex.'s Speech (moved) 10 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 1069 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (water supply) 2588 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton North.*
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change (M. for cor.) 2166 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5081 (iii).
All Red Steamship Route incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 2827 (ii); in Com., 4239 (iii)
See 'Imperial.'
Bait Freezers, Construction in Louisburg, &c., (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2226 (ii).
——— and Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2015 (ii).
Imperial Steamship's Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, (prop. res.) 1106 (i).
See 'All Red.'
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 970 (i).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2547 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2331 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 5014, 5260 (iii).
Reciprocity Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Quotation, 5410 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1061 (i); Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3434 (ii).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 875 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury & Queen's (N.B.)*

Canada Shipping Act (coal barges) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 3664 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Militia (allowance) 8532 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron South.*

Combines Investigation Act, Restraint *re* United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Investigation (remarks) 5953 (iv).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5438 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7110 (iv).

Reciprocity—Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Tariff (read) 5546 (iii).

Senate of Canada, Reform of (prop. res.) 4306 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6219 (iv); Railways—I.C.R. (freight service) 5988 (iv).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *Cape Breton South.*

Alien Labour Law, Emplymt. of Foreign Labour on Public Contracts (remarks) 10374 (v).

Birch Grove, Pet. *re* Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4464 (iii).

Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount imported from G. B. and U. S., 1909-10 (Ques.) 2369 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act, Report *re* (remarks) 1987 (ii).

Customs Preventive Officers, Duties &c. (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Fire Brick, imported into N. S., Number, Ports, &c. (Ques.) 3471 (ii).

Fish Wardens in Victoria, N. B., (inquiry for ret.) 5629 (iii), 6672 (iv).

——— (remarks) on Ret., 5733 (iii).

Glace Bay Bait Association, Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4044 (iii).

——— Payments to from 1906-10, Dates &c. (Ques.) 3670 (ii).

——— (M. for copy*) 3948 (ii).

G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5803 (iii).

Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Fundy Bay)on M.(Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 4618, 4687 (iii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1441 (i).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1127 (i).

McGillivray, Judge, and Conciliation Boards (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4274 (iii).

Naval Service, Medical Examiners *re* Recruits (Ques.) 8991 (v).

North Atlantic Collieries, Application *re* Conciliation Board (M. for cor.*) 3947 (ii).

——— Protest *re* Nomination on Conciliation Board (remarks) 4209 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 10550 (v).

Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board Settlements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1058 (i).
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 3401 (ii) 4262 (iii).
Militia (allowance) 8533 (v)
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8693 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (mails) 6073 (iv); (superanuation *re* clerks) 4284 (iii).

'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation of (remarks) 5627 (iii).

Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used (Ques.) 3471 (ii).

Wharfs, N. S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1277 (i).

Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data &c. (M. for copies) 4677 (iii).

Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8123 (v).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607 (v).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7850 (iv).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 874 (i); on M. for 2°, 9101; in Com., 9212 (v).

Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

Milk River and St. Mary's Boundary: *See* "Long Sault" International Waterways (B. 36).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9321 (v).

Railway Charters, Granting by Parlt., Conditions *re* (remarks) on Railway Estimates, 5122 (iii).

Railway Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5122 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8373 (v).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 5196 (iii); Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9548 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Lethbridge) 3009 (ii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Application *re* Irrigated Lands Reserve (Ques.) 803 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

Reciprocity—Statistics &c. Hearing of Motion read. Vote *re* 6839 (iv).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin East.*

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

——— Post Office Revenue for 1908-1909 &c. (Ques.) 984 (i).

Canned Peas, Number of Cans imported and Amount of Revenue *re* &c. (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

Census Appointments for East Elgin, Names &c. (Ques.) 4302 (iii).

Fish Hatchery in East Elgin, Construction *re* (remarks) 5137 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3276 (ii).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections &c. (Ques.) 985 (i).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9327 (v).

Railways—Transportation Problem. on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5101 (iii)..

Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number &c. (Ques.) 983 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6242; (seeds) 6222; Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6620 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 2363 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8874 (v).

MARTIN, Mr. A. M., *Wellington North.*

Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6829 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2614 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Marys.*

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation Reps. *re*, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2215 (ii).

——— Grantees, Rentals, &c., Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2200 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4114 (iii).

Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Numbers (remarks) 2647 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Railway Act Amt., (B. 4), 1°*, 148 (i); 2° m., 3943 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 2570 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*

Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s. (B. 201) 1°*, 8476 (v); 2°m., 8581 (v).

Casualty Co., of Canada, incorp. (B 174) 1°, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8566 (v).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Terminals, Investigations *re* Mixing of Grain (prop. res.) 2377 (ii).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5456 (iii).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8543 (v).

Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief (B. 200) 1°*, 8477 (v); in Com., 8971 (v).

Grant, Maud Gertrude, Relief (B. 138) 1°*., 5619 (iii).

Half-Breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malboeuf, (M. for cor.*) 2161 (ii).

High River, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co''s incorp., (B. 202) 1°* 8582 (v); 2°m., 8642 (v).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7844 (iv).

Kirkland, Walter Harvey Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 6756 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police, Pay and Allowance &c., (Ques.) 8101 (v).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8589 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Advances, &c., (Ques.) 7245 (iv).

Reciprocity,Fleming Grain Growers Ass'on. Res. (remarks) 5551 (iii).

———Tels. from Saskatchewan Municipalities (read) 5534 (iii).

St. Peter Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5883 (iii).

Sterling Trusts Corporation incorp., (B. 32) 1°*, 817 (i); in Com., 2596, 2648, 3021, 3180, 3453, 3841 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6609 (iv).

SUPPLY—

R. N. W. M. Police (subsistence) 8603 (v).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties (prop. res.) 1915 (i).

——— Resuming Adjnd. Debate (remarks) 2253 (ii), 4383 (iii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Austin Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Battleford Public Buildings, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3031 (ii).
Casualty Co., of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8571 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4585 (iii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res., (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2401 (ii).
Ennis. D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
Estimates *re* Man., Discussion *re* (remarks) 2970 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, Control of Ry. Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res., (Mr. Beattie) 4353 (iii).
Floods on the Assiniboine, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10255; 10293 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8540, 8541 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1429, 1756 (i).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iv).
Markey Fishing Leases, Inquiry for Ret. 6119 (iv).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to. on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2811 (ii).
Minnedosa Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3049 (ii).
Neepawa Post Office, Mail Route, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8351 (v).
Public Buildings in former Estimates, given precedence over new ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).
Public Works Building Plans, approved by Depts, previous to Aug. 5th, &c. (Ques.) 698 (i).
Railway Act (animals killed) Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 529 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9401 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res. (remarks) 4498 (iii).
Reciprocity Papers, Comparative Prices, Printing of (remarks) 10469 (v).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of (remarks) 10524 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).
—— Refusal of Claims (remarks) 1293 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 4730 (iii); Militia (salaries) 1029; Public Works (salaries) 1034 (i).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8683 (v).
Post Office—Outside Service (ry. mail clerks compensation) 6088 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dresden) 2105; (Gananoque) 2112 (ii); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2130; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2142; (Mitchell) 2148; (Peterborough) 2608; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2628; (Waterloo) 2634 (ii);
Public Works — Buildings — Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1892 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2972 (ii).
U.S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U.S. Courts, &c. (M. for ret.) 4342 (iii).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7856 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 1301 (i).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *Grey, North.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 423 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop, Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1939 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3026 (ii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Termination of, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2003, 2271 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7480 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7560 (iv).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 1905 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9260 (v).
Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c. (Ques.) 3608 (ii).
Civil Servants and Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9708 (v).
Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to, &c. (Ques.) 1455 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, Dimensions, &c. (Ques.) 10337 (v).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation at, Charges *re* (Ques.) 663 (i).

Coronation Contingent from Canada, Regulations *re* Apptmts (Ques.) 3220, 3277 (ii).

Dissolution of Parlt., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Opposition (remarks) 5737 (iii).

Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2129 (ii).

Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Farmers Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5324 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8217 (v).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9595; Amt. Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Estimated Number surviving, Pensions, &c. (Ques.) 1715 (i).

——— Grants to (Ques.) 1089 (i).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Fishery Regulations at Washington, *re* Newfoundland (remarks) 2071 (ii).

See "International".

Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8487 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4364 (iii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8622, 8652, 9346 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240, 8920 (v).

G.T.R., Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1078 (i).

Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available, &c. (Ques.) 1907 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1436, 1530, 1741 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8407 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8078 (v)

I.C.R. Special Trains *re* Monument National Demonstration, Montreal (remarks) 2997 (ii).

International Fisheries Regulations, Ratification of (remarks) 1654 (i).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary water) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9097 (v).

International Railway Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c. (Ques.) 4466 (iii).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3062 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 9538 (v).

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8338 (v).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6122 (i).

Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2532 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8091 (v).

Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction (Ques.) 10337 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9316, 9380 (v).

Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between U.S., and Can. (remarks) 3054 (ii).

Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).

Ry. Telegraph, &c., Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8356 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2465 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4535 (iii).

——— Absence of Ministers during discussion (remarks) 8372 (v).

——— Articles in Press *re* Obstruction (remarks) 9999 (v).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2989 (ii).

——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).

——— Res. by Associated Boards of Trade, Ont. (read) 4121 (iii).

——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (ii).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, 6797 (iv).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2601 (ii).

Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).

Stone, Cut, Duty Between U.S. and Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9087 (v).

Civil Govt., Customs (salaries) 1067; Public Works (salaries) 1041 (i).

Fisheries (fish transportation) 6105 (iv); Ont. (inspectors) 6620 (iv); (overseers) 3819 (ii); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6106 (iv).

Indians—N. W. T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6036 (iv).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Fergus) 2111; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2136; (Peterborough) 2605 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1688 (i).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c., for 1910 (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, South.*

Address, The, 229 (i).

Adjournment, Extension of Time (remarks) 9566 (v).

Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum (M.) 2365, 2429, 3599 (ii).

——— (M.) to sit during Sessions of the House, 8355 (v).

Canadian Railways, Accidents *re*, Investigation, &c. (prop. res.) 3922 (ii).

Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).

Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8576 (v).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 7) M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1309 (i).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5354 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8227 (v).

——— Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2241 (ii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9346 (v).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 968; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 24) 975; in Com., 976, 1294, 1510-11; on Order for Com., 1406 (ii).

Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Res. *re* (remarks) 3059 (ii).

——— Attacks *re* by h. m. (remarks) 3372 (ii).

Minister of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).

Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 229 (i).

Quebec Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9345 (v).

Race Track Gambling, (M.) to print Evidence, 10467 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Com. on Res., 4906, 4937 (iii).

Révillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8580 (v).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2652 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2721 (ii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3348 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5978; Ques. of Order, 5934 (iv).

House of Commons (telephones) 6337 (iv).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8690 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Lambert) 1900 (i).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry. Commission) 6434 (iv).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Absence from H. of C., Ques. of Priv., 1353 (i).

Continental Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 196) 1°*, 8403; in Com., 8968 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4373 (iii).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 148) 1°*, 5726 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com., on Res., 4183 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie, Post Office Revenues (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).

Address, The, 111 (amt.) 133; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 595 (i).

Address to His Majesty King George, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 7824 (iv).

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220, on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. orders, 9350 (v).

Arthabaska and Drummond Elections, Cor. laid on Table, 194 (i).

See 'Drummond.'

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6304, 6324 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation of, Reps. *re* (M. for cor.) 2214 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1713 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Grantees, Improvements, Value of Franchise, &c. (Ques.) 1711 (i).

——— Rentals, Sums expended by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.) 2194 (ii).

——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1712 (i).

——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c. (Ques.) 1713 (i).

Canadian Commissioner for France, Vacancy, Apptmts. *re* (Ques.) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).

Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid to, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 655 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Canadian Light and Power Co.'s Plans *re* Improvements (remarks) 7261 (iv).
—— Plans, &c., Date of Approval (Ques.) 7591, 7805 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9265 (v).
C.P.R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c. (M. for cor.) 766 (i).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 661 (i).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c. (Ques.) 8700 (v).
See 'Ottawa River.'
Carrier-Laine Works, Purchase of by Govt. Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 8992 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9049 (v).
Census Enumerators, Names, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4465 (iii).
Census, Hochelaga Division, Names of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 9372 (v).
Census for Jacques Cartier, Names of Enumerators, &c. (Ques.) 9431 (v).
—— Names of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 9372 (v).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2504 (ii).
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration (Ques.) 8308 (v).
Co-operation Credit (B. 11) 1° m., 194; 2° m., 1302; in Com., 1302 (i).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
Declaration of London, Adoption of, Inquiry for Papers, 3530 (ii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, 'pounding England' Speech of Notary Begin (remarks) 57 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order, *re* Mr. Gauvreau's insulting language (remarks) 77 (i).
—— quotations from Speeches, &c., on Address, 125 (i).
Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5933 (iv).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegation, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3529 (ii).
—— French Edition, Inquiry for, 9075 (v).
Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re* (Ques.) 1489 (i).
Gaspé Mail Service, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3854 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use of by Americans (Ques.) 7804 (iv).
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices (M. for stmnt.) 944 (i).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Basis of Settlement by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Great Northwestern Telegraph Co., Request for Board of Conciliation, &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Names, &c. (Ques.) 9432 (v).
Hydro-Electric Co., Limited Water Power Lease on Ottawa River (Ques.) 9430 (v).
—— Tenders called, &c. (Ques.) 9352 (v).
Imperial Conference, Report *re*, Complete, presented to Parlt. (amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10103 (v).
—— Information *re* Precis Rep. and Further Rep. (remarks) 9783 (v).
—— Inquiry for Rep., 9690 (v).
—— Precis *re* (remarks) 9694 (v).
—— Premier's Return from, Amount expended (Ques.) 9780 (v).
Imperial Defence Committee Report (M. for copy) 944 (i).
—— Additional Copies (prop. res.) 2215 (ii).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re* (prop. res.) 2927, 2967 (ii).
I. C. R., Ice Contracts at Riviere du Loup Terms, &c. (Ques.) 2137, 3853 (ii).
International Naval Conference, Final Protocol, (M. for copy) 3073 (ii).
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative, &c. (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
International Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Crairman, Mr. George Gibbons (remarks) 4741 (iii).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections (Ques.) 1907 (i).
Lanctot, Mr. A.: *See* Priv. and Elections.
'Le Devoir,' Quotations from, *re* Drummond Elections, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 471 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.) 771 (i).
Mail Delivery Free in Towns, &c., Conditions *re* (Ques.) 4925 (iii).
Maple Sugar Adulteration, Pet. *re*, Amt. to Foods Act (Ques.) 5131 (iii).
Marieville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 4636 (iii).
Mergers, Competing Industries, Notice of Discussion, 2736 (ii).
See 'Industrial.'
Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1713 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 7717, 7560; in Com., 7718 (iv).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Post Office, Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re* (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Mailing and Registering Facilities (Ques.) 1715 (i).
Naval Defence, Govt. Proposals, on Address, 112, (amt.) 133 (i).
Naval Policy of Govt., Conscription *re* (remarks) on Address, 241 (i).
Naval Policy, Amt. to Address, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651; on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Address, 595 (i).
Naval Service of Can., 'Bristol' Type, Specifications &c. (Ques.) 1279 (i).
—— Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity, &c., per day (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— Construction, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8355 (v).
—— (Ques.) 8700 (v).
—— Expenditure *re* (M. for stmt.*) 786 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4471, 4659 (iii).
—— Names of Employees, Domicile, Duties Assigned, Salaries, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 932 (i).
—— Navy Act, Rules and Regulations (M. for ret.) 1499 (i).
—— (Ques.) 7804 (iv).
—— Navy Regulations, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
—— 'Niobe', Contracts *re* Provisions, &c. (Ques.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe', Date of laying of the Keel, Repairs in England, &c. (Ques.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Gun Practice, Approximate Cost., &c. (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Loan by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 983 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Speed, Result of Official Trials (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— Par. in 'Naval Annual' *re* Scrapping of Cruisers (remarks) 931 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Guns, Type of (Ques.) 1490 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' listed as ineffective (remarks) 1070 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' Struck off Effective List (Ques.) 1081 (i).
—— Recruiting by Postmasters (remarks) 7261 (iv).
—— Ships building for Govt., Par. in 'Ottawa Free Press' (remarks) 866 (i).
—— Total Expenditure since 31st Oct., 1910 (Ques.) 5638 (iii).
Netherland Loan Co., Rep. by Mr. W. T. R. Preston *re* Establishment in Canada (M. for copy) 766 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Netherland Loan Co., (prop. res.) for Com., 781 (i).
—— Cor. between Mr. Preston and Govt. (M. for copies*) 3142 (ii).
—— Further Cor., Reps., &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
—— Inquiry for, 7349 (iv).
—— Statement by W. T. R. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
Ottawa River and Carillon Water Powers, Lease, &c. (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).
Pecuniary Claims Convention, *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c. (Ques.) 802 (i).
Post Office Act B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 9567, (amt.) in Com., 9568, 9577 (v).
Preston, W. T. R., and Sir Chas. Fitzpatrick: *See* 'Netherland.'
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot), on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com. 7889; (amt.) 7899, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 98) 8030 (v).
—— (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Proportional Representation, (M.) for Sel. Com., 3228 (ii).
Quebec Bridge. British Empire Bridge Co.'s. Deposit, Amount, &c., (Ques.) 9981 (v).
—— Agreement *re* Commission (remarks) 3073 (ii).
—— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to, &c., (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Contract for Reconstruction (remarks) 4740 (iii).
—— Members of Construction Board, (Ques.) 9981 (v).
—— Tenders *re* Carriage Way, &c., (Ques.) 9979 (v).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 8992 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2456 (ii).
—— in Com. on Res., 3284; (amt.) 3289; Neg. (Y. 72; N. 97) 3292 (ii).
—— (amt.) *re* Loyalty to G. B., 4051 (iii).
—— Answer to Question on Paper (remarks) 4114 (iii).
—— Cor. with American Govt. *re* Champ Clark's Speech, Inquiry for, 3954 (iii).
—— Debate, Resuming of, (remarks) 5939 (iv).
Restigouche Riparian Association B. 176 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 7589 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2150 (ii).
Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c., (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Dredging, Rep. of *re*, on M. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Copy. 2163 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Riviere des Prairies, Survey, Rep. of Engineer, &c., (M. for ret.) 2161 (ii).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 799 (i).
——— Speech *re* Naval Service at public function (remarks) 932 (i).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N. T. Ry., &c., (Ques.) 2851 (ii).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1489 (i); 4666 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyard, Charges *re* (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
Ste. Marie Division Postoffice, Defective Site. &c., (Ques.) 10336 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. 9170 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) 10132 (v).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2731 (ii).
Sessional Clerks, Application *re* Increase of Salary (Ques.) 5404 (iii).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ques.) 4825 (iii).
Sorel Marine Shops, Complaints *re* Theft, &c., (Ques.) 1088 (i).
Sorel Shipyards, Investigation, Instructions to Commissioners, &c.. (Ques.) 7039 (iv).
——— Investigation into Irregularities (remarks) 6758 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 9994, 10096, 10203 (v).
Soulanges Canal, Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration of (remarks) 6273 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que., (Montreal barracks) 3152 (ii).
Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., (Ques.) 1723 (i).
Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Tobacco Duties of Canada and U. S., (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
——— Leaf Tobacco, Total Imports, &c., for last three years (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Apptmt. of Mr. Bouley (Ques.) 8993 (v).
Transportation—Georgian Bay as a Waterway (amt.) on M. for Sup., 5137, on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5163 (iii).
Trusts: *See* "Industrial."
Water Powers (conservation) (B. 49) 1° m., 1277 (i).
Water Powers, Conservation of, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7261 (iv).
Water Powers owned by Dom., Legislation Regulating (Ques.) 7803 (iv).

MURPHY, Hon. C., (Secretary of State), *Russell.*
Aliens employed by Govt. living outside of Canada, on Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).
Book-keeping in Depts., Names of Employees, &c., (Ans.) 1718 (i).
'Canada's Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Canned Peas, imported into Canada (Ans.) 3279 (ii).
Civil Service, Appointments from South Grey, on Inquiry for Ret., 2555 (ii).
Civil Servants, filling Municipal Positions, on Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. S Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1297 (i).
Dom. Steel Co. of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital Stock, &c. (Ans.) 9690 (v).
External Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmt., 944 (i).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner, Number of Convictions before (Ans.) 1569 (i).
Ministers, Travelling Expenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 3954, 4568 (iii).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons Imported (Ans.) 1721 (i).
Postoffice Dept., Money Orders, &c. (Ans.) 1101 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status (Ans.) 3606 (ii).
Printing Bureau Investigation, Report (presented) 8 (i).
——— Printing, &c. (M.) 8 (i).
——— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 1364 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7706, 7729 (iv).
——— Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
——— Money Loss, &c., (Ans.) 794 (i).
——— Number of Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ans.) 709 (i).
——— Paper purchased, Inspection of (Ans.) 2375 (ii).
Public Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 7348 (iv).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Reciprocity, Canadian Coasting Laws affecting Grain and Hogs (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8093 (v).
'Rexall' Registration by United Drug Co. of U. S. in Canada (Ans.) 4672 (iii).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Statutes, French Translations, Corrections (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 1472; Secretary of State (salaries) 1472 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, (remarks) 10096 (v).
Yukon Ter. Ordnances (presented) 8 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*
Address, The, 179 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6312 (iv).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election (remarks) on Address, 179 (i).
Laurier Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure (Ques.) 9982 (v).
Militia Surveys, Expenditure in each of last five years (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Naval Service for Can.. Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Cruiser building, 196 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7988 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9427 (v).
Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling, Notice of Motion, 4566 (iii).
Rigaud Postoffice Buildings, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3067 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8130 (v).
Ste. Thérèse Postoffice, Purchase of Site (Ques.), 1715 (i).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. *re* Naval Policy, 325 (i).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on Prop. Rés. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2403 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer System, *re* Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3488, (amt.) 3491, Agreed to (Y. 96, N. 54) 3524 (ii).
Fiscal Policy of Can., Speech of P. M. G. at Manufacturer's Banquet, Montreal (remarks) 2079 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4368 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9517 (v).
Homestead Irregularities, Punishment *re*, on Ques. of Order, 5563 (iii).
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3223 (ii).

NEELY, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Privileges, Ques. of, *re* Speech by Member for Dauphin as to Selection of Capital for Saskatchewan, 5620 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3563 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5560, 5595 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3007 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *Oxford, North.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup.. 6297 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5081, 5572 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3026 (ii).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4241 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2433, 3604 (ii).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6212 (iv).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201, on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1487 (i); in Com., 3182, 3454 (ii).
Conciliation Board, Settlement of Strikes, Ques. of Order, 4267 (iii).
Co-operative Credit Society's B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1311 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5424 (iii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Company's incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550, 8919 (v).
Grand Trunk Railwaymen's Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4257 (iii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7856 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8082, 8747 (v).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3062, 3182 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1232 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024, 3181 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ont., Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6436 (iv).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*

Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 7723 (iv).

New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8522; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster, 8958 (vi).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2337 (ii).

Peoples Ry. Co.'s, (B. 110), 1°*, 2983 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6611 (iv).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9326, 9390 (v).

Railway Committee (M.) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) 7549 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7627 (iv).

——— British Preference, Increase of (remarks) 7214 (iv).

——— Farmers' Interests, &c., (remarks) 5544 (iii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8966 (v).

Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2596, 2649, 3180, (ii); on Senate Amts., 6610, (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2703 (ii).

Sheldon. C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, (remarks) 1390 (i).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 817 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6238; (seeds) 6219 (iv); Labour Dept., (conciliation board) 4257 (iii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, East.*

Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 378 (i).

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080, 5570 (iii).

Canada Cement Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 8582 (v).

Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary, &c.. (Ques.) 8582 (v).

External Affairs, Absence of Minister from Washington Negotiations (remarks) 1658 (i).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission to Investigate, on Amt., (Mr. Henderson) 5363 (iii).

G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of men, Apptmt. of Judge Barron (M. for cor.*) 2376 (ii).

——— Inaction of Labour Dept., (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

——— (M. for cor.*) 786 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings East.*

G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1077 (i).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4248 (iii).

Lymburner Contracts with Govt. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 3206 (ii).

Matches, Phosphorus, Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2041 (ii).

Printing Bureau Investigation (M.) for Royal Commission 7687, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 92) 7801 (iv).

——— Evidence under Oath, Printing, Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook (Ques.) 2672 (ii).

Private Bills, Second Readings and in Com. (remarks) 8641 (v).

Quebec Bridge, Investigations *re* River Bed, Tests, &c. (Ques.) 658 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8402 (v).

Rainbow' and 'Niobe', Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c. (Ques.) 792 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4861 (iii).

Reciprocity, Denial of Statement of Member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) Ques. of Priv., 5035 (iii).

——— Quotation by Member for Cape Breton (Ques. of priv.) 5293, 5407 (iii).

Reciprocity, Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7677 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 4248 (iii).

United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, Govt. Representative, &c. (Ques.) 2672 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F. (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083, 5568 (iii).

Algoma Timber Permits, Amount of Dues paid (Ans.) 4674 (iii).

Aylwin Irrigation Grant, Papers *re*, on Inquiry for, 8192, 9076 (v).

Bear Indian Reserve, Medical Officer, Payments to (Ans.) 3224 (ii).

Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence (Ans.) 5289 (iii).

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits to cut Timber, Agent's Name, &c. (Ans.) 4304-5 (iii).

See 'Christian.'

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of (Ans.) 3464 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead (Ans.) 3221 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Bidwell Bay, B.C. Govt. Land Reserve, Disposition of (Ans.) 1284 (i).
B.C.Ry. Belt and Peace River Water (B. 124) 1° m., 4110 (iii).
See 'Homestead Regulations,' &c.
Bradley, Mr. John, Irregularity *re* Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5585 (iii).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5191 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8326 (v).
——— (personal explanation) 8387 (v).
——— (remarks) 8092 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com. 8566 (v).
Chacastapsin Indian Reserve, Owner &c. (Ans.) 4301 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 5726 (iii); in Com., 7869 (iv).
Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question (remarks) 4568 (iii).
See 'Beausoleil.'
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases to (Ans.) 5291 (iii).
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 8309 (v).
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S. (remarks) 4471 (iii).
See 'Negroes.'
Courtice, Mr., Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau (stmnt.) 9897 (v).
Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Dominion Lands Act (school lands) Amt. (B. 107) 1° m., 2851 (ii); (M.) to discharge order for 2°, 8088 (v).
——— (B. 194) 1° m., 8187 (v).
Dom. Lands Act Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1982 (i), 8087 (v).
Dominion Lands, Sask., Gross Receipts, Cost of Administration, &c. (Ans.) 3221 (ii).
See 'Saskatchewan,' &c.
Elbow and Bow River Water Powers, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Elevators, Terminals, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3512 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8113 (v).
Ennis, N. D., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2189 (ii).
——— Stmt. *re*, 2263 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Farm Labourers from U. S., O. C. Regulations *re* Immigration (remarks) 10099 (v).
Forests Reserves and Parks (B. 85) 1° m., 1640 (i); in Com., 8084, 8606, 8652, 9345 (v).
Garden Seeds purchased for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1717 (i).
Graham, Mr. D., Apptmt. as Indian Agent (Ans.) 5291 (iii).
Grain Act (standards) Amt. (B. 209) 1°*, 8887, 2° m., 9512 (v).
Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve on Homestead Lands (Ans.) 3466 (ii).
——— Number of Acres sold to, Price, &c. (Ans.) 2366 (ii).
Grazing Leases in Foothills, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1492 (i).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1722 (i).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908 in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23 (Ans.) 4112 (iii).
Homesteads, Pre-emptions and Purchased, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 812 (i).
Homestead Regulations in B. C., Application *re* Ry. Belt, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2857 (ii).
See 'B. C. Ry. Belt,' 'Indian Reserve,' &c.
Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage Available (Ans.) 1907 (i).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 1284 (i).
Hope Suburban Townsite, Date of Payment of Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 3068 (ii).
——— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval of Govt. (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund (Ans.) 796 (i).
Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination (Ans.) 814 (i).
——— Number from G. B., and U. S., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c. (Ans.) 808 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 47) 1° m., 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 2005 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Total Amount of Commissions paid (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
Immigration, Amount expended in Belgium and France (Ans.) 9991 (v).
——— Amount expended in U. S. (Ans.) 9991 (v).
——— Bonus paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c. (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
——— Commissions to Agents for Western Canada (Ans.) 9991 (v).
——— Efficient Medical Inspection (Ans.) 1716 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Immigration, Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910 (Ans.) 4300 (iii).
——— Immigration into Eastern Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
——— Money Qualification, *re* Operation of Act (remarks) 151 (i).
——— Number received from Europe, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 809 (i).
——— Number since 31st March last to the present, on M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 1498 (i).
——— Organization, Cor. with Miss Wileman (remarks) 9376 (v).
——— Premiums paid by Can. Govt. for 1910-11 (Ans.) 9991 (v).
——— Statistics, Publishing of (remarks) 2366; (stmt.) 2557 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. (B. 177) 2° m., 7825; in Com., 7846 (iv), 8406; 3° m., 8104, 8193, 8403 (v).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Indian Reserve Lands outside of Ry. Belt, B. C., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
See 'B. C.'
Indian Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re* (Ans.) 1910 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9123 (v).
James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians, &c. (Ans.) 1083 (i).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9487 (v).
Japaneese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications (Ans.) 791 (i).
Land Patents for S. E. ¼ of Section 6, Tp, 7, Issue of (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5605 (iii).
McGillicuddy Charges: *See* 'Can. Northern.'
Man. Swamp Lands, Concession to Prov. (remarks) 6759 (iv).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B. (remarks) 9376 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N. W. (remarks) 5912 (iii).
——— Restrictions *re* (remarks) 5944, 6524 (iv).
See 'Colored Aliens.'
New Westminster, Govt. Land Grants issued, &c., (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of, Govt. Assistance (remarks) 6767 (iv).
Obabikong and Sabikong Indian Reserves, Tenders *re* burned Timber (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8590 (v).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9419 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).
Regina and Moosejaw Town Sites, C.P.R.'s Interest, &c. (Ans.) 3281 (ii).
Ruddick, R. F.. Application *re* Homestead (Ans.) 3279 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions, &c., to Rev. J. McDougall, on M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Copies, 1292 (i).
——— Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Amount of Sales, Expenses. &c., (Ans.) 787 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Original Documents (remarks) 8111 (v).
——— Investigation by Rev. J. McDougall, &c., (Ans.) 787 (i).
——— Moneys paid Govt., Complaints, &c., (Ans.) 1974 (ii).
——— Original Documents before Royal Commission (stmnt.) 8477 (v).
——— Original Documents, &c., (remarks) 8192 (v).
——— (remarks) 8356 (v).
——— Rep. in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech, Ques. of Priv., 3840 (ii).
——— Request for Official Documents (remarks) 9899 (v).
School Lands in Man., Sask., and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal (Ans.) 1345 (i).
——— Procedure *re* Disposal (Ans.) 800 (i).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c. (Ans.) 1489, 1908 (i).
See 'Dom. Lands Act.'
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10133 (v).
——— Refusal of Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amounts still owing by Farmers (Ans.) 3848 (ii).
——— Amount *re* (Ans.) 3225 (ii).
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 6272 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve (B. 179) in Com. on Res., 7248; in Com., 7824-5 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Indians (contingencies) 4726; (salaries) 4725; Interior (clerical assistance) 4739; (salaries) 4726 (iii).
Dom. Lands—(Banff water works) 6052; (buffalo) 6049; (forestry convention) 6052; (parks) 6049 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5165 (iii); (seed grain) 3836 (ii), 6047 (iv).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8884 (v); N.W.T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046; (payments to Rev. J. Semmens) 6036; N.S. (medical attendance) 6036; Que. (medical attendance) 6035 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Interior (boundary surveys) 9546 (v); (Dom. lands, homesteads) 5553. 5581 (iii); (Dom. lands, surveys) 9547 (v); (immigration agents) 4729 (iii); (seed grain) 9551; (water investigations) 9550 (v).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 1723 (i).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Lands reserved, &c. (Ans.) 803 (i).

Timber Berths in B.C., Removal of from Hall's Prairie (Ans.) 3282 (ii).

Timber Lands, &c., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).

Timber Licenses in New Westminster District, Pets. against Renewals, &c. (Ans.) 3222 (ii).

Water Powers Conservation B. 49 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 1°, 1278 (i).

Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe (Ans.) 799, 1284 (i).

Winnipeg River Water Powers, &c., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 3955 (ii).

Yukon Beer Import Tax, Repeal of, in Com. on Res., 1977 (ii).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto West.*

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 1302; in Com., 1303 (i).

Farmers' Bank Proceedings, Stmnt. *re* Warning to Fin. Minister (remarks) 10472 (v).

Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10517 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland East (O.)*

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re* (remarks) 1655 (i).

Census Enumerators, Inaccuracies in Quebec (remarks) 7217 (iv).

Fish Ladders on Trent Canal (remarks) 4824 (iii).

Fish Preservation in Trent River, Action of Govt. (remarks) 1503 (i).

Homestead Applications in New Westminster Districts, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1237 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to refer Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 845 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2449 (ii).

——— Opposition to in Riding, Ques. of Priv., 6767 (iv).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Vote, 3343 (ii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

——— Tel. of Senator Cummins, *re* Manufactured Products (remarks) 4115 (iii).

Supply for Public Works, &c. (remarks) 10354 (v).

Victoria Museum, Ottawa, Inspection *re* Defects in Building (remarks) 7349 (iv), 9252 (v).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 197 (i).

Agriculture, Govt Aid to, on Amt (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).

Archives Dept., Commission of Historical Work, Care of Documents, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

——— Names of Staff (Ques.) 2155 (ii).

Census Commissioner, French Apptmt. (Ques.) 2155 (ii).

Cold Storage Depots during 1907-10, Total Amounts paid (Ques.) 2437 (ii).

Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c. (Ques.) 805 (i).

English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters (Ques.) 1080 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Negotiations *re* Transfer (Ques.) 799 (i).

Exhibition Grants, Subsides paid *re* (Ques.) 2437 (ii).

Fisheries Service, Control by Federal Govt. (Ques.) 983 (i).

——— Number of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 805 (i).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4378 (iii).

Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplmt. by Govt., fined for Electoral Corruption (Ques.) 2673 (ii).

Immigration, Amount expended in Belgium and France (Ques.) 9990 (v).

——— Amount expended in U.S. (Ques.) 9991 (v).

——— Commission to Agents in Western Canada (Ques.) 9991 (v).

——— Number received from Europe, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).

——— Number from G.B., U.S., &c., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 807 (i).

——— Premiums by Canadian Govt. for 1910-11 (Ques.) 9991 (v).

I.C.R. Mail Clerks allowing friends to travel in mail cars (Ques.) 8584 (v).

Naval Bill, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) on Address, 197 (i).

Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 8585 (v).

Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11 (Ques.) 8584 (v).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 8584 (v).
——— Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c. (Ques.) 8789 (v).
——— Pet. *re* Annex, &c. (Ques.) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8585 (v).
Paper Imports into U.S., Value, &c. (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Paris Exposition, 1900, Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 7602 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8019 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 8010 (v).
Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 2851 (ii).
——— Members *re* (Ques.) 2136 (ii).
Railway Commission, Aptmt. of French Canadian (Ques.) 1103 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 5182 (iii).
Trade Commissioners for Can., Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton, West.*
Currie, Wm. Francis Relief (B. 215) 1°*, 8955 (v).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7836 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2959 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1518 (i).
Ontario, Michigan Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Railway Locomotive Boiler Inspection (B. 30) 1° m., 699 (i).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (overseers) 3810; Public Works —Buildings, Ont. (Brantford) 2098 (ii).
U.S. Immigration Officers residing in Can., &c. (Ques.) 1723 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 346 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 1350 (i).
——— Complaints *re* Manipulation of Duties &c. (remarks) 1359 (i).
Agricultural Products imported into B.C. from U.S., Australia, &c. (Ans.) 7345 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce imported from U.S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 9992 (v).
Agricultural Products imported into Canada, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 5402 (iii).
Beef, Pork, &c., Quantity imported from Oct. 1910 to Feb. 1911 (Ans.) 6265 (iv).
Bounded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 4464 (iii).
Bricks, Tiles, &c., Number imported from G.B. and U.S., 1909-10 (Ans.) 2370 (ii).
Butter, Cheese and Meats imported into Canada, Weight, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4927 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada for Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911 (Ans.) 4671 (iii).
——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table, 6177 (iv.)
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Officials (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Canned Peas, Amount imported, Revenue received (Ans.) 3221 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. (B. 203) M. for Com. on Res., 8477; in Com. on Res., 8715 (v).
Coal and Coke, Quantity, Value imported into Canada from U.S. (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
Coal imported from U.S. into Ont., Value of Duties (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Coasting Trade Act, Changes *re* (Ans.) 4675 (iii).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity (Ans.) 7025 (iv).
Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1910 and 1896 (Ans.) 801 (i).
Customs Collections in Cities, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 985 (i), 4042 (iii).
Customs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Customs Entries at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Barnard) for Copies, 713 (i).
Customs Free Entry of Goods, Date of last Entry (Ans.) 804 (i).
Customs Goods entered free at Vancouver by Kelly & Co., on M. (Mr. Bernard) for Copies, 932 (i).
Customs Preventive Officers, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).
Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity, Value, &c. of Importation from U.S. (Ans.) 9362 (v).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron (Ans.) 6268 (iv).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value on Articles in Schedules of Customs Act, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 1105 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries (Ans.), 4467 (iii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks), 8116-18 (v).
Exports and Imports, Quantity and Value to Australia, Japan, &c. (Ans.), 9369 (v).
Farm and Garden Products, Imports, Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.), 7034 (iv).
Farm Products entered at Windsor, (Ans.), 7597 (iv).
——— exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8701 (v).
Farm Products imported from U. S. into Kingston, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U. S. (Ans.) 7026 (iv).
Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U. S. (Ans.) 1496 (i).
Fire Bricks imported into N. S., Number, &c. (Ans.) 3471 (ii).
Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Govt. Officials in Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058 (i).
——— *See* "Mercier."
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c. (Ans.) 794 (i).
Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 2161 (ii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8984 (v).
Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5634 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3470 (ii).
Loans in 1909, 1910, Negotiations *re*, &c. (Ans.) 797 (i).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
Mercier, Mr. George, Customs Official, Member of Town Council (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Mica Exports 1900 to 1910 (Ans.) 5290 (iii).
Mica Imports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Milk and Cream, Quantity exported (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
——— Exports to U. S. for March and April, 1911 (Ans.) 8790 (v).
——— Exports to U. S. for 1910-11, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 7038 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Customs Duties on Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 8583 (v.)
Newfoundland Export Trade, Imports, &c. Total Value (Ans.) 2854 (ii).
Nicolet Customs Collections from 1906-11 (Ans.) 8584 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Oshawa Customs Collector, Resignation of Mr. G. F. Blamey (Ans.) 3225 (ii).
Paper Imports into U. S., Value of (Ans.) 2674 (ii).
Pig Iron imported for Steel Rail Mills, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3223 (ii).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections (Ans.) 985 (i).
Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910 (Ans.) 6271 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exports to the U. S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 2674 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer, 5126 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3316 (ii).
——— Absence of Ministers during discussion (remarks) 8365 (v).
——— Dairymen's Ass'cn. of Ont., (remarks) 4570 (iii).
——— French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8098 (v).
——— Inquiry for Pets, &c. (Mr. Bradbury) 3058 (ii).
——— Oleomargarine, Admission of (Ans.) 6668; (remarks) 6504 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re*, 4137 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6889 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6820 (iv).
——— Statistics from Trade and Commerce Dept., Reply of Dep. Min. (remarks) 6511 (iv).
——— Summerland 'Review,' Editorial *re* Fruit Growers (read) 4123 (iii).
Shafting imported since April, 1910, Quantity and Value, &c. (Ans.) 7594 (iv).
Sheep, Lambs, Horses, &c., imported or admitted into Canada, &c. (Ans.) 8988 (v).
Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4467 (iii).
Sinking Funds, Legal Amounts required, Bounties paid, &c. (Ans.) 982 (i).
Stone Cut, Duty between Can. and U. S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1048 (i)., 5992 (iv).; Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008 (ii).
Tobacco, Duties on Imports and Exports to U. S. (Ans.) 7025 (iv).
Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
'Wanda,' Yacht, Date of Entry at Customs Port in Canada, Notice *re* (Ans.) 5934 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
'Wanda' Yacht, Ques. of Priv., 5623 (iii).
West Indies Trade, Exports and Imports, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 2854 (ii).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise, &c. (Ans.) 7601 (iv).
Wolfe Island Custom Official, Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 8100 (v).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. orders, 9350 (v).
Bank Act. Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9340 (v).
British Development Ry. Co.'s incorp, B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9274 (v).
Census, Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9711 (v).
Census Taking, System *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4340 (iii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices. Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9710 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1310 (i).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10354 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Moneys used, &c. (personal explanation) 196 (i).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8124 (v).
Estimates, Mail Service, Objection *re* passing, 4296 (iii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8472 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada and P. M. G.'s Speech in Montreal (remarks) 2266 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8606, 8669, 9346 (v).
Franking for Fraudulent Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of (Ques.) 930 (i).
—— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4224 (iii).
Indian Reserve Lands outside of Ry. Belt, B. C., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
I. C. R., Excursion Rates *re* Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).
—— (remarks) 2996 (ii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3061 (ii).
Montreal Legal Firms, Answer to Question, (remarks) 1012 (i).
Mounted Police—Death of Inspectors on Northern Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
N. T. Ry., Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1099 (i).
Naval Dept., Boot Contract, Tenders, Patterns, &c. *re* (Ques.) 2675 (ii).
'Niobe' Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re* (remarks) 530 (i).
Nominingue Postoffice Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2335 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Postoffice Act (stamp vending machines) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 8069 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com., (A. Lanctot) 3rd Rep. of Com. (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties, *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Inquiry for Rets., 4567 (iii).
Public Works Supply, Objection *re* Full Vote, 9555 (v).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9345 (v).
Questions and Answers, Orally and Written (remarks) 989 (i).
Ques. of Priv., Riordon Paper Co., Cor. *re* Connection with, 10197 (v).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3943 ; in Com., 3947 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Can., 6769; Amt. Neg. (Y. 64; N 98) 6837 (iv).
—— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U.S. (Ques.) 4468 (iii).
—— Butter and Eggs Prices in London, Information *re* by Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6508 (iv).
—— Negotiations at Washington, Reported Draft of Proposals (remarks) 2065 (ii).
—— U.S. Trade Statistics, Inquiry for, 6675 (iv).
—— Vote of Member for Labelle, Question *re* hearing Motion Read, 6839 (iv).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3608 (ii).
Ste. Marie de Monnoir Post Office (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1698 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9082 (v).
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coin) 6060 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1485 (i);
Post Office (clerical assistance) 6065 (iv).
Fisheries (Robichaud, Wm. compensation) 6106 (iv).
Geological Survey (explorations) 9551 (v).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9548 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 8777; (Canada and Mexico) 8782; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8784; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 8786; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8788 (v).
Militia (allowances) 8533 (v)
Miscellaneous — (Coronation decorations) 9565; (coronation trip, members and senators) 8681 (v).
Mounted Police (pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8602 (v)
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Chatham) 1610; (Fairville) 1611; (Hartland) 1619; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (St. John drill hall) 1624 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Parrsboro) 1629 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2619 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (generally, repairs) 1675; (Lévis armoury) 1679; (Maisonneuve) 1692; (Marieville) 1698; (Quebec custom house) 1885; (Quebec immigrant) 1886; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (Three Rivers) 1902; (Westmount) 1903 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9561; (highway protection) 9560 (v).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*
Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1277 (i).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8769 (v).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, West.*
Belleville Docking Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).
Belleville Public Building, Draping for His Maj.'s Death (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board, incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7565 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8850; in Com., 9268 (v).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7818 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5321, 5487 (iii).
Fisheries Appointments, Inquiry for Ret. 5836 (iii).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7829 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Contractors and Labour Conditions (remarks) 8597 (v).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8336 (v).
Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c (Ques.) 6157 (iv).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8590 (v).
Port Credit Harbour, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7712 7771 (iv).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9318, 9381 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9745 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order, referring to previous debate, 8258 (v).
——— Res. from Trent River Paper Co. (read) 4117 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, Quarantine, &c (animals health) 5962; (dairying) 6244 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8768; (Canada and Cuba) 8776 (v).
Mounted Police (subsistence) 8599 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 6027; (quarantine stations) 6027; (draping buildings) 6026 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville drill hall) 6033; Ottawa (heating, &c.) 6027 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (L'Ardoise) 6029; Margaree) 6029; Ont. (Victoria) 6023 (iv).

PRICE, Mr. W., *Quebec West.*
Dry Dock at Quebec, Construction *re* by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 9988 (v).
Freight Car Service, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Contract, Plans, &c. (remarks) 7103 (iv).
Reciprocity, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6820 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6894 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1697 (i); Railways—I.C.R. (freight car service) 5983 (iv).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions Heard, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

PROULX, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Hawkesbury Interprovincial Bridge (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 4227 (iii).
Naval Defence, Govt. Policy (remarks) on Address, 497 (i).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3901 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works), *St. John City and County.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5568 (iii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3392, 3459 (ii).
Armouries, &c., in Canada, on Inquiry for Ret., 1461 (i).
Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7470 (iv).
Bathurst, N.B., Dredging, Total Quantity and Cost (Ans.) 803, 1285 (i).
Battleford Public Buildings, Cor. (read) in Com. of Sup., 3005 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3030 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Grantees, Rentals, Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2201 (ii).
Belleville Docking Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6012 (iv).
Bracebridge Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).
Breakwaters in Digby County, N.S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 657 (i).
Brighton Wharf, Vote *re* (remarks) 1657 (i).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Bronte Harbour Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 7341 (iv).
—— (remarks) *re* Questions, 7349 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7561 (iv).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c. (Ans.) 1905 (i).
Canadian Light and Power Co., Date of Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7591, 7806 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8840; in Com., 9265 (v).
Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).
Carman Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3020 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Carrier-Lainé Public Works, Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 8992 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8566 (v).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 8984 (v).
Chatham, N.B., Public Buildings, Purchase of Site, Names of Owners (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, &c. (Ans.) 10337 (v).
—— Subsidy (prop. res.) 9244 (v).
Coronation Celebration in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers (Ans.) 9990 (v).
—— Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10353 (v).
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for current year (Ans.) 814 (i).
Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2116 (ii).
Drill Halls in Man., Cost of (Ans.) 1975 (ii).
Dry Dock at Quebec, Construction *re*, &c. (Ans.) 9988 (v).
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by "International", on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) for Ret., 1498 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts to (Ans.) 813 (i).
Ellis, J. A. & Ottawa Lighting Contracts: *See* 'Woods.'
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Dept., (remarks) 2994 (ii).
—— *See* 'Public Works,' &c.
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Number of Buildings decorated at Govt. Expense (Ans.) 4667 (iii).
—— Authority of Govt. *re* Decorations of Govt. Buildings (Ans.) 925 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4350 (iii).
Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders *re* (remarks) 2648, 3671 (ii), 4724 (iii).
—— Names of Days ordered by Dept., 4382 (iii).
See 'St. George's.'
Fredericton Pavement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
French River Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re* (Ans.) 1489 (i).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10248 (v).
Georgetown Govt. Buildings, Drainage *re* (Ans.) 3469 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5157 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8543, 8917 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Grand Bend, Right of Way, Purchase of (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. &c. (Ans.) 9371 (v).
See 'St. John Valley Ry.'
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of Men (remarks) 1507 (i).
G.T.P. Developing Co., Land purchased from (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 7806 (iv).
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of (Ans.) 930 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4225 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1543, 1778 (i).
House of Commons, Ottawa, Water supplied to (statement) 2553 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4480 (iii).
——— Rep. of Agriculture Dept. (read) 5401 (iii).
——— *See* 'Smallpox,' 'Typhoid.'
——— Ventilation in House of Commons (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4480 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Typhoid.'
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation incorp. B. 56 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 3994 (iii).
Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re* (Ans.) 2885 (ii).
——— Obstruction to Navigation (Ans.) 5403 (iii).
Hydro Electric Power, Connection across McGann Property (remarks) 1598 (i).
Imperial Realty Co.. *See* 'Woods Building.'
Imperial Steamship's Co.'s incorp., B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6611 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 979, 1524 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (B. 36) in Com. on Res., 867; 1°* of B., 923 (i); 2° m. 9091, (amts.) 9094; on M. for 2°, 9139; in Com., 9156, 9183 (v).
See 'Waterways' 'Long Sault.'
——— Ques. of Order in Com., 9180 (v).
International Waterways Commission (Lake Erie) Rep. (presented) 924 (i).
See 'Waterways' 'Long Sault.'
Jardine, Mr. John, Payment by Govt. in excess of Work (Ans.) 4670, 5405 (iii).
Jesus River Improvements, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 804 (i).
King, Dr., Cost of Residence at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 804 (i).
——— Rental *re* (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Kingston Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7805 (iv).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv)
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re* (remarks) 4222 (iii).
Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Levis Dry Dock, Plans filed, Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 713 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3234 (ii).
——— *See* 'International B. 36.'
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Lunenburg Tower Clock, Specifications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2578 (ii).
——— Stmt. of Chief Architect (read) 2360 (ii).
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re* (Ans.) 2158 (ii).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3389 (ii).
Marieville Postoffice, Purchase of Site (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c. (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Meteghan Landing Place, Rep. *re* Defective Condition (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
Milton Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1872 (i).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7440 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site *re* (Ans.) 9993 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3049 (ii).
Monetteville Cut, Lake Nipissing, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1495 (i).
Montreal Postoffice, Electrical Fixtures, Drawings, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
——— Mailing and Registering Facilities (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Napanee River Dredging, Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).
——— (remarks) 4050 (iii).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of (remarks) 5913 (iii).
New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1283 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 8642; on Amt., 8956; on M. for 3°, 8963 (v).
Niagara River Water Power, Regulations, &c. (stmnt.) 8890 (v).
——— *See* 'International B. 36.'
Nicolet Military Accommodation (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Nicolet Post Office, Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c. (Ans.) 8789 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 8584 (v).
——— Pet. *re* Annex (Ans.) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Nominingue Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 2435 (ii).
Ottallie Creek Public Works, N.B., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2275 (ii).
——— New Leases, &c. (Ans.) 1281 (i).
——— *See* 'Victoria Museum.'
——— Parliament Grounds, Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 2583 (ii); 7346 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
——— Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement *re* Installation (Ans.) 1350 (i).
——— Sussex Street, Deptl. Block, Plans laid on Table, 4824 (iii).
——— Sussex St. Govt. Properties, Names of Owners, &c. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
Ottawa Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted (Ans.) 1280 (i).
——— *See* 'Woods Building, &c.'
Ottawa City Sanitary Conditions, Conditions *re* Public Health (remarks) 5539 (iii).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
Owen Sound Dock, Proceeding with Work (Ans.) 10337 (v).
Parrsboro Public Building, Instructions *re* Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. Rhodes) for copy, 1728 (i).
——— Post Office Return, on Inquiry for, 8535 (v).
Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1879 (i).
Perley, Mr., Connection with Riordan Paper Co. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April, 1910 (Ans.) 6267 (iv).
Petawawa Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 7590 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Piles Federal Works, Charges *re* (Ans.) 8104 (v).
Port Credit, Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
——— Public Works Expenditure, for 1909-10 (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1101 (i).
——— Lowest Tender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Port Perry Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1881 (i).
Post Office Buildings, Advertisement for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1871 (i).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2181 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lennox) *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com., 997 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 840 (i).
Public Buildings, on Inquiry for Ret, 7347 (iv).
Public Buildings, Cost of, Ques. of Order *re* discussion in Sup., 2101 (ii).
Public Buildings in former estimates, given Precedence over new ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2113 (ii).
Public Works Building Plans, approved by Dept. previous to Aug. 5th, (Ans.) 698 (i).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Public Works Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4567 (iii).
Public Works, Travelling Expenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 7440 (iv), 8356, 9071 (v).
Public Works, Vote for Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Discussions *re* in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Quebec Public Works Estimates (remarks) 1639 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9331, 9380 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6806 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10024, 10051 (v).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7610, 7673; Letter from Hansard Reporter, (read), 7675; Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, 7675 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, 7616 (iv).
Red Point Wharf, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 3469 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4570 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7257 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8577, 9166 (v).
Rigaud Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3067 (ii).
Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
—— Rep. of *re*, on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Copy, 2164 (ii).
St. Andrews. Man., Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3039 (ii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Sum for Completion, (remarks) 1509 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids, Fish Ladder, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3608 (ii).
St. Charles Rifle Range, Winnipeg, Sale, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 7343 (iv).
St. Croix River, N.B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re* (Ans.) 1348 (i).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1489 (i).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag (remarks) 7553, 7687 (iv).
See 'Flags.'
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2675 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5129, 5631 (iii).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c. (Ans) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John River Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5646 (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Lambert Govt. Lands, Options on Land, &c. (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Buildings, Option *re* (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 2577 (ii).
St. Lambert River Dam, Legislation *re* at Washington, 3283 (ii).
—— *See* 'Long Sault.'
Ste. Marie Post Office Division, Defective Site, &c. (Ans.) 10336 (v).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repairs, &c. 7344 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
St. Peter's Bay Wharf, Repair of (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
Ste. Therese Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Seagull Dock, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Security (Stirling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2600, 2655 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6609 (iv).
Senate Chamber, Expenditure *re* Decorations (Ans.) 1100 (i).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
Smallpox Epedimic, Condition of House of Commons, 7253 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
South African Parliament, Rep. of Postmaster General (remarks) 1580 (i).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry, (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3346 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia— (salaries), 1027; Public Works (contingencies) 1047 (i); 5993 (iv); (salaries) 1032 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 3007; (Lethbridge) 3009; (Macleod) 3003; (Strathcona) 3011; (Vegreville) 3011; (Wetaskiwin) 3011 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 3012; (Cranbrook) 3013; (Duncan) 3014; (Fernie) 3014; (Grand Forks) 3015; (Greenwood) 3015; (Nanaimo) 3015; (Nelson) 3016; (Prince Rupert) 3016; (Revelstoke) 3017; (Vancouver) 3018; (Vernon) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 6027; (electric power) 3210; (engineers, salaries) 3212; (fire escapes) 3160; (quarantine stations) 3213 (ii), 6027 (iv); (renewals) 2969; (rents, &c.) 3212 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157; (immigration buildings) 3156; (sundries) 3161 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3019; (Souris) 3019; (Winnipeg) 3018, 3029; (Winnipeg armoury) 3052 (ii).
Public Works—Buildngs—N. B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Chatham) 1610; (Fairville) 1611; (Fredericton pavement) 1612; (Grand Falls) 1614; (Hampton) 1614; (Hartland) 1617; (Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (St. John drill hall) 1624; (Tracadie) 1625 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 1592; (Halifax citadel) 1581; (Halifax post office) 1583; (Lunenburg) 1592, 1625; (Parrsboro) 1598, 1625; (Weymouth) 1601;

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(Wolfville) 1599; (iv); (Yarmouth) 1600 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2088 (ii); (Belleville drill hall) 6033 (iv); (Brantford drill hall) 2098; (Chesley) 2103; (Dresden) 2105; (Dundas) 2109; (Elora) 2109; (Essex) 2110, (Fergus) 2111; (Fort William) 2111; (Gananoque) 2112; (Goderich) 2115; (Harriston) 2115; (Kingston P. O.) 2130; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2130, 3156; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2142; (Mitchell) 2146; (Mount Forest) 2149; (Peterborough) 2603; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2627; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wallaceburg) 2634; (Waterloo) 2634; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3161; (furniture) 3163; (heating, &c.) 2590, 3162 (ii), 6027, (iv); (H. of C. improvements) 2590 (ii); (lavatories) 2583; (lighting) 3173, 3187 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv); (pavements) 2593, 2602 (ii), 8883 (v); (Printing Bureau) 2361, 2582; ; (Rideau Hall) 3170 (ii), 8872 (v); (steel cases) 2582; (Sussex St. block) 3172; (telephones) 3169; (water supply) 2583; (Woods building lighting) 3175 (ii).

Public Works — Buildings—Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9565 (v); (draping buildings) 6026 (iv); (tobacco curing stations) 3161 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Summerside armoury) 1602; (Tignish) 1602 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1665; (Aylmer) 1672; (generally, repairs, &c.) 1675; (Grosse Isle) 1675; (Levis armoury) 1678; (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1697; (Megantic) 1710, 1860; (Montreal barracks) 1863 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii); (Montreal postal station) 1861; (Montreal P.O. alterations) 1862; (Napierville) 1865; (Que. custom house) 1885; (Quebec drill hall) 1886; (Quebec immigrant) 1886; (Rigaud) 1887; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1890; (St. Lambert) 1894; (Shawinigan) 1890; (Three Rivers) 1901; (Westmount) 1903 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2970, 3001; (Battleford cor. read) 3005; (Humboldt) 3007; (Lloydminster) 3009; (Melfort) 3010; (Moosejaw) 3010; (Saskatoon) 3010; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 9555 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500; (Argyle Sound) 9501 (v); (Cribbins Point) 6029 (iv); (generally) 9554 (v); (L'Ardoise) 6029; (Margaree) 6029; (Upper Prospect) 6030; (West Dublin Bay) 6030; (Yarmouth) 6030 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ontario (Port Arthur, &c.) 5994 (iv); (repairs, &c.) 9551 (v); (Victoria) 6021 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alberta (repairs, &c.) 9553 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Telegraphs, B. C. (Okanagan) 6033; Sask. and Alta., (maintenance) 6034 (iv).

Railways—I. C. R. (Halifax) 5922 (iii); (Halifax docks) 9561 (v).

Sussex Street, Ottawa, Deptl. Buildings, Alterations, &c. (remarks) 2077 (ii).

See 'Ottawa,' 'Supply—Public Works—Ottawa.'

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings for 1910 (Ans.) 2159 (ii).

Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Amount paid in Interest, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).

Three Rivers Post Office, Temporary Building (Ans.) 8984 (v).

Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).

Toronto Federal Buildings, Plans of Erection (remarks) 8479 (v).

Toronto Harbour Consolidation Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 8234, 8536 (v).

Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Change *re* Specification (Ans.) 805 (i).

Typhoid in Ottawa: *See* 'House of Commons, Ottawa,' &c.

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 1084 (i).

—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 9782 (v).

Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of (Ans.) 3469 (ii).

Victoria Memorial Museum, Ottawa, Total Cost, Space allotted (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

—— Cor. *re* Foundation, on Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes) 7666 (iv).

—— Cracking of Tower, &c. (Ans.) 5938 (iv).

—— Inspection *re* Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).

Walkerville Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of (Ans.) 1101 (i).

Water-Power on St. Lawrence, Concession *re* (Ans.) 9780 (v).

—— *See* 'Long Sault.'

Waterways Treaty, on Inquiry for Plans, 3681 (ii).

—— *See* 'International Waterways' B. 36.'

Westville Postoffice, Number of Bricks used (Ans.) 3471 (ii).

Wharfs, N.S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of (Ans.) 6272 (iv).

Wingham Public Building Clock, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6664 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Winnipeg, Govt. Buildings, Pavements, &c., Corrected Stmnt., 8923 (v).
—— Rifle Range: *See* 'St. Charles.'
Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Woods and Canadian Buildings, Cancellations of Heat and Lighting Contract (Ans.) 795, 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Cor. with Mr. Ellis (read) 3672 (ii).
—— Inaccurate Answer to Question (remarks) 1000 (i).
—— Stmnt., *re* Discrepancy in figures, 1011 (i).
—— Last Cheque paid to Imp. Realty Co. (Ans.) 1280 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3175, 3187 (ii).
See 'Supply — Pub. Works — Buildings — Ottawa.'

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *Perth North.*
Commercial Travellers' Accident Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 1277 (i).
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 817 (i).
Imperial Traction Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2434 (ii).
Logan, Robt. William, Relief (B. 173) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Meyer, Paulina Verena, Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 5933 (iv).
Robertson, Lorne Forbes, Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Western Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1969 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Advertising Policy of Government. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4239 (iii).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c. (Ques.) 1909 (i).
—— Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son (Ques.) 2438 (ii).
Baggage Smashing Prevention B. 124 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4199 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2432 (ii).
Boat painted by Govt. Officials, Denial *re*, 7942 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9261 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Cardinal Canal Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930 (iii).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9709 (v).
Coloured Person appointed to Experimental Farm (remarks) 5039 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Principle *re* Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4244 (iii).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8713 (v).
Courtice, Howard, Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau (remarks) 9784 (v).
Customs Free Entries of Goods, Date of last Entry (Ques.) 803 (i).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 479 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Ice-breaker, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2994 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9612 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10235 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s. incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8916 (v).
Grand Trunk Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
—— Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1078 (i).
House of Commons Galleries, Applause by Visitors (remarks) 4468 (iii).
I. C. R., Accidents, Causes of (remarks) 6680 (iv).
—— Construction, Letter of Gloucester Farmers Union (read) in Com. of Sup., 5985 (iv).
—— Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1162 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 913 (i); on M. for 2°, 9099 (v); in Com., 9157, 9182 (v).
Lighthouse Construction, and Marine Purchases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2397 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3231 (ii).
See 'International B. 36,' 'Long Sault.'
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchasing of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 6764, 6914 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services (Ques.) 984 (i).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887 (v).
Naval Service, Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' (Ques.) 1091 (i).
Negroes in Civil Service: *See* 'Civil Service.'
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead Irregularities (remarks) 5563 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2282 (ii).
——— Plaza, Removal of Poles, &c. (remarks) 6507 (iv).
——— Sussex St. Deptl. Buildings, Tenders *re* (remarks) 4824 (iii).
P. E. I. Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks) 6925 (iv).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7731 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com., (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7970 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 857 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 700 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., Alterations, &c., Better Information placed before House (remarks) 4933 (iii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10062 (v).
——— Importations from Favoured Nation Countries (Ques.) 4111 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer, 4113 (iii).
——— Names of Countries affected by Treaty *re* importations into Canada, 4131 (iii).
——— Oshawa Fruit Growers' Association (remarks) 5747 (iii).
——— on Ques, of Order *re* Referring to previous debate (remarks) 8253 (v).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3610 (ii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6829 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Prices, Information *re* from Trade and Commerce Dept. (remarks) 6512 (iv).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Statement (read) 6840 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., on Ruling (Dep. Speaker) *re* Amendments, 5723 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault, Letter from Mr. J. Wesley Allison (read) 3767 (ii).
——— Legislation at Washington, &c. (remarks) 3282 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix (read) 3839 (ii).
——— Protests *re* Bill now before U.S. (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— *See* 'Long Sault.'
Sadler, Maggie Florence Relief (B. 137) 1°*, 6116 (iv).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9171 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3843 (ii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3345 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3790 (ii).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6395; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6392; Welland (Port Colborne) 6400 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3810 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5613 (iii).
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 4244 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6460; (lighthouses) 6461 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8769; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and South Africa) 8784; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3161; (furniture) 3163; (heating) 3162; (lighting contracts) 3196(ii); (Rideau Hall) 8874 (v); (Rideau Hall Grounds) 3170; (telephones) 3169 (ii)
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 3002 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (freight cars) 5985 (iv).
Woods Building Lighting Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3196 (ii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 2161 (ii).
Battleford Public Buildings, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Civil Servants in Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 6913 (iv).
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 656 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Crittenden, Mary Kathleen Relief (B. 180) 1°*, 7666 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co., Strike of Employees, Reports, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1340 (i).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 480 (i).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2269 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation of, Inquiry for Ret., 1806 (ii).
G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5779 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1753 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Demand for Repeal, &c., (remarks), 6929 (iv).
I. C. R., Accidents, Pars. from N.S Newspaper (read) 6676 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Acquisition of (remarks) 6769 (iv).
——— Hay transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Proves. (Ques.) 5134 (iii).
Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ques.) 656 (i).
Parrsboro, N.S., Public Building, Instructions *re* Plans, &c. (M. for copy) 1727 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 8535 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 854 (i).
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5078 (iii).
Reciprocity Announcement, Par. in Winnipeg 'Free Press,' *re* Treatment of Reporters (remarks) 2642 (ii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks 10066 (v).
——— Kentville Board of Trade Res. (read) 5749 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 1001 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1054; Militia (salaries) 1021; Public Works (salaries)) 1033 (i).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3378 3399 (ii).
Mounted Police (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 3029 (ii); N.S. (Lunenburg) 1625; (Parrsboro) 1625 (i); Ont. (Wiarton) 2636 (ii); Ottawa (lighting) 3174 (ii); Sask. (Battleford) 2978, 3001 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (airbrakes) 5913; (airbrakes, freight cars) 5915; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5915; (draw bars) 5915; (fire extinguishers) 5927; (Fredericton) 5916; (Halifax) 5924; (highways protection) 5918; (rolling stock) 5927; (Truro) 5929; (surveys) 5928 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. and Mainland Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3879 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorial Reps., &c. *re* Survey (M. for copies) 176 (ii).

RIVET Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*
Address, The, 208 (i).
Goldschmidt Thermit Co. Patent Relief B. 165) 1*, 6906 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1514 (i).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 203) in Com., 8970 (iv).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 208 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 2574 (ii).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*
Beauharnois Canal, Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
——— Rentals, Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2199 (ii).
C.P.R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 769 (i).
Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3487 (ii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8460 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7328 (iv).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette*
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1361 (i).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N. W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9041 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3519 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2417 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085, 8631 (v).
Fort Osborne, Purchase of Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Homestead Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iii).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1284 (i).
Immigration Act. Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2018 (ii).
Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 9993 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3046 (ii).
Ry. Rates, Comparison with U. S. Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6431 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., Fleming Grain Growers' Association Res. (read) 5550 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7623 (iv).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3046 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 4728 (iii).
Immigration (seed grain) 3836 (ii).
Indians—N.W.T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5616 (iii).
Militia—(Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic) 6089 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry. Commission) 6431 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (inspectors) 6059 (iv).
Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe (Ques.) 799, 1284 (i).

ROSS, Mr. D. C., *Middlesex West.*
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny.*
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1770 (i).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1168 (i).
Light-House Keepers, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 775 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, Montmagny Electors, Correction in Hansard, 1356 (i).

ROY, Mr. E., *Dorchester.*
Naval Service for Can. (remarks) on Address, 204 (i).

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *Toronto East.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8721 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8913, 8928 (v).

RUSSELL, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9996 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9570 (v).
SUPPLY.
Canals—Miscellaneous (working expenses) 6453; (Newmarket) 6453; Welland (Port Colborne) 6397 (iv).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8885 (v).
Post Office (letter carriers' boots) 4283; (ry. mail clerks) 4286 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 6027 (iv); Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8882 (v).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert.*
Alberta, Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 133) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Canadian Loans and Investments in U. S., Amount, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).
Farm Products, Dutiable Exports from Provs. for 1908-10 into U.S. (Ques.) 7026 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8095, 8236, 8536, 8916 (v).
Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Co.'s incorp. (B. 166) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts (Ques.) 5634 (iii).
Railways owned, Operated in U. S. and Can., Mileage, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6158 (iv).
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7626 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1941 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8807 (v).
Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c. (Ques.) 4301 (iii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, System *re* Operating (prop. res.) 3472, Neg. (N. 96; Y. 54) 3524 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2414 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8122 (v).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c. (Ques) 10196 (v).
——— *See* 'Parcel.'
Farmers' Bank, Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier (remarks) 2264 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation *re* Tarifl Changes, Distribution of Copies (remarks) 6908 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8610 (v).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9526 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8243 (v).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull,' Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1558 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 968 (i).

Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).

Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead Irregularities (remarks) 5562 (iii).

Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9923 (v).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9313 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8281 (v).

——— Consolidated Boards of Trade, Sask., Despatch from W. A. Shepherd (read) 5752 (iii).

——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10019 (v).

——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6815 (iv).

Rural Mail Routes, Number operating in Man. (Ques.) 1105 (i).

SUPPLY—

Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coin) 6060 (iv).

Dom. Lands—(Forestry convention) 6053 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5171 (iii); (seed grain) 6048 (iv).

Indians—N. W. T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046; (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6038 (iv).

Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5587 (iii).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Prince Rupert) 3016; Man. (Souris) 3019; Sask. (Humboldt) 3007; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Typhoid Epidemic and Water Supply (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4481 (iii).

Yukon Beer Import Tax, Repeal Bill (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1978 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford South.*

Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6212 (iv).

Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Agricultural Com. (remarks) 2992 (ii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1258 (i).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*

Burlington Bay Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 7341 (iv).

——— (remarks) *re* Question, 7348 (iv).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O.—*Con.*

Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 2434 (ii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7530, (amt.) 7547 (iv).

——— Vote *re* Amendment, Ques. of Priv., 7666 (iv).

Selkirk Route, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *Peterborough, East.*

Cement Production, Total Production annually since 1900 (Ques.) 10196 (v).

Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8952 (v).

Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 7806 (iv).

Indian Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re* (Ques.) 1910 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8079 (v).

Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting (Ques.) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910 (Ques.) 6269 (iv).

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910 (Ques.) 6271 (iv).

Railways—Transportation Problem, on Statement (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5072 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7224 (iv).

——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8372 (v).

——— Par. *re* Quaker Oats Co. (read) 4120 (iii).

——— Peterborough Board of Trade Res. (read) 5750 (iii).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6814 (iv).

Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6190 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c (animals health) 5963; (dairy experiments) 6235; (seeds) 6221 (iv).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 6419 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 1478 (i).

Post Office—Outside Service (rural) 6089 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2603 (ii).

Victoria Museum, Cracking of Tower, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 5937 (iv).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *Ontario, North.*

Agricultural Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 5401 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Agriculture and Militia Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ques.) 9371, 9432 (v).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 33 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5079, 5574, 5630 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 14) 1° m., 261 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9335 (v).
Bank Failures, Statement of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
See 'Farmers' Bank.'
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. to Justice Dept. (Ques.) 926, 1091 (i).
See 'Justice.'
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds (Ques.) 1716 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9277 (v).
Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 9431 (v).
Companies Act (annual stmnts.) Amt. (B. 7) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 1296 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr Monk) in Com., 1336 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (counting ballots) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 377 (i).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron (Ques.) 6288 (iv).
See 'Steel.'
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International' (M. for ret.*) 1498 (i).
Eclipse Mfg. Co., Office Specialty Co., and Ahearn & Soper, Payments to, Contracts *re*, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Ellis, Mr., Ottawa City Lighting Co. *See* 'Woods.'
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission, *re* (remarks) 1510 (i).
——— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston (Ques.) 4826 (iii).
——— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5465 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9624 (v).
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c. (Ques.) 794 (i).
Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent (Ques.) 5291 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8921 (v).
G.T.P, Classification, Arbitrator's Rep. (Ques.) 696 (i).
Hague Arbitration *re* Newfoundland Fisheries, Counsel, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 797 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1527 (i).
House of Commons, Sessional Employees since 1896, &c. (M. for ret.) 3471 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c. (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Imperial Realty Co.: *See* 'Woods.'
Indian Act (fences) Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 1969 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8408 (v).
I.C.R. Freight Rates on Coal, &c., in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c. (Ques.) 6156 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1522 (i).
Justice, Deputy Minister of, acting as counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Sup., 1014 (i).
See 'Bank of Montreal.'
Loans, Negotiations for, 1909, 1910, Financial Agents, &c. (Ques.) 797 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 3281 (ii).
Militia and Agriculture, Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ques.) 9371, 9432 (v).
Militia Regiments, Number in Montreal, Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 7595 (iv).
Ministers of Crown, Absence on Public Business, for 1908-10, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9-10 (Ques.) 817 (i).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7442 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10502 (v).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup.. 2300 (ii).
——— New Leases, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1281 (i).
Ottawa Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted (Ques.) 1280 (i).
See 'Woods.'
Parry Sound Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1881 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 849 (i).
Railway Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3933 (ii).
Railway Act (express cos.) Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 1298 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9312, 9320 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9227 (v).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 10151, 10310 (v).
—— Conferences Length of Sessions, Names of Representatives, &c. (Ques.) 7036 (iv).
—— Stmnt. in White Book, &c. (Ques.) 10193 (v).
—— Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 7037 (iv).
—— Trade with other Countries affected (Ques.) 3667 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4569 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment (Ques.) 9781 (v).
St. Lambert Govt. Buildings, Option on Lands (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2577 (ii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light and Power, &c. (Ques.) 3468 (ii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9167 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, (remarks) 1385 (i).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Subsidies *re* (M. for memorials*) 3948 (ii).
—— Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 5936 (iv).
—— Renewal of (remarks) 3274 (ii).
—— Total Amounts paid since 1896 (Ques.) 3607 (ii).
See 'Dumping.'
Sub-targets, Number purchased by Govt., Price, &c. (Ques.) 8583 (v).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 1014; Militia (salaries) 1029 (i).
Militia (allowance) 8518 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2610; (Seaforth) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2628; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wiarton) 2637 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Napierville) 1867; (Roberval) 1888; (Rock-Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Shawenegan) 1890 (i).

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 1084 (i).
—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 9782 (v).
'Wanda' Yacht, Appraising by Customs, &c. (M. for reps.*) 4678 (iii).
—— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c. (Ques.) 4300 (iii).
—— Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept. (Ques.) 5933 (iv).
—— Length, Motive Power, &c. (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
—— Valuation by Customs, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5624 (iii).
See 'Farmer's Bank.'

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
Woods and Canadian Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contract, Cancellation of (Ques.) 794, 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Inaccurate Answer (remarks) 999 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 3948 (ii).
—— Lighting Contracts, *re* Cor. with Mr. Ellis (remarks) 3675 (ii).
—— Lighting Contracts (remarks) 1011 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).
—— Date of last cheque paid to Imperial Realty Co. for Lighting (Ques.) 1279 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*
Battleford Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
British Preference Trade Policy (remarks) 5545, 5619 (iii).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9726 (v)
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued, &c. (Ques.) 5291 (iii).
Elevators, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3495 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8125 (v).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Sale of Eggs, &c. (Ques.) 662, 1285 (i).
G.T.P. Developing Co., Land Purchase from (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
—— Govt. Reserve on Homestead Lands (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
—— Number of Acres sold by Govt., Price, &c. (Ques.) 2366 (ii).
Homestead Irregularities &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5593 (iii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy, &c. (Ques.) 660 (i).
Interest Act Amt B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 972 (i).
Lands, Mineral Rights, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 3955 (iii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1253 (i).
Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c. (Ques.) 1090 (i).
See 'St. Andrews.'
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5052 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8162 (v).
—— British Preference, &c. (remarks) 5545, 5619 (iii).
—— Farm Products imported from other countries (Ques.) 3668 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

St. Andrews Rapids, Fish Ladder, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
See 'Pembina.'

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of (remarks) 10509 (v).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount *re* (Ques.) 3225 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6226 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 1484 (i).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5587 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Wetaskiwin) 3011 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 3013; (Cranbrook) 3013; (Fernie) 3015; (Nanaimo) 3016; (Prince Rupert) 3016 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 3032, 3053 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008; (Melfort) 3010; (Moosejaw) 3010; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Wheat Prices in West and in Canada and Liverpool Market (Ques.) 6267 (iv).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6146 (iv).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4385 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H. *Guysborough.*

Canadian Northern Ry., Guarantee of Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8862 (v).

Grain Stored in Port Arthur and Ft. William Elevators, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3605 (ii).

Guysborough, 'Times,' Application *re* Postal Privileges, (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).

I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1115 (i).

—— Westbound and Eastbound Traffic for five Years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2162 (ii).

Life Saving Rewards, Names of Recipients (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2774 (ii).

Post Office Service in N.S., Weekly and Biweekly, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7626 (iv).

Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4467 (iii).

Sick Mariners, Law *re* Payment of Dues, &c. (Ques.) 1904 (i).

Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting (prop res.) 3074, 3138 (ii).

Steam Trawlers, 'Wren' and 'Croquette,' Registration in Can. (Ques.) 4046 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (farm bulletins) 6187 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1057 (i).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6101 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8760 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8688 (v).
Ocean and River Service—Govt. Steamers —(maintenance, &c.) 5813 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2609 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods Act (wood) Amt. (B. 210) 1°*, 8887, in Com., 9349 (v).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *Middlesex, North.*

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1248 (i).

Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6776 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 402 (i).

British Columbia and Central Can. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) 1°*, 3143 (ii), in Com., 5127, 5253 (iii).

Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s (B. 204) 1°*, 8582 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Stmt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister (remarks) 2738 (ii).

—— Total Number, Capita Tax, Exempts, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).

Co-operation (B. 29) 1° m., 699 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1431 (i).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in "John Bull", Conditions *re* (remarks) 1564 (i).

'Iroquois,' Str., Report *re* Wreck (remarks) 7104 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c. (Ques.) 790 (i).

Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 548 (i).

Netherland Mortgage Loan Co., Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, Cor. with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2352 (ii).

Pacific and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 6906 (iv).

Railway Accidents, since 1st April ,1909, on running trains, construction work, &c. (M. for ret.) 713 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6709 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Ry. Employees Protection (B. 114) 1° m., 3218 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Nanaimo) 3016 (ii).
Truesdell, Frances Whittington Relief (B. 183) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 377 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Stormont.*
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3240 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland—(enlargement) 6407 (iv).

SMYTH, Mr. W. R., *Algoma, East.*
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie, 4371 (iii).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8959 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6141 (iv).
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Aid by Govt. (remarks) 9635 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 827 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9966 (v).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10011 (v).
——— Resolutions *re*, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 10146 (v).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8681 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1695 (i).
Thessalon Breakwater, Construction of (remarks) 10532 (v).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9907 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C..) *Bonaventure.*
Address, The, Order, Ques., of *re* 'coward,' member asked to withdraw expression, 462, Apology asked for, 463 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6321 (iv).
Alien Labour Law, Emplymt of Foreign Labour in B.C., Members remarks checked 10372 (v).
Bank Act Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6442 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal Grantees, &c, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., Member's remarks checked, 2213 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 4231, 6574 (iii), 9536 (v).
Bois Blanc Island Dam: (ruling) *re* Discussion, 1575 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) Member's remarks checcked, 8190 (v).
Cobalt Mail Service, Members' remarks checked, 1650 (i).
Divorce Bills, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Ethier) Members' remarks checked, 4204 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Electoral District, Certificate *re*, 259 (i).
——— Election, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Gauvreau) insulting language (ruling) 77 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonald) 144 (i).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) (ruling) 472-3 (i).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
——— Ruling *re* Introduction of, 2364 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 159 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) (ruling) 5164 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 9524 (v).
Hours of Labour Bill, on M. for 3° (ruling) *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) 2874 (ii).
House of Commons Speaker's Gallery, Rules *re* Allotment of Seats (remarks) 270 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions (ruling) 1551 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Limiting remarks, 6946 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
Labour Strikes, Cor. with Mr. Geo. Taylor (ruling) 10349 (v).
Mails, Illegal Use of *re* C. D. Sheldon (ruling *re* M. to adjn. hse., 1357 (i).
See 'Sheldon.'
Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Members remarks checked, 6763 (iv).
Ministerial Association Ottawa, Res. *re* Member checked, 3059 (ii).
Ministers' Speeches distributed by Postmasters, Members' remarks checked, 9255 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Boyce) 2769, 2814 (ii).
Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse., Members' remarks checked, 2262 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
National Battlefields in Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on Regularity of Proceedings (ruling) 9500 (v).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) Members' remarks checked, 10522 (v).
Offensive Weapons, Sale of (Mr. Lewis) Members' remarks checked, 2559 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill (Mr. Conmee) on M. to introduce, 2829, Ruled out of Order, 2850 (ii).
——— Printing in English (remarks) in Com., 3184 (ii).
——— Ruling *re* Procedure, 2883 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to apologize for using word 'liar,' (remarks) 463 (i).
——— Member asked to withdraw and apologize, 462 (i).
Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Ques. of Order, 7974 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Boyce) irrelevancy of debate, 6361 (iv).
——— (Mr. Paterson)—(remarks) 5626 (iii).
——— (Mr. Geo. Taylor) Unparliamentary Language (ruling) 9784 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, Ques. of Order (ruling) 3073 (ii).
Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Perley) on Ques. of Order (ruling) 10202 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* Answering, Orally or Written (remaks) 700 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, Member asked to withdraw words, 5258 (iii).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to meet during sittings of the House (ruling) 9228 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Absence of Miinsters, Ques. of Order, 8359 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk). Ques. of Order. (Mr. Currie) 4055 (iii).
———Answers of Ministers to Questions (ruling) 4137 (iii).
——— Importation from other Countries, Members' remarks checked, 4114 (iii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 5545 (iii).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Instructions to Mr. Bryce *re* (ruling) *re* answers of Ministers, 4141 (iii).
——— Objections *re* Interruptions (remarks) 4451 (iii.)
——— Obstruction *re*, Member requested to withdraw stmnt., 10008 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox), Sustaining of Deputy Speaker's Ruling (ruling) 5032 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U. S., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Ministers of the Crown (ruling) 4124 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) Remarks checked, 5744 (iii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
——— Statistics, Members' remarks checked, 4473 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6835 (iv).
——— Tel. read by Mr. Burrell, Remarks checked, 3771 (ii).
——— Vote of Member for Labelle. 6839 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7616 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7675 (iv).
Returns, Notice of, Member's remarks checked, 5939 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Ltd., incorp. B. 159 (Mr. Devlin) on M, for 1°, 6439 (iv).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag. Member's remarks checked, 7687 (iv).
St. Lawrence Dam, Member's remarks checked, 4211 (iii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bradbury) 5865 (iii).
Senate Amendments to Public Bills, Consideration of (ruling) 3845 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (ruling) *re* M. (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
See 'Mails.'
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) Member's remarks checked, 3350 (ii).
Speech from Throne (read) 2 (i).
Sterling Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) on Senate Amts.. 6609 (iv.)
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174; (committees) 6170; (debates) 6171; (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (electric light attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6172; (pages) 6174; (servants) 6175; (sessional clerks) 6168; (stationery) 6176; (telephones) 6171, (Senate stationery) 6337 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa, Member's remarks checked, 4657 (iii).
Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District (notification) 1 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.), *Perth South.*
'Arctic,' Capt. Bernier's Report, Member's remarks checked, 6541 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.)—*Con.*
British Columbia Development Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., Objection to proposed Amt., 5127 (iii).
Canada Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Middlebro) 7564 (iv).
Canada and Japan Trade Relations, on Ques of Order, 9484 (v).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201, on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Chatham. Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com., 8970 (v).
Conciliation Board and Labour Dept., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Nesbitt) 4267 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 482 (i).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8921 (v).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., (ruling) *re* Power of Govt. to introduce word 'Equipment,' 5721 (iii).
Homestead Irregularities, &c., on Ques. of Order (rulings) 5561-3 (iii).
Hours of Labour B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., Irrelevancy of deb. (remarks) 1433 (i).
Indian Act (Treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (remarks) *re* discussion 7857 (iv).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in com., 9158, 9180 (v).
——— Irrelevancy of debate, 9177 (v).
Lethbridge, Speech of Member for Pictou, Acceptance of Denial (remarks) 1877 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7724 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Irrelevancy of Debate, 10523-4 (v).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to withdraw word 'Liar', 5561 (iii).
Postoffice Estimates, on objection to passing (remarks) 4298 (iii).
Public Buildings, Cost of (ruling) *re* Ques. of Order, on Discussion in Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., Interruptions not relevant (ruling) 7527 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Quotations, &c. (read) 7548 (iv).
——— Interruptions to speakers (remarks) 5030 (iii).
——— Letter read by member for Saltcoats, Giving of Names (ruling) 7265 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.)—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U. S., Letter of Sir Charles Tupper (ruling) *re* reading, 8279 (iv).
——— Member (Mr. Geo. Taylor) referring to previous debate (ruling) 8252 (v).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9889 (v).
———on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) *re* 'Cowardice' applied to Minister of Crown, 10564 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3705 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Guthrie) *re* ref. to former debate, 3690-91 (ii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Irrelevancy of debate (ruling) 6899 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order *re* Addressing the Chair, 6890 (iv).
——— Talking of Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7293 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (explanation) 7670 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7619 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com. on amts. 8966 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2649 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (animals health) member's remarks checked, 5964; (dairying) Member's remarks checked, 6247 (iv); (exhibitions) Member's remarks checked, 3796 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board), Ques. of Order, 3448 (ruling) 3448, 3450, 3451 (ii).
Marine—Public Works—St. Lawrence ship channel, Discussion *re*, 6555 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 2148 (ii).
Whitby Postoffice Site (ruling) on Ques. of Order, 1870 (i).
Winnipeg World's Fair, Irrelevancy of debate, in Com. of Sup., 5982 (iv)
Woods Building Lighting Contract, Ques. of Order, 3194 (ii).
SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey East.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 334 (i).
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080; on M. for 3°, 5252 (iii).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 9225; on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. Orders, 9350 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty, Communication *re* (remarks) 5619 (iii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause &c. (remarks) 6758 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6906 (iv).
Annual Drill, Number of Officers, Men, &c. (Ques.) 8699, 9352 (v).
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, Rumours *re* (remarks) 9372 (v).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1341 (i).
——— B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9337 (v).
——— B. 207 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 8698 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2431, 3600 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7480 (iv).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number &c., on M. (Mr. McCarthy) for Ret., 2680 (ii).
British Columbia Development Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1682 (i).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6208 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7564 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com., 9261, 9297 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3454 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Broder) on M. to ref. to Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6675 (iv).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sanford Fleming (remarks) 9372, 10468 (v).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7220 (iv).
Chinese Immigration, Encounter of Mr. Jardine and Min. of Inland Revenue (remarks) 2739 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9832 (v).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Cholera Precautions &c. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8716 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Civil Servants and Municipal Office, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2225 (ii).
Civil Servants earning Extra Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1019 (i).
Coal Miners' Strike in the West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9701 (v).
Cocaine: *See* 'Opium,' 'Poisons.'
Consuls General, Foreign, Status at Official Receptions &c. (M. for Cor. with Imp. Govt.), 949 (i).
Convicts liberated from Penitentiaries, Clothing &c. (remarks) 2069 (ii).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1316 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7813 (iv).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7016 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act, Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1984 (ii).
Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2128 (ii).
Drummond &c. Elections, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 473 (i).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. (B. 101) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3502 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2379 (ii).
Embargo on British Cattle (remarks) 10344 (v).
Estimates, Discussion of (remarks) 2970 (ii).
——— Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2995 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Ref. to Questions, Ques. of Order, 158 (i).
——— Deputy Governor or Administrator, Apptmt. of Mr. Justice Girouard, Tel. to Cardinal Vannutelli *re* Eucharistic Congress (Ques.) 702 (i).
——— Guards of Honour, Authority for (Ques.) 704 (i).
——— Reception to Cardinal Vannutelli, Telegram *re* Govt., Answers *re* (remarks) 6518 (iv).
——— Speaker's Attendance in Official Robes (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Eucharistic Congress, Telegram from Mr. Justice Girouard *re* Visit of Cardinal Vannutelli (Ques.) 702 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8453 (v).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8215 (v).
—— Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2244 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation &c., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9607 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2270 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8422 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8490 (v).
Flags Flying on Public Buildings (remarks) 3672 (ii).
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale, on prop. Res. (Mr. Stanfield) 3227 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks (B. 85) Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8619, 8655 (v).
Gaspereau Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) Ques. of Order, 10228 (v).
'Globe' Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Morning Sittings, 10095 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M for 2° 9522, 9528 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
G. T. P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3021 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306; in Com., 9510 (v).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10102 (v).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay. Ry. Co.'s incorp., B. 202 (Mr. W. M. Martin) on M. for 2°, 8642 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1423 (i); on M for 3°, 3526 (ii).
House of Commons, Speaker of, Wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, &c. (Ques.) 705 (i).
See 'Eucharistic.'
—— Sessional Employes, Names, Ages, &c. (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Ventilation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4479 (iii).
Imperial Steamship Co.'s incorp., B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., &c. (iv).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6938, 6946 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).
I. C. R., Branch Lines Lease, (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9590 (v).
I. C. R., Special Excursion Trains &c.. (remarks) 2999 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9091 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations B. 223 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9495 (v).
See 'China.'
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3182 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for ret. (remarks) 773 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System (prop. res.) 1184, neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).
McClary's Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Militia Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910 (Ques.) 8699 (v).
See 'Annual Drill.'
Ministers. Travelling Expenses, Tips, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7476 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) on M. for 3°, 7717; in Com., 7720 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9230; in Com., 9495 (v).
Naval Service of Canada, Total Cost of Cruisers, &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6525 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. Monk) 780, 783 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 8648 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Oliver, Hon. Mr.. Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8329 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2848 (ii).
Opium, Importation of, Prohibition B. 22 (Mr. King) on M. for 1°, 469 (i).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Ottawa City Sanitary Conditions, Rep. of Dr. Hodgetts (remarks) 5535 (iii).
Ottawa Government Buildings, Parliament Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 7024 (iv).
Oyster Culture, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. (remarks) 762 (i).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Associations, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7340 (iv).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9920 (v).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G.B. and U.S. *re* Protection (remarks) 3670 (ii).
——— Further information *re* (remarks) 3839 (ii).
——— Ratification of (remarks) 3769 (ii).
See 'Sealing.'
People's Railway Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Nesbitt) on Senate Amts., 6611 (iv).
Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).
Poisons, Sale of, B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 261 (i).
Post Office Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Post Office Dept., Overcrowding in Basement (Ques.) 6667 (iv).
Precedence at Official Receptions (M. for cor.) 949 (i).
Preston, Mr.: *See* 'Netherlands.'
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 846 (i).
Public Works Supply, Objection *re* Full Vote, 9558 (v).
Quebec Boundaries, Cor. with Ont. and Dom. Govts, O.Cs, &c (M. for copies*) 981 (i).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9343 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of (remarks) 7109 (iv).
Ques. of Order, *re* Mr. Pugsley's Record in Public Life, 10202 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Rabies Outbreak, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Race Track Gambling, on M. (Mr. Miller) to print evidence, 10467 (v).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3944, in Com., 3946 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959 (i).
Railway Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3939 (ii).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5254 (iii).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5066 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3980, 3995 (iii).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8370 (v).
——— Berlin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5729 (iii).
——— Editorial in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) 4139 (iii).
——— Letter read by Member for Saltcoats, Giving Name of Writer (remarks) 7264 (iv).
——— Oleomargarine, Admission of (remarks) 6504 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Interruptions, 4451 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Obstruction by Ministers of Crown (Mr. Paterson) 4124 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order, *re* referring to previous debate (remarks) 8253 (v).
——— in Com. on Res. (remarks) on handing in Statements, 6954 (iv).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6823 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7613, 7669 (iv).
——— Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, Reading of, Ques. of Order, 7675 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 9166 (v).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3230 (ii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) 10138 (v).
Seal Fisheries Negotiations (remarks) 9594 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 10196 (v).
See 'Pelagic.'

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2597, 2649, 3844 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2715 (ii).

Sewage Disposal B. 122 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4040 (iii).

Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1373 (i).

Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7249 (iv).

South African Parlt., Rep. *re* from P.M.G. (remarks) 1581 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 5955; (dairying) 6238 (iv); (exhibitions) 3781 (ii); (seeds) 6223; (tobacco production) 6262 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6412 (iv)

Canals—Chambly — (macadamizing) 6408; (machinery) 6357 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (working expenses) 6453 (iv)

Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396 (iv).

Canals—Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391 (iv).

Canals—Trent—(lift lock) 6398 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

Canals—Williamsburg (machinery) 6426 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955 (iv); Justice (salaries) 1019; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1472; Militia (salaries) 1031 (i); Privy Cuncil (clerkships) 8752 (v); Public Works—(salaries) 1033 (i).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 6661; Ont. (inspectors) 6618 (iv).

Indians—Man. Sask. &c. (annuities) 8884 (v); Que. (medical attendance) 6036 (iv).

Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3803 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6455; (pensions to pilots) 6533; (shipbuilding) 6484; (Thunder Bay) 6500 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752; (Canada and G.B.) 8774; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784; (Gaspe and Dalhousie) 8786; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 8786; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8788; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).

Militia (allowance) 8518 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 5828; (schools of navigation) 5824 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 3210; (engineers) 3213; (Quarantine stations) 3213 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2096; (Dresden) 2107; (Dundas) 2109; (Essex) 2110; (Fort William) 2111; (Kingston) 2130; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2132; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2144; (Mitchell) 2146; (Peterborough) 2604 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 2591; (Montreal barracks) 2569; (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8878 (v); (water supply) 2583 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1686; (Marieville) 1697 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500 (v); Ont. (Victoria) 6022 (iv).

Railways—I. C. R. (working expenses) 6338; Miscellaneous (ry. commissioners) 6429 (iv).

Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) in Com., 6950 (iv).

Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to (Ques.) 708 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 5982 (iv).

Woods Building Lighting Contract, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 3°, 5253 (iii).

Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U. S. (Ques.) 4674 (iii).

Creighton, Mr. W. O., Farmer Delegate to G. B., Payments to (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).

——— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

'Earl Grey' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (ii).

Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale (prop. res.) 3226 (ii).

See 'Inspection.'

Hickman, W. A., Payments to *re* Immigration Agent to G. B. (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3276 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (flour and meal) Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 3453 (ii).

I. C. R., Accidents, Passes, &c., Inquiry for Return, 1571 (i).

——— I. C. R. and P. E. I. Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

——— Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

——— Porters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6339 (iv).

——— Special Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings (remarks) 2999 (ii).

'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 1724 (i).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt. (Ques.) 5135 (iii).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt. by Govt. in Inland Revenue, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 2435 (ii).
Postoffice Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names &c. (Ques.) 1568 (i).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3889 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5066 (iii).
St. Peter's Canal, C.B., Construction &c. (Ques.) 8103 (v).
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3607 (ii).
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 1910 (i).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3112 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Fredericton pavement) 1612 (i)
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax post office) 1586; (Lunenburg) 1592; (Parrsboro) 1599 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c., 6027 (iv); (lighting) 3175 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Tignish) 1603 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5915; (Chatham) 5915; (facilities and accommodation) 5929; (highways protection) 5917; (Moncton car shops) 5926; (Truro) 5930 (iii); (working expenses) 6339 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (working expenses) 6356 (iv).
Truro Political Meeting, Instructions *re* Special Rates over I.C.R. (remarks) 2999 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Expenditures *re*, Space allotted, &c. (Ques.) 1975 (ii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Agricultural Implements, Imports since 1908, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).
—— Imported into Can., Valuations, &c., Complaint *re* Manipulation of Duties, &c. (remarks) 1359 (i).
Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii.
Census Enumerators for Man., Recommendations *re* Apptmt (remarks) 8889 (v).
—— Apptmt. of by Liberal Organizers, Cor., &c. (read) on M. for Sup., 9006, (amt.) 9015; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 84) 9068 (v).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*
Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c. (Ques). 5937 (iv).
Drill Halls, Man., Cost *re* (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8128 (v).
Estimates for Man. Buildings, Objection to Discussing, 2969 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, and Govt. Ownership of Elevators (remarks) 1504 (i).
Flax exported from Saskatchewan (remarks) 10521 (v).
Fort Osborne Grounds, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9520 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8550, 8921 (v).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver)) in Com., 7848 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 146) 1° m., 5618 (iii).
Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land (M. for cor.*) 3225 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).
Land Patents for S.E. ¼ of Sec. 6, Tp. 7, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iii).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6201 (iv).
—— Negotiations with Dom. Govt. (M. for cor*) 980 (i).
—— Speech of Prime Minister at Winnipeg *re* Cor., &c. (Ques.) 709 (i).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents, Cor. with Miss Wileman (remarks) 9376 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 2770 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10514 (v).
Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re* (Ques.) 3067 (ii).
Ry. Commission, Vacancy on, Apptmt. of Farmer (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Reciprocity Statistics, Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6510 (iv).
—— Western Farmers' Interests (remarks) 5543 (iii).
Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Extravagance of (remarks) 10519 (v).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6194 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6251 (iv); (exhibitions) 3794 (ii), 9076 (v); (Quarantine, public health) 5981; (seeds) 6217; (tobacco production) 6263 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6400 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955; Postoffice (contingencies) 6068 (iv).

Fisheries (overseers) 3825 (ii).

Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9547 (v).

Militia (rifle ranges) 6056 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3019; (Souris) 3019; (Winnipeg) 3018 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).

Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv), 9076 (v).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *Peterborough West.*

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1*, 1487 (i).

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1313 (i).

Fergus Postoffice Site, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

Postoffice Buildings, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

Reciprocity, Peterborough Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5750 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (seeds) 6218 (iv).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Drummond &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 483 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8749 (v).

Naval Defence, Govt. Policy (remarks) on Address, 127 (i).

Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) Ques. of Order, 7973 (v).

Quebec Members, Revolt against extra Session, Newspaper Articles, Denial of, 10096 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., Ques. of Order, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4066 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, calling Minister a coward, 10564 (v).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6808 (iv).

——— Vote of member for Labelle &c., 6839 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (public health) 5980; Fisheries (inspectors) 6635 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Agriculture Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1944 (i).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry Co., Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 8853 (ii).

Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2433 (ii).

Beef, Pork, &c. and other Animal Products, Imports, Quantity from Oct. 1, 1910, to Feb. 1911 (Ques.) 6264 (iv).

Bliss, Lt. Col. D. C. Foster, Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 8100 (v).

Butter, Cheese and Meats, Imported, Value, Weight, &c. (Ques.) 4926 (iii).

Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911 (Ques.) 4670 (iii).

Buoys, Stolen at Sorel Shipyards, Investigation *re* (remarks) 7216 (iv).

Cab Fares and Street Ry. Fares. Payments for last year to Govt. Employees, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).

See 'Ministers Travelling Expenses.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8835 (v).

Census, Omissions *re* Enumerations (remarks) 9720 (v).

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of (Ques.) 8095 (v).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909 (Ques.) 1103 (i).

Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8908 (v).

Coal Strike in the West, Agreement of Two Years past (remarks) 6365 (iv).

——— Suggestions to Minister of Labour (remarks) 9720 (v).

See 'Labour.'

Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* (remarks) 5 (i).

Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v).

Drummond and Arthabaska Elections (personal explanation) *re* Speech of Mr. Miller. M.P., *re* 'disloyalty,' 489 (i).

Dry Docks, Applications for Subsidies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4383 (iii).

Escott Postmaster, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

——— Salary, Date of Increase (Ques.) 7001 (iv).

Escott Postmastership, Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster (Ques.) 4926 (iii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Farmers' Bank Failure, Applications *re* Establishment (M. for papers*) 1726 (i).

——— Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5450 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., appointed by Dom. Govt., Duties, &c.. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp., B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8243 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1779 (i).

House of Commons, Number of People Residing in, (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— Restaurant and Speaker's Rooms, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1085 (i).

——— Speakers' Chambers, Expenditure *re* Piano Rental (Ques.) 927 (i).

——— Speakers' Chambers, Purchase of Birds (Ques.) 928 (i).

——— Speakers' Chambers. Purchase of Glassware (Ques.) 928 (i).

——— Speakers' Chambers, Purchasing of Gramophone Records (Ques.) 927 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8750 (v).

I.C.R., Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation, (Ques.) 6665 (iv).

——— Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* appropriating Scrap Brass, &c., (Ques.) 6664 (iv).

——— Gaskin, Mr. John, Investigation *re* Charges, &c., (Ques.) 7601 (iv).

——— Hawke, Mr. J. T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds, &c., (Ques.) 6665 (iv).

——— Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept., (Ques.) 6666 (iv).

——— Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray, *re* Tickets, &s. (,Ques.) 7031 (iv).

Kelly, Robt., Emplymt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B.C. (Ques.) 2665 (ii).

Labour Strikes, 'Point of the Bayonet,' Ques of Priv., 9784 (v).

——— Use of Militia, Cor., &c., (remarks) 10345 (v).

See 'Coal.'

Letter Carriers, Free Transportation on Electric Rys. (Ques.) 1104 (i).

Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3266 (ii).

Mahone Bay Customs Collector. Dismissal, &c., (Ques.) 4301 (iii).

——— (M. for cor.*) 4383 (iii).

Marriages, Power of Parlt. to Legalize (Ques.) 8585 (v).

——— Govt.'s Intention *re* (Ques.) 10195 (v).

Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2060 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Meteorological Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Ministers, Speeches of, Distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).

——— Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters (remarks) 9071 (v).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Govt. Employees, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3954 (iii).

——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means. 7432 (iv).

See 'Cab', 'Public Works.'

National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9243 (v).

Post Office Buildings, Necessity of, Quotation from President Taft's Speech (read) in Com. of Sup., 1873 (i).

Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 954 (i).

Printing Bureau Investigation, Number of Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Aud. Gen.'s Report, 839 (i).

Public Works, Travelling Expenses, Inquiry for Ret., 8356, 9071 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8244 (v).

——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8358 (v).

——— Admission of Agricultural Products free from Foreign Countries (remarks) 4934 (iii).

——— Letter of Sir Charles Tupper (read) 8277 (v).

——— Negotiations at Washington, Instruction to Mr. Bryce, Cable Dispatch (read) 4140 (iii).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Ques. of Order, 6835 (iv).

——— accepting as read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6857 (iv).

Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).

St. Lawrence, Aids to Navigation, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c. (Ques.) 799 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3777 (ii), 9080 (v); (farm bulletins) 6187; (Patent Record) 6184; Quarantine (public health) 5980 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6411; Chambly (macadamizing) 6409; Cornwall (Robertson's culvert) 6409; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391; (mooring posts) 6389 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955 (iv); (salaries) 1475; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1464 (i).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6614; (overseers) 6159 (iv).

House of Commons (messengers) 6172 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6546; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (maritime road) 6545 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6556 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax post office) 1587; (Parrsboro) 1598; (Wolfville) 1599 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting contracts) 3174, 3191 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1865 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5994 (iv).

Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6187 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (freight cars) 5989 (iv).

Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558; (meteorological service) 6561, 6566 (iv).

Senate (address to His Ex.) 6167 (iv).

Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 6572 (iv).

Technical Education, Progress re, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1721 (i).

Truro Freight Shed Fire (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Whip, Chief, Retirement of, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Sel. Com. (remarks) 6 (i).

Winnipeg, St. Charles Rifle Range, Sale of, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 7343 (iv).

Woods Building, Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of (Ques.) 3463 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead, &c., (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of (Ques.) 1284 (i).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 17) 1°*, 376; in Com., 1682 (i).

Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1487 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7870 (iv).

Chinese Investigation Commission. Censure to Govt. (Amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy, Inquiry for, 9594 (v).

——— (evidence read, &c.) 9786 (v).

——— Accusation *re* Obstruction (Mr. Fielding) 9888 (v).

——— Discussion *re* Rep., 9926 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Conciliation Board of Labour Dept., Principle of Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).

Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8049 (v).

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of (M. for cor.) 2188 (ii).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9630 (v).

Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044; in Com., 8419 (v).

See 'Supply Fisheries'.

Fisheries Treaty. 1908, Non-fulfilment by U. S. (remarks) 6528 (iv).

——— Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).

Fisheries Treaty, Further Information *re* (remarks) 8479 (v).

——— Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8479 (v).

Fishery Regulations *re* International Commission, Date of Operation *re* (Ques.) 3465 (ii).

——— Regulations, Mess. from Wash. (remarks) 6504 (iv).

Fraser Mills, Postmaster, Defalcation of Funds, Bonds *re* (Ques.) 1566 (i).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re* (Ques.) 3463 (ii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions &c., (Ques.) 1285 (i).

Fruit Growers Association, B.C., Protest *re* Duty, &c. (read) 3373 (ii).

G. T. P. Labourers at Lafond, in Alberta, Amounts owing for work, &c., (Ques.) 3669 (ii).

Hall's Prairie P.O., Pet. *re* Location, Postmaster, &c., (Ques.) 3468 (ii).

Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 3282 (ii).

Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

See 'New Westminster.'

Homestead Regulations in B.C., Application, &c., Ry. Belt, &c., (M. for ret.) 2855 (ii).

Hope Townsite, Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 3068 (ii).

——— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1447 (i); on M. for 3°, 2864 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings of Com. (Ques.) 3280 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Japanese Immigration, Application *re* Special Purposes (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1°*, 376 (i).
Letter Carriers in New Westminster, Free Transportation on Tramways (M. for cor.) 2194 (ii).
Miner. Bill, Capture of, Return to Canada (remarks) 4384 (iii).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, Grant issued, &c. (Ques.) 1291 (i).
See 'Homestead,' 'Timber,' &c.
New Westminster Penitentiary, Increase of Pay to Employees (M. for cor.) 2183 (ii).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8343 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7785 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res. 9673 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2988 (ii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
——— Tels. read from B.C. Agricultural Associations, 3955 (iii).
See 'Fruit.'
Ruddock, R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B.C., &c. (Ques.) 3279 (ii).
Springhill Strike, Action of Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4241 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6238 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3825 (ii).
Labour Dept (conciliation board) 4244; (Labour Gazette) 4235 (iii); Ques. of Order, 3451 (ii).
Post Office (clerks) 4288; (postmasters' salaries) 4290; (stamps) 4280 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 3012; (Cranbrook) 3014; Generally (experimental farms) 3159 (ii).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster District, Pets. against Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 3222 (ii).
See 'New Westminster.'

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue, *Comox-Atlin.*
Astronomers Rep. (presented) 9690 (v).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 8583 (v).
Canning, J. H., Inland Revenue Inspector, Retirement of (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Encounter with Mr. Jardine (remarks) 2740 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10392, 10422 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9805 (v).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10381 (v).
Elliott, George E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1497 (i).
Explosives Regulations (B. 79) M. for Com. on Res., 989; in Com. on prop. Res., 1577 (i); in Com., 8451 (v).
Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c. (Ans.) 2374 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8426 (v).
Gas Meters in Toronto, Excessive Measurements (Ans.) 3280 (ii).
Geological Survey Rep. (presented) 9690 (v).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., Fined for Electoral Corruption (Ans.) 2673 (ii).
Holland Peat Bog (Ans.) 4303 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act (French version), Correction of Clerical Error (B. 132) 1°*, 4566 (iii); in Com., 8088 (v).
Inland Revenue Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act (Ans.) 5131 (iii).
Mineral Notices, Circular of Mr. F. H. Fourchet, &c. (Ans.) 4306 (iii).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt by Govt in Inland Revenue, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2668 (ii).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c. (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Peat Gas, Generating Electric Power, Process, &c. (Ans.) 708, 986 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4811 (iii).
Statutes, French Translations, Corrections (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Inland Revenue (contingencies) 1048; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1047; Mines (salaries) 1475 (i).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 9551 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3216 (ii).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *Lanark, North.*
Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P.W Dept (remarks) 2648 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 2880 (ii).
James Bay, Fishing Lease to A. McNee, Duration of, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1206 (1).
Mississippi Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9252 (v).

THOBURN, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6523 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9764, 9879 (v).
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1893 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Services, Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9644 (v).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*
Brown, George Addison, Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5525 (iii).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6211 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, Failure, Assets, &c., Keely Mine, Value &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
—— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5315, 5440 (iii).
Forest Reserves B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8080 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7040 (v).
—— Canadian Coasting Laws, affecting Grain and Hogs (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
—— Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Editorials in 'Christian Guardian' (read &c.) 9072 (v).
SUPPLY—
Art, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6248 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3158 (ii).
Sussex Street, Govt. Properties, Names of Owners (Ques.) 6666 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Denial by Mr. Begin *re* words quoted by Mr. Monk *re* Naval Defence, 134 (i).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8447 (v).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *Bruce North.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1487 (i); in Com., 3392, 3459 (ii).
Bell, Hugh Samuel Relief (B. 191) 1°*, 8187 (v).
Johnston, Mary Hamilton Relief (B. 140) 1°*, 5619 (iii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 159) 1°*, 6439 (iv).
Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 76) 1°*, 1488 (i).

TOLMIE, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Stapleton, Dalton Mabel Relief (B. 141) 1°*, 5619 (iii).
Sutherland, George Mackay Relief (B. 218) 1°*, 9089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2609 (ii).
Western Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 8308 (v).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*
Naval Policy and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 494 (i).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*
Address, The, 190 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6320 (iv).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4579 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 190 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1710 (i).
I.C.R., St. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Privileges and Elections Com., Ques. of Order, 8000 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7506 (iv).
—— Convention at Washington, Cor. with G. B. and Can. *re* Negotiations &c. (M. for copy*) 3948 (ii).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited, incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
I.C.R., Branch Lines Lease (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9590 (v).
—— Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1166 (i).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5082, 5575; on M. for 3°, 5252 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3028 (ii).
Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 1453 (i).
Bradley, Mr. John, Irregularity *re* Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5586 (iii).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3062 (ii).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9705 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2421 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9620 (v).
Flax Exports from Saskatchewan, &c., (remarks) 10521 (v).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8620 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp., B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238, 8559 (v).
G. T. P. Branch Lines (B. 73) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3021 (ii).
Homestead Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5592 (iii).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie), 1124 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3265 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6145 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8148 (v).
—— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10023 (v).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7679 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5559 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Sask., (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9645 (v).
Waterways Treaty Bill, Govt. Intention, (remarks) 8895 (v).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1333 (i).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, (B. 3) 1°*, 148; 2° m., 1407, in Com., 1408, 1527, 1728-9 (i); 3° m., 2864, 3276, 3526 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause, &c. (Ques.) 5835 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *York Centre (O.)*
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res., (Mr. Beattie) 4360 (iii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Arrangement *re* re-instatement (Ques.) 654 (i).
Humber River Bridge, Obstruction to Navigation (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. and Cor. of Mr. Walsh (read) 10474, (amt.) 10489, Neg., Y. 45; N. 79) 10533 (v).
—— Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept. (M. for copies*) 5136 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
—— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 7556 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 7556 (iv).
Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5830 (iii).
Porcupine Fire Sufferers, Request for Tents, Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 9983 (v).
Reciprocity Vote, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Ques. of Priv., 3461 (ii).
Sections 11, 12, 14, 22, &c., in Tp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re* (M. for copies*) 980 (i).
Shafting imported, Quantities and Values, since April, 1910 (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (free delivery) 4295 (iii).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c. (M. for cor.) 714 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 3863, 3917 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorial, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2179 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. (M.) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Committee, 527, 818 (i).
—— on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 836 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3709 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine ('Earl Grey') 6477 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, North.*
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract *re* Bank Notes, Acceptance of Designs for Postage Stamps (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
See 'Stamps.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8823; in Com., 9304 (v).
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries (Ques.) 4467 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4348 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5148 (iii).
—— Estimates *re* &c. (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Ontario and Abitibi Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 3° m., 8962 (v).
Pensions to Veterans (remarks) 6915 (iv).
Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Forces in Training (Ques.) 4465 (iii).
—— Extent of Damage by Fire (remarks) 9090 (v).
Petawawa Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design, (remarks) 7106 (iv).
—— New Issue, Condemnation *re* (Ques.) 9990 (v).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Postage Stamps, Prizes *re* Best Design, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5402 (iii).
See 'American.'

Quebec Bridge, Caisson, Damage to, Claims *re* (Ques.) 4045 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (farm bulletins) 6185 (iv); Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 1032 (i).

Tariff Resolutions, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2641 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alta.*

Elevators, Terminal, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3509 (ii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1274 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Vegreville) 3011 (ii).

WILCOX Mr O. J., *Essex, North.*

Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules, &c. (remarks) 310 (i).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiations with U.S. *re* (remarks) 1575 (i).

Canning, J. H., Inspector of Inland Revenue, Retirement of, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Farm Products entered at Windsor, from 1906-1910 (Ques.) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8701 (v.)

Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re* Commission (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations, Modification of (remarks) 1803 (i)

G.T.Trainmen's Strike, Inaction of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5809 (iii).

Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail, &c. (Ques.) 9782 (v).

Negro Immigrants, Treatment of, Prohibition of into Canada (remarks) 5941 (iv).

Post Office Revenue at Tlbury, Essex, &c., for the years 1904-10 (Ques.) 807 (i).
See 'Walkervlle.'

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 1617; Que. (Maisonneuve) 1685 (i).

Walkerville Post Office Building, and Mail Distribution (remarks) *re* Post Office Staff 2559 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
See 'Post Office.'

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of (Ques.) 6272 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6316 (iv).

Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3603 (ii).

Canadian Commissioner at Paris, Contradiction of Question asked in Senate, 9545 (v).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 804 (i).

Montreal Customs House, Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).

National Weekly Indemnity Co., Change of Name (B. 77) 1°*, 1488 (i).

Racial and Religious Prejudices in Liberal Pamphlets (remarks) on Address, 542 (i).

Riviere des Prairies Dredging, Rep. *re* (M. for copy) 2162 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1698 (i); (Montreal barracks) 3149 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Cameron, Miss, Immigration Agent in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5191 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827 (v).

Immigration Agents in G.B. and Europe, List, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 981 (i).

Immigration Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910 (Ques.) 4300 (iii).

Immigration, Number since 31st March last to present, &c. (M. for ret.) 1498 (i).

Immigration Statistics, Publication of (remarks) 2366, 2556 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).

Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 1104 (i).

Napanee River Dredging, Instructions, &c. (M. for cor.*) 981 (i).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 1903 (i), 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 9727 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture — Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (lock keepers) 6453; Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

Dom. Lands—(Forestry convention) 6052 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5166, Reply to Minister, 5177 (iii).

Interior (immigration agents) 4729 (iii).

Justice—Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6164 (iv).

Labour Dept—(Labour Gazette) 6057 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses) 6460, 6496 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine (supplies) 6473 (iv).

Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9565 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2089; (Peterborough) 2603 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 1677; (Montreal barracks) 1864; (Napierville) 1866 (i).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446 (iv).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Bracebridge Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. in Com. on Res., 7461 7481 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (Agents) 5166 (iii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Victoria) 6023 (iv).

Technical Education Commission, Completion of Work (remarks) 1662 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Absence of Ministers during Discussion *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8358 (v).

Accidents on Rys: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

——— *See* 'Railways.'

Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5403 (iii).

———*See* 'Finance.'

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie Post-office Revenues: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 980 (i).

Address, The, M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Precedence, 5 (i).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech: Moved (Mr. McGiverin) 10; Seconded (Mr. Lapointe) 16 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 22; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44; (Mr. Foster) 60; (Mr. Guthrie) 77; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 98; (Mr. Monk) 111; (amt.) 133, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651; (Mr. Brodeur) 135, 152; (Mr. Blondin) 169; (Mr. Beland) 172; (Mr. Nantel) 179; (Mr. Jos. Turcotte) 190; (Mr. Paquet) 197; (Mr. Rivet) 208; (Mr. R. L. Borden) Amt. to Amt., 228, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649; (Mr. Miller) 229; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 246; (Mr. Fowke) 254, 271; (Mr. M. Clark) 297; (Mr. Burrell) 303, 311; (Mr. Neely) 325; (Mr. Sproule) 334; (Mr. Paterson) 346; (Mr. Blain) 355; (Mr. Kyte) 369; (Mr. Northrup) 378; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 402; (Mr. Middlebro) 423; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 441; (Mr. Crothers) 491; (Mr. G. A. Turcotte) 494; (Mr. Proulx) 497; (Mr. Carvell) 512; (Mr. Foster) 531; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 567; (Mr. Monk) on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 595;(Mr. Lafortune) 615; (Mr. Gilbert) 624; (Mr. Fisher) 626; (Mr. Campbell) 640; (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 664 (i).

Address in Ans. to His Ex's Speech: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 694 (i).

Address, the, Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1487 (i).

Address to His Ex., Casket for: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).

Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9090 (v).

———Extension of Time: Remarks (Mr. Miller) 9566 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Fielding) 9580 (v).

See 'Coronation', 'Business.'

Adjournment of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 866 (i).

Administration of Oaths: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change: M. for Cor. (Mr. McKenzie) 2166 (ii).

Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s Absence, Emoluments for: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1089 (i).

Adulteration of Foods: *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Advertising Govt. Works, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).

See 'Public Works.'

Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Reciprocity; Read (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5546 (iii).

Agricultural Implements: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5745 (iii).

See 'Agriculture, Implements.'

Agricultural and Manufactured Products of the U. S. *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Stmnt. made by Mr. M. Clark, 4196 (iii).

———*See* 'Reciprocity.'

AGRICULTURE:

Agriculture, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 1474 (i), 5955 (iv), 9076 (v).

——— Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to: Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Gilbert) 5938 (iv).

Agricultural Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5401 (iii).

Agricultural Products, imported into B. C. from U. S., Australia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7344 (iv).

Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce imported from U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9991 (v).

Agriculture, Total Expenditure from Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 4302 (iii).

Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6756 (iv).

Animals Health, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Magrath) 4677 (iii).

Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 310 (i).

Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 10350 (v).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Beef, Pork, &c., and other Animal Productions, Imports, Quantity, &c. from Oct. 1910 to Feb. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6264 (iv).

Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 655 (i).

Butter, Cheese and Meats imported, Value, Weight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).

Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4670 (iii).

—— Suppl. Answer laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6188 (iv).

Cattle exports to the U.S., Bonded to G.B.: Remarks (Mr Blain) 7426 (iv).

—— Reshipped to G.B.: Remarks *re* Return (Mr. Blain) 7558 (iv).

Cattle Inspection on Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8095 (v).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5406 (iii).

Cholera Precautions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10197 (v).

Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1455 (i).

Cold Storage Depots, Total Amounts paid from 1907-10: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).

Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5937 (iv).

Dairy Industry, Memorials *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2671 (ii).

Dairy and Fruit Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6234 (iv).

Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 662 (i).

Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries: Ques.(Mr. G. V. White) 4467 (iii).

Embargo on British Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10344 (v).

Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii), 9076 (v).

Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid to: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).

—— See 'Winnipeg.'

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Expenditurec on Militia and Agriculture from 1867 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9371, 9432 (v).

Expenditures in Ontario for 1910; Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6668 (iv).

Experimental Farm Bulletins: in Com. of Sup., 6185 (iv).

Experimental Farms Reps.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 662, 1285 (i).

Experimental Farms, Stock *re*: Remarks (Mr. Best), in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Number established for past year: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 656 (i).

—— Number operated in Dom., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1102 (i).

Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).

Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 7026 (iv).

Farm Products entered at Windsor from 1906-1910: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 8701 (v).

Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8096 (v).

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1496 (i).

Farm and Dairy Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9361 (v).

Farm Products imported from U.S. into Kingson Port, Quantities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3668 (ii).

Farm and Garden Products imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7034 (iv).

Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Apptmt. Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 8701 (v).

Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5403 (iii).

Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8984 (v).

Horses admitted into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).

Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 7427 (iv).

Implements, Reduction of Duties: Prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1915 (i).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

—— Resuming adjd. Debate: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 2253 (ii), 4383 (iii).

Implements, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1350 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1358 (i).

Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5401 (iii).

King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 804, 1349 (i).

Live Stock Industry and Cold Storage Systems: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1184; Neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).

Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5131 (iii).

Milk and Cream shipped from Western Ont., Accommodation *re* Handling: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-11, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7038 (iv).

—— Exports to U.S. for March and April, 1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8790 (v).

Pork Packing Industry, Delegation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Blain) 3530 (ii).

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6271 (iv).

Quarantine Stations, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3213 (ii).

Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase by Govt.: Ques., (Mr. Monk) 8992 (v).

Rabies, Outbreak of, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9995, 10095 (v).

Seeds and Farm Weeds: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).

Sheep and Lambs imported into Canada from U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).

Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 5965 (iv).

Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, Imports and Exports from and to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).

Tobacco Production, Encouragement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6267 (iv).

Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9076 (v).

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 6455 (iv).

Aids to Navigation on St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 799 (i).

See '*Marine*'.

Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Air Brakes, Triple Valve, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Alaskan Boundary Commission's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3952 (iii).

Alberta Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92'.

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93'.

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51'.

Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organisation of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's Connection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7340 (iv).

Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 133'.

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 220'.

Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5632 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62'.

Algoma Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4673 (iii).

Alien Labour Law, Administration at Sault Ste. Marie: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).

—— Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 10367 (v).

Aliens Naturalization, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2666 (ii).

See 'Labour'.

Aliens, Outside of Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 7554 (iv).

All Red Steamship Co.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

See 'Atlantic'.

Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* , B. No. 162.'

'Alva' Str., Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2438 (ii).

—— Purchase of, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1909 (i).

Amaguadees Pond, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9500 (v).

American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 7247 (iv).

See 'Post Office'.

American Boats through Can. Canals, Reciprocity for: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).
——— *See* 'Coin.'
American War Vessels passing through Canadian Canals, Permission from Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10334 (v).
——— *See* 'U.S.'
Ancona Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Anglo-American Treaty, Arbitration, Communications *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5619 (iii).
Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Signing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6673 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Favoured Nation Clause: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6758, 6906 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Burrell) 7255 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 2271 (ii).
——— Termination of, Cor. *re* Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 2003 (ii).
——— *See* 'Japan.'
Animals Health, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Magrath) 4677 (iii).
Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 310 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8752 (v).
Annual Drill, Number of Officers, Men, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 9352 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Annuities for Indians, Man., Sask., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8884 (v).
Answers of Ministers to Questions *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4137 (iii).
Arbitrations, &c. and Awards, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Archives, Historical Researches, Names of Staff: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2155 (ii).
'Arctic,' Rep. of Capt. Bernier: Inquiry for (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Provisions: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 10350 (v).
Argyle Sound, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Armouries, &c. in Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 1460 (i).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Arthabaska Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i), 5955 (iv), 9076 (v).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4115 (iii).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Associated Boards of Trade of Ont. and Reciprocity: Res. Read (Mr. Middlebro) 4121 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity.'
Astronomers Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 9690 (v).
Athens Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2088 (ii).
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Rhodes) 2161 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).
See 'Post Office.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3853 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co., and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2161 (ii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 4048 (iii).
See 'Charing Cross.'
Aud. Gen., Cor. *re* Overpayments by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Best) 1010 (i).
Aud. Gen's Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).
Austin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Australia and Can., Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).
Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Aylmer Post Office Revenue for 1908-9, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 984 (i).
Aylmer, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).
Aylwin Irrigation Grant: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Babcock, Mr., Payments *re* Extra Work: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
Baby Farm, Toronto Sale of, Competition *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2155 (ii).
———*See* 'Militia'

Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8763 (v).
Baggage Smashing: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Bahamas and Canada, Negotiations *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8955 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372 (v).
Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Jameson) 3947 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 8889 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5039, 5293 (iii), 8791 (v).
Bait Freezers Construction in Louisburg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 6505 (iv).
Banff Park Water Works: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Bank Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 5, 14, 50, 213, 219.'
Bank Act, Consideration of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6674 (iv).
Bank Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
Bank Act, Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govt. Action: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5632 (iii).
———*See* 'Finance.'
Bank Charters, Extension: *See* 'B. Nos. 213, 219 and 221.
Bank Curators' Reports: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3142 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4569 (iii), 7556 (iv).
——— Explanation (Mr. Foster) 5038 (iii).
Bankers Association, Agreement *re* Competition: Ques. (Mr. Low) 3466 (ii).
——— Bylaws, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4116 (iii).
Bank Failures, Rep. of Curators to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2670 (ii).
——— Stmnt. of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2670 (ii).
———*See* 'Finance.'
Banking and Commerce Com.: M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2364, 2429, 3599 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Miller) to sit during Sessions of House, 8355 (v).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt. ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 926, 1091 (i).
Bank Officers and Creditors: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Que.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
See 'Can. Baptist.'
Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt. by Geological Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8533 (v).
Barrett, Mr., Payments to *re* Lifting Buoys: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).
Barrington Bait Freezer: *See* Bait 'Freezer.'
Bathurst Dredging Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 803, 1285 (i).
——— *See* 'Gaspereaux.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2970 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3005 (ii).
——— Further Cor.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Bay of Fundy Buoy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 6458 (iv).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
——— *See* 'Hague Arbitration.'
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Bear River Indian Reserves, Medical Officer, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3223 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3606 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii), 6057 (iv).
Beatty, Mary Jane, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation of, Reps. *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2214 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
——— Grantees, Improvements, Valuation of Franchise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1711 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2194 (ii).
——— Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2677 (ii).
——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1712 (i).
——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
See 'Canals.'
Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5288 (iii).
Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4304-5 (iii).
See Indians.'
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Beef, Pork, &c., and other Animal Productions, Imports, Quantity, &c. from Oct., 1910 to Feb., 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6264 (iv).
See 'Butter.'
Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application re Homestead, Date of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3221 (ii).
Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation *re* I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Bell, Hugh Samuel, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Belleville Docking Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Belleville Govt. Buildings, Draping for King's Death: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Bellevue Mining Disaster, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 1079 (i).

Berlin Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5726 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity.'

Bermuda, Information *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5216 (iii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1284 (i).

Big Bay Point Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6574 (iv) 9536 (v).

Bills, Royal Assent, 9591 (v).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 2 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 8; 2°, 956, 1407, 1797 (i).

Bill (No. 3) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 148; 2°, 1407; in Com., 1408, 1527, 1728 (i); 3° m., 3276, 3526 (ii).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).
1°*, 148 (i); 2°, 3943; M. for Com., 3945; in Com., 3946 (ii); 3°*, 4583 (iii).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Demers).
1°, 148 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 149; 2°, 968; in Com., 976, 1294, 1510; 3°*, 1728 (i).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 149; 2°, 1296 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 149; 2°, 1298 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°, 150; 2°, 1300; in Com., 1301, 1526; 3°*, 1527 (i); Sen. Amts., 3460, 3845 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 10) To prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosporus.—(Mr. King).
1°, 194; 2°, 1576 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 194; 2°, 1302; in Com., 1302 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.—(Mr. Beauparlant).
1°, 195 (i); Order dschgd., 4464 (iii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Sale of Poisons. (Mr. Lewis).
1°, 259 (i).

Bill (No. 14) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 261 (i).

Bill (No. 15) To amend the Canada Medical Act.—(Mr. Black).
1°, 309 (i); 2°, 2253 (ii); in Com., 6067; 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 377 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700; in Com., 1682; 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 19) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2100 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 377; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 377; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2100 (ii).

Bill (No. 22) To prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. King).
1°, 468 (i).

Bill (No. 23) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 529 (i).

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°, 530 (i).

Bill (No. 25) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Barnard).
1°, 663 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 663 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting Licenses to Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 698 (i).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Elections Act.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Inspection of Railway Locomotive Steam Boilers.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1080; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Sterling Trusts Corporation.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032 (i); in Com., 2596, 2648, 3021, 3180, 3453, 3841 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4664 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting Pure Foods.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 865 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Relating to the establishment and expenses of the International Joint Commission under the Waterways Treaty of January the eleventh, nineteen hundred and nine.—(Mr. Pugsley).
Prop. Res., 695; in Com. on Res., 867; 1°* of B., 923 (i); 2° m., 9091; in Com., 9156, 9172; 3°*, 9220 (v).

Bill (No. 37) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 40) To amend the Criminal Code, respecting Homicide while Hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 987 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 41) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 988 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting a Patent of Conduits Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); 3°*, 4241 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 2594, 3021 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Ecrement).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3180, 3389, 3454 (ii), 3993 (iii); 3°, 7560, 7717; in Com., 7718 (iv); 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 2005; 3°*, 2740 (ii).

Bill (No. 48),to amend the Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act, 1894.— (Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 8451; 3°*, 8451; Sen. Amt., 9534 (v).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting Water Powers.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 1277 (i).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting Banks and Banking.—Mr. Fielding).
1°, 1340 (i).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr Magrath).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181 3391; 3°*, 3392 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Commercial Travellers Accident Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Pickup).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684; in Com., and 3°* 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) Respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3028 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 55) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation. (Mr. Knowles).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3994; 3°*, 3995 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6952 (iv).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the London & Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Barnard).

1°, 1343 (i).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the Athabasca Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3060, 3182; 3°*, 3183 (ii).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3392, 3459; 3°*, 3460 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) To incorporate the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—(Mr. Congdon).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the British Crown Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. McColl).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1848 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Stratton).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Burrard. Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°* 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3183, 3454; 3°*, 3459 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) Respecting the Canadian Western Railw y Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3062; 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3021; 3°*, 3024 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the International Railway Company and International Traction Railway.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181, 3389; 3°*, 3391 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3392 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the National Weekly Indemnity Company, and to change its name to the National Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Wilson, Laval).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonnell).

1°, 1551 (i); order dschgd, 4464 (iii).

Bill (No. 79) To regulate the Manufacture, Storage and Importation of Explosives.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 989; in Com. on Res., 1577; 1°* of B., 1580 (i); 2° and in Com., 8451 (v).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Lancaster).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2°*, 2100, in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Cash).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, and to change its name to the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) To incorporate the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) Respecting Forest Reserves and Parks.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2° and in Com., 8084, 8606, 8650, 9345; 3°*, 9348 (v).

Bill (No. 86) To amend the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1642 (i).

Bill (No. 87) To prevent giving and taking Secret Commissions.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1646 (i).

Bill (No. 88) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie, Prince Edward).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Lafortune).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—(Mr. Turcotte, (Quebec).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the Pacific and Peace Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company .—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295; in Com., and 3°*, 3809 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6469 (iv).

Bill (No. 93) To incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295 (ii); in Com., 5079, 5252, 5568, 5630; 3°*, 5631 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Western Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 6066 (iv).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).

1°, 1969 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosphorus.—(Mr. King).

Res. prop., 1802 (i); in Com. on Res., 2021; 1°* of B., 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) To prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal purposes.—(Mr. King).

Res. prop., 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 2062; 1°* of B., 2063; 2°, 2518; in Com., 2532; 3°, 2740 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8090 (v).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2063 (ii).

Bill (No. 99) To incorporate the Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 2254; 2°*, 2602; in Com., and 3°*, 3809 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Hunt).

1°*, 2254; 2°*, 2602; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Sealey).

1°*, 2434; 2°*, 2665 (iii), in Com., and 3°* 4606 (iii).

Bill (No. 102) To incorporate the Imperial Traction Company.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 2434; 2°*, 2665 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 103) Relating to Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 1802 (i); in Com. on Res., 2503; 1°* of B., 2518 (ii); 2° and in Com., 8675; 3°*, 8678 (v).

Bill (No. 104) To amend paragraph (*l*) of Section 2, and paragraphs (*n*) and (*o*) of Section 9 of the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1° m., 2736 (ii); 2°, 8065; in Com., 8070; 3°*, 8077 (v).

Bill (No. 105) To incorporate the All Red Steamship Company (title changed to Imperial Steamship Company). — (Mr. McKenzie).

1°*, 2827; 2°*, 3064 (ii); in Com., 4239; 3°*, 4428 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6610 (iv).

Bill (No. 106) To incorporate the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 2828; 2°*, 3064 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4606 (iii).

Bill (No. 107) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 2851 (ii); wthdwn., 8088 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. — (Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 2983; 2°*, 3183 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) Respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., 6121; 3°*, 6156 (iv).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the People's Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).

1°*, 2983; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6611 (iv).

Bill (No. 111) To incorporate the Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°*, 2983; 2°, 3184 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) Respecting the Storage of Food.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2983 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) To incorporate the Dominion Development Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 3184; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., 5127, 5253 3°*, 5254 (iii).

Bill (No. 114) For the Protection of Railway Employees.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 3218 (ii).

Bill (No. 115, from the Senate), To incorporate the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Doherty).

1°*, 3453, 2°*, 3563 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Telegraphs Act. —(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 3453 (ii).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Stanfield).

1°, 3453 (ii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McLean, Queens).

1°, 3664 (ii).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate), Respecting the Ontario Northern and Timagimi Railway Company.—(Mr. Proulx).

1°*, 4109; 2°*, 4241; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate), Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°, 4110; 2°*, 4241 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6066 (iv).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate), Respecting the Globe Printing Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°, 4040; 2°*, 4300; in Com., 5127; 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) Respecting Sewage.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4039 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 123) To incorporate La Banque Internationale du Canada.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 4109; 2°*, 4241; in Com., 5631, 5766 (iii), 6120; 3°*, 6121 (iv).

Bill (No. 124) Relating to the Water in the Railway Belt and Peace River Block of Land.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4110 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate), Respecting the Pacific, Northern and Omenica Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

2°*, 4300; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fortier).

1°*, 4384; 2°*, 4606; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate), To Incorporate the Universal Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Low).

2°*, 4300; in Com., and 3°*, 4664 (iii).

Bill (No. 128) For granting to His Majesty certain sums for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4210 (iii).

Bill (No. 129) Respecting Baggage Smashing. —(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4198 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate), For the Relief of Matilda Emo.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 4298; 2°*, 4428; in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting Drinking Water.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4564 (iii).

Bill (No. 132) To correct certain Clerical Errors in the French Version of the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

1°*, 4566; 2° and in Com., 8088; 3°*, 8090 (v).

Bill (No. 133 from the Senate), To incorporate the Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Rutan.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129; in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate), To incorporate the Canadian Inter-Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129; in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate), Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company. —(Mr. Douglas.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129 (iii); in Com., 6950; 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate), To correct a Clerical Error in the Title of the French Version of Chapter 142 of the Statutes of 1910.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 4740 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate), For the relief of Maggie Florence Sadler.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

2°*, 6224; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate), For the relief of Gertrude Maud Grant.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate), For the relief of George Addison Brown.—(Mr. Thornton).

1°*, 5525; 2°*, 5631 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate), For the relief of Mary Hamilton Johnston.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate), For the relief of Dalton Mabel Stapleton.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate), For the relief of Lorne Forbes Robertson.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate), For the relief of Cecil Ernest Freeman.—(Mr. Blain).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate), For the relief of Ethel May Hornell.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 145, from the Senate) For the relief of Paulina Verena Meyer.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 5933; 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Staples).

1°, 5618 (iii).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate), To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2° and in Com., 7869 (iv).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate), Respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate), Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To authorize the Government of Canada to acquire, by lease, a certain line of railway in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 4200; in Com. on Res., 5640; 1°* of B., 5726 (iii); 2°, 8410; in Com., 8411; 3°*, 8419 (v).

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) To incorporate The Canadian Surety Company.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 5933; 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 7024 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) Respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 6439; 2°*, 6504; in Com., and 3°*, 7470 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act, as regards the Weight of a bushel and a bag of certain articles.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 6035 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8078, 8743 (v).

Bill (No. 154) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 6034 (iv).

Bill (No. 155) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 6112; 2° and ref. to Marine Com., 6675 (iv).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 6188 (iv); 2°, 8409; in Com., 8409; 3°*, 8410 (v).

Bill (No. 157) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. Fisher).

In Com. on Res., 6188; 1°*, 2°* of B., 6196 (iv); in Com. on B., 8077; 3°*, 8078 (v).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—(Mr. Devlin).

1°, 6439; 2°, 7147, 7590 (iv); in Com., 8577, 8966, 9165, 9575; 3°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) To change the name of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 6439; 2°*, 6504; in Com., and 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 160) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the thirty-first March, 1911, and the thirty-first March, 1912.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 6440; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 6441 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6951; in Com., 7470, 7560; 3°*, 7589 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) Respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6952 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Jane Beatty.—(Mr. Congdon).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6952; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Walter Harvey Kirkland.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 165, from the Senate) Respecting a Patent of the Goldschmidt Thermit Company.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To incorporate the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Rutan).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8070 (v).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8070 (v).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canada West Loan Corporation.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., 8563; 3°*, 8566 (v).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) To incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., 8094, 8233, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916, 8956; 3° m., 8962 (v).

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) To incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—(Mr. Rutan).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., 8095, 8236, 8536, 8916; 3°*, 8923 (v).

Bill (No. 172 from the Senate) Respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. Barker).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 173, from the Senate) For the relief of Robert William Logan.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7025; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) To incorporate the Casualty Company of Canada.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7025; in Com., 8566; 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate), To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour of Toronto.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., 8234, 8535; 3°*, 8536 (v).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate), to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Association.—(Mr. Geoffrion).

1°*, 7019; 2°*, 7148; in Com., 7589; 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 177), To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 7019; 2°, 7825; in Com., 7846 (iv); 3°m., 8104, 8193, 8403 (v).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate), Respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°*, 7339 (iv).

Bill (No. 179), Respecting the Songhees Indian Reserve.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7248; in Com. on Res., 7248; 1°* of B., 7252; 2° and in Com., 7824; 3°*, 7825 (iv).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate), For the relief of Mary Kathleen Crittenden.—(Mr. Rhodes).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 181, from the Senate), For the relief of Pauline Winslow Saunderson.—(Mr. Todd).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate), For the relief of Nellie Bridgland Morrison.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577(v).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate), For the relief of Frances Whittington Truesdell.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 184), Respecting Copyrights.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 7807; in Com. on Res., 7817; 1°* of B., 7824 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8895 (v).

Bill (No. 185), To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 4201 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8042; 1°* of B., 8065; in Com., 8419; 3°*, 8451 (v).

Bill (No. 186, from the Senate), Respecting The Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate), Respecting a Patent of the Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8969; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate), To confer on the Commission of Patents certain Powers for the relief of Trussed Concrete Steel Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate), To amend The Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Sir Allen Aylesworth).

1°*, 8187 (v).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate), For the relief of Violet Jane Dakin.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate), For the relief of Hugh Samuel Bell.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate), To provide for increasing the Capital Stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8969; 3°*, 8969 (v).

Bill (No. 193, from the Senate), Respecting La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Company —(Mr. Geoffrion)

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 ,v).

Bill (No. 194), To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8187 (v).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate), To incorporate the Western Canal Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate), To incorporate The Continental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 8403; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8968; 3°*, 8969 (v).

Bill (No. 197), To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 8399; 2° and in Com., 9312, 9377; 3°*, 9430 (v).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate), To incorporate the Quebec and Great North Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 9936 (v).

Bill (No. 199, from the Senate), For the relief of Fanny Mary Healey.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 200, from the Senate), For the relief of Gertrude Mary Grantham.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8477; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8971; 3°*, 8981 (v).

Bill (No. 201, from the Senate), Respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8981; 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 202, from the Senate), To incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8582; 2°, 8642; in Com., and 3°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate), Respecting certain Patents of Munderloh and Company, Limited.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8641; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 204, from the Senate), Respecting the Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8641; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 205, from the Senate), Respecting the Canada Cement Company, Limited. (Mr. Northrup).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8642 (v).

Bill (No. 206, from the Senate), Respecting the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8642; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8971 (v).

Bill (No. 207), Respecting Bank Officers and Creditors.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 8695 (v).

Bill (No. 208, To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Paterson).

Res. prop., 8477; in Com. on Res., 8716; 1°* of B., 8743 (v).

Bill (No. 209, from the Senate), Respecting Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 8887; 2°, 9512 (v).

Bill (No. 210, from the Senate), To amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act as regards the delivery of wood.—(Mr. Sinclair), 1°*, 8887 (v).

Bill (No. 211) Respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 8704; M. for Com. on Res., 8801; in Com. on Res., 8825; 1°* of B., 8872; 2° and in Com., 9222, 9255; 3°m., 9294 (v).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°*, 8887; 2° and in Com., 9348; 3°*, 9349 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 8887; 2°, 9221; in Com., 9222; 3°, 9334 (v).

Bill (No. 214, from the Senate) Respecting the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 8955; 2°*, 8983; in Com., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 215, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Currie.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 8955; 2°*, 9172 (v).

Bill (No. 216) To amend the Post Office Act, —(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 8585; in Com. on Res., 8906, 8924; 1°* of B., 8954; 2°, 9567; in Com., 9568, 9576; 3°*, 9580 (v).

Bill (No. 217) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 8586; in Com., on Res, 8954; 1°* of B., 8955 (v).

Bill (No. 218, from the Senate) For the relief of George Mackay Sutherland.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 9089; 2°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 219) To amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 9089; 2°, 9343; in Com., and 3°, 9343 (v).

Bill (No. 220 from the Senate) To incorporate the Albert and Moncton Railway Company.—(Mr. Emmerson).
2°, 9224; M. for Com., 9350; in Com., 9351; in Com., and 3°*, 9377 (v).

Bill (No. 221) To amend the Penny Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 8104; M. for Com. on Res., 9220; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°* of B., 9221 (v).

Bill (No. 222) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 9228; 2°, in Com., 9495; 3°*, 9499 (v).

Bill (No. 223) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
M. for 1°, 9305; 1°*, 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 9308; in Com. of the Whole, 9509, 3°*, 9511 (v).

Bill (No. 224) Respecting Duties of Customs on Importations from Japan.—(Mr. Fielding).
M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9432; in Com., 9445; 1°*, 2°* and in Com. on B., 9494; 3°, 9533 (v).

Bill (No. 225) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively 31st March, 1911, and 31st. March, 1912.—(Mr. Fielding).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 9580; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9589 (v).

Birch Grove Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 6073 (iv).

Birthday Congratulations to Prime Minister (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).

Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c.; M. for Ret. (Mr. McCarthy) 2679 (ii).

Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 655 (i).

Bliss, Lt.-Col. D. C., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8100 (v).

Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 187.'

Boiler Inspection on Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Bonaventure River, Quebec, and N. B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v).

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4464 (iii).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiation with U. S. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1575 (i).

Bookkeeping: *See* 'Falconer.'

Boot and Shoe Lasts, Names of Manufacturers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 1340 (i).

Boot Contract: *See* 'Naval Service,' &c.

Boston Speech of Min. of Militia, *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 5751 (iii).

Boundary Surveys and Demarcation: in Com. of Sup., 9546 (v).

Bracebridge Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Bradford Channel, Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

Brantford Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount Imported from G. B. and U. S., 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2369 (ii).

Bridge Strengthening on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Brier Island Light, Application *re* new house: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
—— Lightkeeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1655 (i).

Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4825 (iii).

Britain's Demand for Tariff Concession *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6574 (iv).

British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Ministers *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

B. C. and Central Can. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

B. C. Coal Strike, Agreement of Two Years ago: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6365 (iv).

B. C. Coal Strike: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6363 (iv).
——— *See* 'Coal,' 'Militia.'
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
B. C. Fisheries Regulations: *See* 'B. No. 185.' *See* 'Fisheries.'
B. C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B. C. Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 9248 (v).
B. C. Ry. Belt, Water: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
British Columbia and White River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
British Crown Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
British Patriotic Songs in Western Schools and American Pupils: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 656 (i).
——— Remarks of Mr. Armstrong: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4931 (iii).
British Preference Trade Policy: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5619 (iii).
British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, Reciprocity, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7210 (iv).
British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3859 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Brown, George Addison, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6577 (iv).
——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6439 (iv). *See* 'Address,' 'Finance,' 'Reciprocity.'
Buffalo Herds in National Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).
Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extension: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 6158 (iv).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Buildings, Public Works, Plans approved by Depts. previous to Aug 5th, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 698 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sealey) 7341 (iv).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Remarks on Question (Mr. Sealey) 7348 (iv).
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Business of the House, Adjournment for Coronation: Stmnt. (Mr. Fielding) 9309 (v).
——— *See* 'Adjournment.'
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887, 10095 (v).
Business of Hse. for Thursdays, Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1550 (i).
——— Public Bills for Thursdays: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2064 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Butter, Cheese and Meats imported, Value, Weight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada, Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4670 (iii).
——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6188 (iv).
Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Statistics *re* Reciprocity: Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce *re* Return (Mr. Perley) 6508 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Cab Fares and Street Ry. Fares, Payments for last year to Govt. Employees: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1339 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works. &c.'
Calgary Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).
Callender Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 6497 (iv).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. by Govt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 5191 (iii).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Campbellton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii), 5983 (iv).
Campbellton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v).
Canada Cement Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Canada Cement Co., Charges by Sir Sandford Fleming: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372 (v).
——— *See* 'Cement.'
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8775 (v).
'Canada's Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2885 (ii).
Canada and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8773 (v).
——— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'Post Office,' &c.

Canada and Japan Mail Subsidy: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1802 (i), 2503 (ii).
——— *See* 'Bill No. 103.'
Canada-Japan Trade Treaty, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5638 (iii).
——— *See* 'Japan.'
Can. Medical Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8781 (v).
Can. National Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canada and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8783 (v).
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 24, 118, 155.'
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 8784 (v).
Canada and S. America SS. Service, Subsidies to: Ques. (Mr. Daniel), 5290 (iii).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints of Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 661 (i).
Canada and West Indies SS. Subsidy Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5936 (iv).
Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Can. West Loan Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
See 'Baptist.'
Canadian Coasting Laws, Reciprocity affecting Grain and Hogs: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 5133 (iii).
Canadian Commissioner for France, Vacancy, Apptmt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).
——— Contradiction of Question asked in Senate (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 9545 (v).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities, Dredges, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1905 (i).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).
——— Control by Federal Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 983 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Com. on Ag.: Remarks (Mr. Schell) 2992 (ii).
———*See* 'Reciprocity.'
Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid by, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 655 (i).
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1716 (i).
Can. Inter-Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Canadian Light and Power Co., Lease between Govt., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lortie) 1501 (i).
——— Plans, &c., Date of Approval: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7591, 7805 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
Canadian Loans and Investments in U. S., Amount, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rutan) 6505 (iv).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Canadian National Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).
Canadian Naval Service, Applications from Canadians and British Navy: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1339 (i).
——— 'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1279 (i).
——— Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1091 (i).
——— Home Rule: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1461 (i).
——— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow', Loan by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 983 (i).
——— Number of Battleships withdrawn from Can. by G. B. during the past five years: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1093 (i).
——— 'Rainbow' Type, Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1490 (i).
——— 'Rainbow' listed as ineffective: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1070 (i).
——— Total Expenditure since 31st Oct. 1910: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5638 (iii).
See 'Naval Service,' &c.
Can. Northern Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 69 and 211.'
Can. Northern Quebec Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 8187 (v).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
C. P. R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 766 i).
——— Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision (Mr. Bradbury) 2992 (ii).
——— Reduction of Rates &c.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i); Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1573 (i).
——— *See* 'Railways.'
Canadian Railways, Accidents *re*, Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3922 (ii).
Can. Surety Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U. S. Citizens: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4672 (iii).
Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3608 (ii).

Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: *See* 'Militia.'

Can. Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'

CANALS—

Arbitrations, &c. and Awards, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation, Rep. *re* Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2214 (ii).

——— Grantees, Improvements, Valuation of Franchise &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1711 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2194 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2677 (ii).

——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1712 (i).

——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

Canal Statistics: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7019 (iv).

——— Working Expenses, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 8453 (v).

Cardinal Canal Bridge: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

——— Dock Rebuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

——— Names of Lessee, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2668 (ii).

Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

——— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iv).

Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).

——— Charges against: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Enlargement of Office: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Lock, 17: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Lock. 19: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Removing High Spots from Prism: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Robertson's Culvert, Reinforcing Bank: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Farran's Point, Lower Entrance Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Galops Canal—Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Use by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).

——— *See* main heading.

Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6358, 6410 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Lachine Canal: New Tug: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).

——— Tugs: in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).

——— Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).

Lake St. Francis Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iv).

Lockmen, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6413, 6453 (iv).

Murray Canal Dredging: in Com. of Su 6410 (iv).

——— New Scow: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Newmarket Canal, Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5830 (iii).

——— Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept. M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 5136 (iii).

——— Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10474; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 79) 10532 (v).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7556 (iv).

Newmarket Canal: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).

——— Bradford Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

Quebec, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Rapide Plat Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

Rideau Canal, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

——— Lockmen, Increase of Pay: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

——— Removal of Stumps: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

St. Ours Locks, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

St. Peter's Canal, C. B., Construction, &c., Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8103 (v).

——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie, Lock Gates, Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).

——— Concrete Walls: Remarks (Mr Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup, 6397 (iv).

——— Upper Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).

——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Soulanges Canal, Leaks and Trimming Slopes: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

——— Protection Works, Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* administration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6273 (iv).

Trent Canal, Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).

——— Fenelon Falls Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

——— Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).

——— Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

——— Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).

——— Scugog River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv). *See* 'Newmarket.'

Welland Canal, Enlargement, Change of Route, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).

——— Enlargement, Memorial, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Hodgins) 1500 (i).

——— Jane St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).

——— Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).

——— Selkirk Route, Welland Canal: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

——— Stone Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).

——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).

Williamsburg Canal, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).

——— Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

——— Lockmaster's House: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).

——— Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

Canned Goods: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Canned Pease, Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3279 (ii).

——— Quantity imported into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3221 (ii).

Canning, J. H., Inspector of Inland Revenue, Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1350 (i).

Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8994 (v).

Capital Life Assurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'

Cardinal Canal Bridge: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Cardinal Dock Rebuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'

Carillon Water Power, Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c.: (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2668 (ii).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Carrier-Laine Works, Purchase by Govt., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8992

Casualty Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Cattle Exports to the U. S., Bonded to G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7426 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* Return (Mr. Blain) 7558 (v).

Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).

Cattle Inspection on Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Cement Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'

Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sandford Fleming: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372, 10468 (v).

Cement Production, Total Production annually since 1900: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 10196 (v).

CENSUS—

Appointments for East Elgin, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 4302 (iii).

Census Commissioner, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2155 (ii).

Census Methods: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6669, 7556 (iv).

Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9431 (v).

Census, Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 9594 (v).

Census Returns: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 8193 (v).

Census, Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 9694 (v).

Census, System of Taking: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4337 (iii).

Commissioner for York County, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8704 (v).

Enumerators, Apptmt. of Enumerators: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9994 (v).

——— Apptmt. of by Liberal Associations: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7021 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).

CENSUS—*Con.*

Enumerators, Circulating Pets. *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Best) 6507 (iv).

—— Completion of Work: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7218 (iv).

—— Inaccuracies in Quebec: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 7217 (iv).

Enumerators in Man., Apptmt. of by Liberal Organizers, Cor. &c., Read: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Staples) 9006, 9015 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) 8889 (v).

Enumerators, Names, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4465 (iii).

Enumerators in Peel County, Number, Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).

Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9432 (v).

Jacques Cartier Census Enumerators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9431 (v).

Omissions *re* Enumerations: Further Information re (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9897 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9711 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 659 (i).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7556 (iv).

Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8983 (v).

Certificates to Masters, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c.: (Mr. Schaffner) 4301 (iii).

Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (v).

—— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

—— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).

Charing Cross Bank and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. with Govt. (Mr. Ames) 1726 (i).

—— *See* 'Atlantic, Quebec & Western.'

Charwomen, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).

Chatham, Diversion of I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Chatham, N. B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

—— Purchase of Site, Name of Owners: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8095 (v).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5406 (iii).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Protection *re* Marketing: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

See 'Butter'.

Chemin Gouin Postmaster, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7038 (iv).

—— A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7210 (iv).

Chesley Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (ii).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

China, Japan and Can. SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 103.'

China-Japan SS. Subsidy: M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 147.'

See 'Immigration.'

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv).

Chinese Investigation Commission, Censure of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

—— Discussion *re* Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9926 (v).

—— Evidence read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9786 (v).

—— Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy: Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9594 (v).

—— Rep. of Judge Murphy: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9897 (v).

—— Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2738 (ii).

Chinese Immigration, Total Number, Capita Tax, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 788 (i).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1103 (i).

Cholera Precautions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10197 (v).

Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).

—— *See* 'Beausoleil.'

Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1453 (i).

Chrysler, Mr. F. H., Amounts paid by Govt. *re* Legal Services from 1896 to 1910 (M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1727 (i).

Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4571 (iii).

Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*: M. for O. Cs., &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7553 (iv).

—— Notice (Mr. R. L. Borden) of Discussion, 1912 (i).

Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*: *See* 'Govt. Officials.'
Civil Service Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 12, 208 & 217.'
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4930, 5038 (iii).
Civil Service Apptmts. from South Grey: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2555 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Apptmts.'
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
——— Charges against: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Barnard) 785 (i).
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 9996 (v).
Coal Barges and Pilotage Fees: *See* 'B. No. 118..
Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4674 (iii).
Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity per Day: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).
Coal imported from U. S. for 1910 for Ont., Total Amounts of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Gordon) 4041 (iii).
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).
Coal Miners Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, 9720 (v).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Coal Strike in Alberta and B. C., Conciliation by Labour Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6197 (iv).
Coal Strikes in the West, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6363, 6908, 7105 (iv).
Coasting Trade Act, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4675 (iii).
Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and inefficient Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).
Cocaine, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8308 (v).
Coins, Foreign and Uncurrent, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1455 (i).
Cold Storage Depots, Total Amounts paid from 1907-10: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii). *See* 'Agriculture.'
Cold Storage Warehouses: *See* 'B. Nos. 36 & 112.'
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name, Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middleboro) 10337 (v).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1280 (i).
——— *See* 'Imperial Conference.'
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4470 (iii).
——— *See* 'Civil Service,' 'Negroes,' &c.
Combines Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act, Charges re: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro), 663 (i).
Combines Investigation Act, Rep of: Inquiry for (Mr. Maddin) 1987 (ii).
Combines Investigation in United Shoe Machinery Co., Restraint, &c.: Remarks (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5953 (iv).
Commercial Agent for Canada at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9511 (v).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Commercial Relations Documents, Translation of: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3462 (ii).
Commercial Travellers Accident Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2436 (ii).
Commissions, Taking of: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
——— Lists: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 262 (i).
——— M. to add Names (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 377 (i).
Committees, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Commutation Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B No. 7.'
Compensation to Workmen for Injuries: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Conciliation Board, Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3378, 3399 (ii), 4244 (iii).
Conciliation Board, Principle of Action: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Industrial.'
Conduits Co.'s Ltd., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Conservation Commission, Annual Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 698 (i).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Number of Copies printed: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 660 (i).
Consolidated Boards of Trade, Saskatchewan, Despatch from W. A. Shepherd: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions heard ,Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 982 (i).

Consuls General, Foreign, Status at Official Receptions, &c.: M. for Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (i).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Convicts liberated from Penitentiary at Kingston without Clothing or Means: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 1913 (i), 2065 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1986 (ii).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 29.'
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Copyright Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5134 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Enlargement of Office: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock 17: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock 19: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Removing High Spots from Prism: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Robertson's Culvert, Reinforcing Bank: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Coronation of King George V, Invitation to Members of Parlt: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1580 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8709 (v).
——— *See* 'Adjournment.'
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4659 (iii)
——— Apptmt. of Col. Landry: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 8093 (iv)
——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6506 (iv).
——— Regulations *re* Apptmt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3220, 3277 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Selecting Corps: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4464 (iii).
——— Names of Officers, &c., Cadets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7105 (iv).
——— Selection of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4828 (iii).
Coronation Day Celebration in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9989 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Beattie) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10351 (v).
Coronation Decorations: in Com. of Sup. 9565 (v).
Coronation Expenses of Members and Senators: in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 5836 (iii).
Coronation Naval Cadets, Method of Selection &c.: Ques. Mr. Macdonell) 9986 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).
Coronation Stamps: Inquiry *re* (Mr. Armstrong) 9247 (v).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
Courtice, Howard, Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9784 (v).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 9897 (v).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent,: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4828 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).
Creston Fruit and Produce Association: Reciprocity Treaty, &c.: Res. *re* Read (Mr. Goodeve) 4119 (iii).
Cribbins Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 40, 86.'
'Crissie Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Crittenden, Mary Kathleen, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase in Salary: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5937 (iv).
Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr.Paquet) 805 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service &c.
Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co., Strike of Employees, Reps., &c.: M. for Cor.*: (Mr. Rhodes) 1340 (i).
——— *See* 'Conciliation'
Curren, R. C., Gratuity *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3948 (ii).
Currie, Wm. Francis, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Customs Dept. Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 208.'

CUSTOMS:

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4464 (iii).
Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount imported from G.B. and U.S., 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2369 (ii).
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Citizens: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4672 (iii).
Canned Peas, Quantity Imported into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3221 (ii)
——— Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3279 (ii).
Coal imported from U.S. for 1910 for Ont., Total Amounts of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Gordon) 4041 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4674 (iii).

Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1896 and 1910: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 801 (i).

Customs Collections in Cities, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4042 (iii).

Customs Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i), 5992 (iv).

——— Dept. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).

Customs Duties, Average Value for 1896 and 1910, Units of: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2162 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Speech of Hon. Mr. Foster, 7022 (iv).

——— Correction (Mr. Foster) 7104 (iv).

Customs Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of Articles in Schedules of Customs Act: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1105 (i).

Customs Duties *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Customs, Free Entries of Goods, Date of last Entry: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 803 (i).

——— Free Goods entered at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 931 (i).

Customs Officer at Ingram Dock, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Elections: M. for O. Cs, &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218 (ii).

Customs Preventive Officers, Duties &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).

Customs Tariff with Foreign Countries, Arrangements by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 981 (i).

Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6268 (iv).

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10196 (v).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-1911, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9369 (v).

Fire Bricks imported into N. S., Number of Ports &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2161 (ii).

Halifax Customs Officials, Complaint *re* Treatment *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. R.L. Borden) in Com. on Bill, 8723 (v).

Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 5634 (iii).

Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4301 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official at Dalhousie, Member of Town Council: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4044 (iii).

Mica Exports 1900 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5290 (iii).

Mica Imports, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4827 (iii).

Montreal Customs House, Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1340 (i).

Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).

Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

Oshawa Customs Collector, Retirement of Mr. Blamey: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3225 (ii).

Paper Imports into U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons Imported: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1721 (i).

Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4828 (iii).

Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 3223 (ii).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 985 (i).

Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Paterson) 5126 (iii).

Shafting imported, Quantities and Values since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 7593 (iv).

Stone Cut, Duty between U. S. and Can., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1287 (i).

Vancouver Customs, Entries by Robt. Kelly, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 713 (i).

'Wanda' Yacht, Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5933 (iv).

——— Appraising by Customs &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4678 (iii).

——— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c,: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4300 (iii).

——— Length, Motive Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5834 (iii).

——— Valuation of: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5623 (iii).

Wolfe Island Customs Official, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8099 (v).

See 'Reciprocity.'

Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9361 (v).

Dairy and Fruit Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6234 (iv).
Dairy Industry, Memorials *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2671 (ii).
Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario: (Mr. Lalor); Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) about Reciprocity, 4223 (iii).
——— Denial of Stmnt. of Minister of Customs (Mr. Armstrong) 4570 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Dakin, Violet Jane, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re*: Ans. (Mr. Brodeur) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 9247 (v).
Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. re Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).
Daylight, Saving of: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Debates Committee, 1st Rep.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 6438 (iv).
——— Status of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7015 (iv).
Debates Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Declaration of London, Adoption of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Monk) 3530 (ii).
——— Consideration by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5935 (iv).
Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 4383 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii).
Deferred Elections: *See* 'Elections.'
Deptl. Expenditure of Public Moneys, Investigations *re*: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Departments Generally, Cleaning, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
Deputy Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Deputy Governor or Administrator, Apptmt. of Mr. Justice Girouard, Tel. to Cardinal Vanutelli *re* Eucharistic Congress: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 702 (i).
Digby Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 8582 (v).
Dissolution of Parlt., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Opposition: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 5737 (iii).
Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 130, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 163, 164, 173, 180, 181, 182, 183, 190, 191, 199, 200, 215 and 218.'
Divorce Bills: Ques. of Privilege *re* Remarks made by Senator Kirchhoffer (Mr. Ethier) 4201 (iii).
Dixon Postoffice, Pets. *re* Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4669 (iii).
Dog Fish Industry: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 8044 (v).
Dog Fish Works: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).
——— Electric Power: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
——— Que., General Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
——— Rents, Engineers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Dom. Development Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 107 and 194.'
Dominion Lands, Administration of : in Com. of Sup., 5553, 5581 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
Dom. Lands in Alberta, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 2271 (ii).
Dom. Lands in Saskatchewan, Gross Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3221 (ii).
See 'Interior.
Dom. Police Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Donland Postoffice, Removal of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 9994 (v).
Don Postoffice, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).
Drawbars for Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for Current Year: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2105 (ii).
Drill Halls, Generally, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Man., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1975 (ii).
Drinking Water, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Drugs made with Opium, Regulation: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Cartoons used by Min. of Marine, published in 'Le Canada' of 1904: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 223 (i).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 194 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Denial of Mr. Begin *re* words quoted by Mr. Monk *re* Naval Defence (Mr. Tobin) 134 (i).
——— Statements in 'Le Devoir', Denial, &c. (Mr. Blondin) 145 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Cartoons displayed to Hse. (Mr. Brodeur) 146 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska, Electoral Distrist: Certificate *re* (Mr. Speaker) 259 (i).
——— Disloyal Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) on Address 169 (i).
——— 'Le Devoir,' Quotations: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 469.
——— Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 472 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Moneys used, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Perley) 196 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, 'pounding England' speech of Notary Begin: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 57; Ques. of Order, Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 57 (i); Telling hon. mem. he 'lied to the House,' (Mr. Gauvreau) 57 (i): Ques. of Order, Insulting Language: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 77 (i).
——— Speeches: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 153 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Address, 54 (i).
Dry Docks, Applications for Subsidies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).
——— *See* 'Collingwood.'
Dry Docks at Quebec, Construction *re* by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Price) 9988 (v).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 662 (i)
Dufferin Board Trade Res., Reciprocity Treaty: Read (Mr. Black) 5547 (iii).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6268 (iv).
——— *See* 'Iron.'
Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10196 (v).
Duncan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii)
Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).
Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3470 (ii).
Dunnville Postoffice; :Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup. 1668 (i).
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International': M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1498 (i).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of Articles in Schedules of Customs Act: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1105 (i).
——— *See* 'Customs.'
Dynamite, Storage of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
'Earl Grey.' Ice Breaker, Construction: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
'Earl Grey', Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1972 (ii).
East Chezzetcook Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
Easter Adjournment: Notice of M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6758 (iv).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 813 (i).
E. B. Eddy Co.: *See* 'B No 54.'
Echo Lake Postoffice, Application *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8993 (v).
Eclipse Mfg. Co., Office Specialty Co., and Ahearn & Soper, Paymenis to *re* Contracts: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1339 (i).
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4467 (iii)
Elbow River Conserving of Water Flow: M. for Cor. (Mr. McCarthy) 1912 (i).
Elbow River Water Power License, Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCarthy) 1501 (i).
Elbow and Bow Rivers Water Power Privileges, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).
Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 16, 28, 37, 38.'
Elections Deferred in B. C. and Generally: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 10376 (v).
Electricians at Sault Ste. Marie, Protest *re* Dismissals, Alien Labour Law Administration: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
Electricity Exportation B. 101 (Mr. Conmee): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Introduction, 2364 (ii).
Electric Light Attendant, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4043 (iii).
Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Terminals, Investigations *re* Mixing of Grain; Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2377 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, System *re* Operating: Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3472; Amt. (Mr. Neely) 3488. Agreed to (Y. 96, N. 54) 3524 (ii).
Elliott, Geo., Emplyt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 1497 (i).
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractors, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).
Elora Post Office Site, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 6505 (iv).
Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).
Embargo on British Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10344 (v)

Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8111 (v).
Emo, Matilda, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Empire Life Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Employees of Rys. paid fortnightly: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
English Mail Service to Maritime Provs: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8792 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1080 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service, &c.
Ennis, D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 3847 (ii).
Escott, Postmaster, Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).
——— Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
——— Salary, Date of Increase: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).
Esquimalt Fort, Removal of Guns: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3220 (ii).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Negotiations *re* Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 799 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 799 (i).
Essex Public Building: in Com of Sup., 2110 (ii).
Estimates, 1912: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).
——— Further Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii), 5525 (iii), 8355, 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).
Estimates of Depts., Procedure *re* Discussing: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).
Estimates *re* Mail Service, Objection (Mr. Perley) to Passing, 4296 (iii).
Estimates for Man., Objections *re* Discussion (Mr. Staples) 2969 (ii).
Estimates, Order for Discussion *re* Depts.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2994 (ii).
——— Special Items reported as passed, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9076 (v).
Estimates to be Voted *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9223 (v).
Eucharistic Congress at Montreal, Guards of Honour: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) on Address, 289 (i).
——— Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 704 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Govt. Authority *re* Decoration of Govt. Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 925 (i); Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3369 (ii).
——— Number of Buildings decorated by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4667 (iii).
Eucharistic Congress and Mess. of Homage from Administrator of Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Militia in Attendance, Authorization for: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3219 (ii).
——— Militia Officers at Reception in Uniform: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 707 (i).
——— Public Procession, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 925 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Reception to Cardinal Vanutelli, Imperfect Answer: Remarks Sproule) 158 (i).
——— Reception to by Federal Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5935 (iv).
——— Ref. to Questions: Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 158 (i).
——— Tel. to Cardinal Vanutelli by Administrator: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 702 (i).
'Eureka' Pilotage Boat, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6502-3 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Exchequer Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
——— Reports, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Excursion Trains *re* Political Meeting, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii), 9076 (v).
Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid to: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3157 (ii).
Experimental Farm Bulletins: in Com. of Sup., 6185 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number established for past year: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 656 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number operated in Dom., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1102 (i).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 662, 1285 (i).
Experimental Farms, Reps.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).
——— Stock *re*: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Explosives, Regulation of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2374 (ii).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-11, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9369 (v).

Express Co.s.' Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Express Cos'. Unclaimed Balances: *See* 'B. No. 8.'

Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 10196 (v).

—— *See* 'Post Office—Parcel Post.'

External Affairs, Absence of Minister from Washington Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 1658 (i).

—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).

Extradition: *See* 'Fedorenko.'

Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5933 (iv).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

Falconer System of Book-keeping, Adoption of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1904 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Bookkeeping.'

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).

—— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 2263 (ii).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Applications *re* Establishment: M. for Papers (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1726 (i).

—— Assets *re* Keely Mine, Value &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2152 (ii).

—— Application *re* Charter, Date and Names: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1970 (ii).

—— Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i), 2230 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1904 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4468 (iii).

—— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4111 (iii).

—— Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 2264 (ii).

—— Proceedings *re* Commission: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10471 (v).

Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) *re* Mr. Calvert's connection, 5730 (iii).

—— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4826 (iii).

—— Representations to Finance Dept. *re* Stability: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2151 (ii).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation: Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to Com. on Ways and Means, 5295: Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

Debate:

(Mr. Fielding) 5306; (Mr. Lalor) 5314; (Mr. Beattie) 5316; (Mr. Middlebro) 5324; (Mr. Porter) 5325; (Mr. Foster) 5329; (Mr. Miller) 5354; (Mr. Northrup) 5363; (Mr. Crothers) 5377; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5389; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5395; (Mr. Edwards) 5412; (Mr. Nesbitt) 5424; (Mr. Blain) 5431; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5438; (Mr. Thornton) 5440; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5450; (Mr. Armstrong) 5453; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5456; (Mr. Lalor) 5456; (Mr. Donnelly) 5461; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5465; (Mr. Carvell) 5481; (Mr. Porter) 5487; (Mr. Hughes) 5496; (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 5498; (Mr. Boyce) 5508; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1510 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7560 (iv).

Farmers' Bank Investigation, Treasury Board Ref.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 5552 (iii).

—— Treasury Board Minutes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4741 (iii).

Farmers' Bank Failures, Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2666 (ii).

—— Remarks *re* Answer to Question, 2679 (ii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry., Denial of Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1574 (i).

—— Control of Hudson Bay Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1508 (i).

—— Govt. Ownership of Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1504 (i).

Farmers' Delegation: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print Speeches, 3054 (ii).

—— Distribution of Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 6908 (iv).

—— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1454 (i).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm and Garden Products imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Mr. Boyce) 7034 (iv).

Farmers' Interests, Assurance of Member for N. Oxford *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 5541 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4663 (iii).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm Labourers, O.C. *re* Immigration Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 7026 (iv).

Farm Products entered at Windsor from 1906-1910: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 8701 (v).

Farm Products imported from U.S. into Kingston Port, Quantities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3668 (ii).

Farm Products imported from other Countries, &c., Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3668 (ii).

Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8096 (v).

——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1496 (i).

Farran's Point, Lower Entrance improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Favoured Nation Treaties before Imperial Conference, Abrogation of: Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. Armstrong) 5292 (iii).

——— Importations from Most Favoured Nations: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4111 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4113 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 4114 (iii).

——— Names of Countries affected by Treaty *re* Importations into Canada (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4131 (iii).

——— Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4104; Reply (Mr. Fielding) 4134 (iii).

———Names of Favoured Nation Treaty Countries: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4665 (iii).

Fedorenko, A., Extradition of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10 (i).

Fences on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Fencing along Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Fenelon Falls Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation: on Amt., M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Middlebro) 9595, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Compensation to: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 658 (i).

——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1089 (i).

——— Number surviving, Pensions &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1715 (i).

——— *See* 'Militia.'

Fergus Post Office Site, Remarks (Mr. Stratton) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Festival of the Empire in London: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 3775 (ii).

Festival of the Empire: Chateauguay, Battle, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 8105, 9251 (v).

FINANCE :

Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5403 (iii).

American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).

Aud. Gen., Cor. *re* Overpayments by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Best) 1010 (i).

——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).

Bank Act, Consideration of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6674 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).

——— Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govt. Action: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5632 (iii).

——— *See* 'Farmers Bank.'

Bankers Association, Agreement *re* Competition: Ques. (Mr. Low) 3466 (ii).

Bankers Association, Bylaws, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4116 (iii).

Bank Curators' Reports: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3142 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2670 (ii), 4569, 5038 (iii), 7556 (iv).

Bank Failures, Stmnt. of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses: (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2670 (ii).

Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 926, 1091 (i).

Budget, The—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6577 (iv).

——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1716 (i).

Charing Cross Bank and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. with Govt. (Mr. Ames) 1726 (i).

——— *See* 'Railways.'

Coins, Foreign and Uncurrent, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).

Estimates, 1912: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).

——— Suppl. (1911): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii). 5525 (iii), 8355 (v).

——— Suppl, 1912: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).

Estimates, Order for Discussion *re* Depts: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2994 (ii).

——— Procedure *re* Discussing: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).

Estimates to be Voted *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9223 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re* Investigation: Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to Com. on Ways and Means, 5295; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

—— Negligence of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).

—— Application *re* Charter, Date and Names: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1970 (ii).

—— Assets *re* Keeley Mine, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2152 (ii).

—— M. for Papers (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1726 (i).

—— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4111 (iii).

—— Incorporation, Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i), 2230 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4468 (iii).

—— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7560 (iv).

—— Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 2264 (ii).

—— Proceedings *re* Commission: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10471 (v).

—— Question *re* Incorp.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1904 (i).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) *re* Mr. Calvert's connection, 5730 (iii).

—— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4826 (iii).

—— Representations to Finance Dept. *re* Stability: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2151 (ii).

—— Royal Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1510 (i).

—— Treasury Board, Ref.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 5552 (iii).

—— Treasury Board Minutes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4741 (iii).

—— *See* 'Treasury.'

—— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2666 (ii).

—— Remarks re answer to question, 2679 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 6577; Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

—— Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6441 (iv).

Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U.S. and British, Authority *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9985 (v).

Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).

Loans and Investments in U.S., Amount, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rutan) 6595 (iv).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Loans, Negotiations for 1909-10, Financial Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3281 (ii).

Loans and Sinking Funds, ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3772 (ii).

Mint Operations, Implementing Information: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, &c., Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3065 (ii).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total for 1890-1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9992 (v).

Sinking Fund, Legal Amount required, Bounties paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 982 (i).

Treasury Board Minutes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4659 (iii).

Treasury Board Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5136 (iii).

—— *See* 'Bank Curators,' &c.

Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3066 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 6577: Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

—— Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6441 (iv).

Fire Arms, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 86.'

Fire Bricks imported into N.S., Number of, Ports &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

Fire Escapes for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3160 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers for Passenger Cars, I.C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).

Fires in Forest Reserves: *See* 'B. No. 85.'

Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal Banquet: Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2079 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2266 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 58 & 185

FISHERIES—

Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Jameson) 3947 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5039, 5293 (iii), 8791 (v).

—— Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 8889 (v).

Bait Freezers, Construction in Louisburg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 6505 (iv).

Bay of Fundy Fishing Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Bounty in Kings, P.E.I., Names of Persons Receiving Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7246 (iv).

Bounties, Payments *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 6670 (iv).

Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).

Dog Fish Industry: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 8044 (v).

Fish Ladders on Trent Canal: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4824 (iii).

——— Preservation, Action of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1503 (i).

Fish Landed by Canadian Atlantic Fisheries since 1870, Quantities, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1501 (i).

Fish Transportation: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).

Fish Transportation, Expenditure annually, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6271 (iv).

——— Amounts paid out of Aiding Funds, Further Information: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6506, 7106 (iv).

——— Statement read (Mr. Brodeur) 7259 (iv).

Fisheries Appointments: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Porter) 5836 (iii).

Fisheries Commission *re* Saskatchewan and Alberta, Interim Rep., laid on Table (Mr Brodeur) 10590 (v).

Fisheries Arbitration at Washington, Sir John Thompson's Memorandum: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2004 (ii).

Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re* Commission: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

Fisheries Inspectors, Dom. Appointments in Ontario: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (i).

Fisheries Regulations, Changes at Washington: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).

——— Further Information: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).

——— Mess. from Wash.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6504 (iv).

——— 1908, Proclamation *re*: Remarks (Mr. . D. Taylor) 5035 (iii).

———1908, Non-fulfilment by U.S.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6528 (iv).

——— *See* 'Fisheries, International.'

Fisheries Regulations between Can. and U.S., Proclamation *re*, Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1725 (i).

Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2088 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Fisheries Regulations at Washington Conference, Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4207 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations at Washington, Trap Nets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2070 (ii).

Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2088 (ii).

Fishery Regulations, Complaint *re* C. K. Golden for Violation of: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).

——— Penalties *re* Violation of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 1806 (i).

Fisheries Service of Can., Control by Federal Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 983 (i).

Fisheries Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7022 (iv).

Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations, Request to place on Govt. Orders (Mr. Jameson) 3373 (ii).

Fish Tariff Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2886 (ii).

Fish Wardens in Victoria, N.B.: Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Maddin) 5629 (iii), 6672 (iv).

———Remarke (Mr. Brodeur) 5732 (iii).

Fishways and Clearing Streams: in Com. of Sup., 6659 (iv).

Fishways on Pembina River: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pembina.'

Glace Bait Association, Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4044 (iii).

——— Payments to from 1906-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3670 (ii).

——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Maddin) 3948 (ii).

Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).

Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).

——— Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Location, Applications for Fish Fry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1494 (i).

——— Hatcheries in East Elgin, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 5137 (iii).

Herring Traps, Close Season *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 2086 (ii).

International Fisheries Commission Regulations, Modifications of: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1803 (i).

——— Date of Operation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3465 (ii).

——— *See* 'Fisheries Regulations.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

International Fisherise Commission Regulations: Proclamation *re* Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1725 (i).

——— Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 1654 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7259 (iv).

James Bay, Fishing Lease to Arch. McNee, Duration of, Rental &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thoburn) 4830 (iii).

Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 796 (i).

Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 529 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bradbury) 4207, 5035 (iii).

Manitou Lake, Fishing Privileges, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1348 (i).

Markey Fishing Rights on Nelson River, Extension of, Cancellation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4664 (iii).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Campbell) 4382 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 6119 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6914 (iv).

Modus Vivendi Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).

Montreal Govt. Weir: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 2065 (ii).

Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmnt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1104 (i).

Newfoundland Fisheries, North Atlantic, &c.: *See* main heading 'Hague.'

Northwest Fishing Co.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5630 (iii).

Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6157 (iv).

Otter, Beaver or Stream Trawling in Northumberland Strait: M. for Cor* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 980 (i).

Overseers: in Com. of Sup., 3809 (ii), 6159 (iv).

Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Warburton) 714 (i).

Pelagic Sealing Conference: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (v).

——— Further Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3670, 3769, 3839 (ii).

——— *See* 'Seal'.

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1090 (i).

——— *See* 'Fishway'.

Poachers in Lake Superior, Par. in Otawa Free Press: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1459 (i).

Poachers on Pacific Coast, Protective Service *re*: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 2080 (ii).

——— Par. in Victoria Daily Colonist: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 1458 (i)

P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fraser) 1501 (i).

Protection Service *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).

——— Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 805 (i).

——— Seizure by 'Rainbow' of Str. 'Edric': Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 4116, 4208 (iii).

Robichaud, Wm., Compensation *re* Fire: in Com. of Sup., 6105, 6159 (iv).

St. Andrew's Dam, Fishway, Correction in Stmnt. (Mr. Bradbury) 1650 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Fish Ladders &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).

Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2853 (ii)

Seal Fisheries Treaty, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9594, 10196 (v).

——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10337 (v).

——— *See* 'Pelagic.'

Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3607 (ii)

Smelt Fishing in N.S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9984 (v).

Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4046 (iii).

——— 'Wren' and 'Croquette', Registration in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4046 (iii).

Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3074 (ii).

Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7806 (iv).

Whitemouth River Fishway: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).

Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Apptmt. of Keeper &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4041 (iii).

Fishing Vessels' Licenses: *See* 'B. No. 27'.

Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P. W. Dept. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 2648 (ii).

——— *See* 'St. George's'

Flags flying on Govt. Buildings on St. David's Day: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3671 (ii).

Flags Flying on Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4724 (iii).
Flags, Regulation by Govt. *re* Flying with Foreign Flags: Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4347; M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) to adjn. Debate, Agreed to (Y. 89; N. 49) 4380 (iii).
Flax Exports from Saskatchewan: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 10521 (v).
Fleming Grain Growers' Association, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5550 (iii).
Floods on the Assiniboine, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Flour and Meal, Sale of in Bags: *See* 'B. No. 117'.
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale: Prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 3226. (ii)
Foods; Adulteration of: *See* 'B. No. 35 & 112.
Foreign Consuls, Official Status: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9511 (v).
Forest Fires caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 197'.
Forest Reserves and Parks: *See* B. No. 85'.
Forestry Convention at Quebec, in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Fort Churchill and Nelson River Survey: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).
Fort Frances Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 109'.
Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase by Man. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Fort William Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).
'Fossy Jaw': *See* 'B. No. 10 & 96.'
Franking Privilege, Fraudulent Use of: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).
Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcations, Bonds &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1566 (i).
Fredericton, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).
Fredericton Public Building, Pavement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612, 1665 (i).
Freight Car Service, I.C.R., Complaints, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Freight Rates on Coal &c. in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6156 (iv).
——— *See* 'C.P.R.'
Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1285 (i).
Free Delivery of Mail: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Freeman, Cecil Ernest, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Free Trade Offer by U.S., Pres'dt. Taft's Speech: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5293 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
French, Gen. Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 76 (i).
——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).
French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c., Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8097 (v).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
French River Dam: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
French Translation of Inland Revenue Act: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
French Translation of Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa Citizen: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3283 (ii).
Fruit Duty, Res. from B. C. Inland Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Burrell) 3377 (ii).
Fruit Growers Association, B. C., Protest *re* Duty: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3373 (ii).
——— Burlington: Read (Mr. Henderson) 4122 (iii).
——— Tel. read from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B. C. (Mr. Burrell) 3770 (ii).
——— Tel. from Mission City Agricultural Ass'cn.: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3955 (iii).
Fruit Growers Delegation: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Burrell) 6120 (iv).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegates, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3529 (ii).
——— Report of Proceedings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Print, 3952 (iii).
——— French Editions: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v).
Fruit and Vegetables Amt. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sealey) 7666 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Apptmt., Qualifications &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 8701 (v).
Fruit Packing and Marking: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Galleries of the House of Commons, Applause by Visitors: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4468 (iii).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Galops Canal—Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Gananoque Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).
Garden Seeds, Purchase for Indians in N.W., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1717 (i).
Garnishment of Civil Servants' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 12.'

Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i).
Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriatinfg Scrap Brass, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6664 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).
Gas Meters in Toronto, Complaints *re* Excessive Measurements: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3280 (ii).
Gaspe and Dalhousie SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8785 (v).
Gaspe Mail Service, Revenue *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3854 (ii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging Contracts: Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).
Geological Survey Explorations: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Geological Survey Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 9690 (v).
Georgetown Public Building, Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).
Georgian Bay Ship Canal, Estimates *re*: Remarks (Mr. G. White) 2004 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Globe' *re* Commencement of: Remarks (Mr. German) 2261 (ii).
——— Use by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).
——— *See* 'Transportation.'
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Germany, Trade Relations with: *See* 'Trade Relations.'
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., Fined for Electoral Corruption: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2673 (ii).
Glace Bay Bait Association, Application re Subsidy for Building: M. for Copy* (Mr. Maddin) 3948 (ii).
——— Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c.: (Mr. Maddin) 4044 (iii).
——— Payments to from 1906-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3670 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U.S. and British, Authority *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9985 (v).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Goldschmidt Thermit Co.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Govt. Appointments from South Grey since 1904, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 1912 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2555, 3059 (iii).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2080 (ii).
Govt. Book-keeping, Names of Employees in Depts: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1718 (i).
——— *See* 'Falconer.'
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10095 (v).
——— Precedence on Mondays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4114 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Govt. Buildings, Draping for His Majesty's Death: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Govt. Goods purchased in U.S., Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 817 (i).
Govt. Loans, Negotiations for 1909-10, Financial Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3772 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 982 (i).
Govt. Loans, Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3281 (ii).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Govt. Officials in Political Contests: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
——— *See* 'Civil Servants.'
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Monk) 944 (i).
Govt. Railways constructed previons to Comfederation, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 4829 (iii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5811 (iii).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Gov. General's Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Gov. General, Duke of Connaught, Rumours *re* Apptmt: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 1725 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec. Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).
Grain Elevators: *See* 'Elevators.'
Grain Growers Grain Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Grain Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
Grain stored in Port Arthur and Ft. William Elevators, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3605 (ii).
Grand Bend, Ont., Right of Way, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1287 (i).

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).
Grand Falls and St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Cor. re: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 9371 (v).
——— *See* 'St. John Valley.'
Grand Forks Public Building, in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).
Grand Narrows, I.C.R. Construction at, O.C.s, &c., *re* Claims of Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5640 (iii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
G.T.R. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. Nos. 55 and 223.'
G.T.Ry. and I.C.R., Arbitration Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3665 (ii).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Foster) 4205 (iii).
Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve *re* Homestead Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3466 (ii).
G.T.Ry., Pension Fund. Rules, Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2153 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, and Action of Labour Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
——— Agreement *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 811 (i).
——— Arrangement *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 654 (i).
——— Basis of Settlement by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 809 (i).
——— Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 3383 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron *re* Investigation: Ques. Mr. Macdonell) 2158 (ii).
——— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1805 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 2376 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Minister's Efforts a Success: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 810 (i).
——— Reinstatement of Dismissed Officials: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1071 (i).
——— Reinstatement of Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1507 (i).
——— Res. from Order of Ry. Conductors: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).
——— Settlement of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 786 (i).
——— Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 9692 (v).
——— Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike: Status of Men Reinstated: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3375 (ii).
——— Tel. sent by Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1105 (i).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:

Classification, Arbitrators Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 696 (i).
Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1570 (i).
Government Director, Remuneration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).
G. T. P. Developing Co., Number of Acres sold by Govt., Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 2366 (ii).
——— Land Purchased from: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 2666, 3466 (ii).
Labourers at Lafond in Alberta, Amounts owing for Wages: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3669 (ii).
Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1492 (i).
Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost re: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1493 (i).
See 'Natl. Transcl.'
Grant, Gertrude Maud, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 200.''
Grazing Leases in the Foothills, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1492 (i).
G. B. and Canada, State-owned Cable, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1905 (i).
G. B. and U. S., Arbitration Treaty, Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 5834 (iii).
——— *See* 'U. S.'
Great Northwestern Telegraph Co., Request for Board of Conciliation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5639 (iii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Conditions *re* Public Health: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 5535 (iii).
——— Water Filters, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
Guardian Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2161 (ii).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7038 (iv).
Guysborough 'Times', Application *re* Postal Privileges: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6505 (iv).

Hague Arbitration (Bay of Fundy) North Atlantic Fisheries, Production of Papers: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) on M. for Sup., 4588 (iii).
—— Debate resmd.: (Mr. Brodeur) 4678 (iii).
Hague Arbitration Award, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8093 (v).
Hague Arbitration Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).
Hague Arbitration, Award *re* Fisheries: Remarks in Speech on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24 (i).
—— Fisheries Negotiations with U. S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1725, 1804 (i).
—— Fisheries Regulations: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 2365 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1988 (ii).
Hague Arbitration: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 4337 (iii).
Hague Arbitration *re* Newfoundland Fisheries, Counsel, Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).
—— Statement on Address (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 664 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1913 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 7806 (iv).
Half-breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 1912 (i).
Half-breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malboeuf: M. for Cor* (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2161 (ii).
Halifax Citadel, New Quarters: on Com. of Sup,. 1581 (i).
Halifax Customs Officials, Complaint *re* Treatment *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Bill, 8723 (v).
—— *See* 'Civil Service'.
Halifax Docks: in Com. of Sup., 9561 (v).
Halifax Dom. Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (v).
Halifax Increased Accomodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
—— Pier at Cunard Wharf, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2150 (ii).
Halifax Post Office Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
—— Completion of Repairs &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).
Halifax and St. John Wharfage &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7807 (iv).
Halifax Terminals, Accommodation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2647 (ii).
—— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Hall's Prairie P. O., Pets *re* Location, Postmaster &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3468 (ii).
Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3282 (ii).
Hamilton Cotton Co., Stmnt. of Employees *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 5747 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 10101 (v).
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society: *See* 'B. No. 172'.
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 149'
Hampton Public Building: Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).
Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg: M. for Copy*(Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1339 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
—— N. S., Estimates to be Voted for Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9501 (v).
—— *See* 'Public Works'.
Harling, Mr. Thos., Compensation *re* Report: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Hartland Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).
Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8991 (v).
Hawke, Mr. John T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 930 (i),
Hawkesbury Interprovincial Bridge: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Perley) 4224 (iii).
Hay Claims, Delay in Repayment to Canadian Exporters: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5403 (iii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8984 (v).
Hay transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Provs: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5134 (iii).
Healy, Fanny Mary, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 199'.
Herring Traps, Close Season *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 2086 (ii).
Hickman, W. A., Immigration Agent to G. B.: Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 1486 (i).

High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 202.
Highways on I. C. Rys., Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 9560 (v).
Hillsborough Brirge, P. E. I., Material purchased, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).
Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Name, &c : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9432 (v).
Holland Peat Bog, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4303 iii).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
Homage: *See* 'Eucharistic.'
Homestead Applications, Cancellations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
——— Infractions of Regulations, Punishment, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5561-2 (iii).
Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).
Homestead Entry of Mr. John Bradley, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1722 (i).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4112 (iii).
Homestead Regulations in B.C., Application *re* Ry. Belt: M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2855 (ii).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1284 (i).
Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1907 (i).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Homicide while Hunting: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Hope Suburban Townsite, Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3068 (ii).
——— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3846 (ii).
Hornell, Ethel May, Relief: *See* 'B. No 144.'
Horses admitted into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).
Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 7427 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Govt. Works : *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings *re* Com.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3280 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, Representation *re* I.C.R. Workingmen: Correction of Stmnt. (Mr. King) 4116 (iii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4825 (iii).
Charwomen: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1453 (i).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Committees: in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Coronation of King George V., Invitation to Members of Parlt: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1580 (i).
See main heading.
Divorce Bills: Ques. of Privilege *re* Remarks made by Senator Kirchhoffer (Mr. Ethier) 4201 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska , Electoral District: Certificate *re* (Mr. Speaker) 259 (i).
Elections Deferred in B.C. and Generally: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 10376 (v).
Electric Light Attendant: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Fraudulent Use of : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Galleries of the House of Commons, Applause by Visitors : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4468 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding : Remarks (Mr. Barker) 10101 (v).
House of Commons' Appointments : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 5288, 5400 (iii).
——— Number of people residing in: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3847 (ii).
See 'Restaurant.'
——— Sessional Employees since 1896:M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3471 (ii).
House of Commons and Senate : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2556 (ii).
Library Improvements *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590 (ii).
Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iv).
Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9988 (v).
Pages : in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Parliament, Opening and Closing Date of from 1896 to 1910: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 786 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Quebec Members, Revolt against Extra Session, Newspaper Articles: Denial of (Mr. Talbot) 10096 (v).

Questions and Answers, Orally and Written: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 989 (i).

——— Copies given to Press (Mr. Hughes) 900 (i).

——— Procedure *re* Answering orally or written: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 700 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1080 (i).

——— Incomplete Answers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1013 (i).

Restaurant, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 469 (i).

Restaurant and Speaker Rooms, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1085 (i).

Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling: Notice of Motion (Mr. Nantel) 4566 (iii).

Rules of House, Amendment *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10470 (v).

Servants: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Sessional Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).

——— Application *re* Increase of Salary: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5404 (iii).

Sessional Employees of H. of C., Names, Ages, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 980 (i).

Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 926 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* Pianos: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).

——— Purchase of Birds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).

——— Purchase of Glassware: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).

——— Purchasing Gramaphone Records: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).

Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 269 (i).

Speaker of House of Commons, Wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 705 (i).

Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Stationery: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 6171, 6337 (iv).

Translators for H. of C., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7015 (iv).

——— Translation Staff, Promotions: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 527 (i).

Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ottawa Buildings.'

——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4209 (iii).

Victoria Electoral Div., Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 7602 (iv).

Voter's Lists, Preparation of: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10096 (v).

——— On Stmnt. of Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10455 (v).

Voter's Lists in Unorgnized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 9900, 10142 (v).

Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 56.'

Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'

Hudson Bay, Position *re* Hague Award: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 673 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 660 (i).

——— Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 796 (i).

Humber River Bridge, G.T.Ry. Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2885 (ii).

——— Obstruction to Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5403 (iii).

Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Hunting Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 40.'

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'

Hydro-Electric Commission Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1574 (i).

——— Decision of Minister: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1598 (i).

Hydro-Electric Commission, Water Power Lease on Ottawa River: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9430 (v).

———Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9352 (v).

Iberville Bridge Construction: in Com of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Ice Contracts, I.C.R., at Rivière du Loup, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2437, 3853 (ii).

Immigration Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 47, 146.

IMMIGRATION:

Agencies, Can. and G.B.: in Com of Sup., 6047 (iv).

Agents in G. B. and Europe, List, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 981 (i).

———Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5165; Reply (Mr. U. Wilson) 5177 (iii).

Agents: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 4729 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Aliens Outside of Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 7554 (iv).

Amount expended in Belgium and France: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9990 (v).

Amount expended in U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Bonuses paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2436 (ii).

Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. by Govt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 5191 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv).

Chinese Immigration, Total Number, Capita Tax, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 788 (i).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1103 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Investigation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy: Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9594 (v).

——— Censure of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

——— Discussion *re* Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9926 (v).

——— Evidence read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9786 (v).

——— Rep. of Judge Murphy: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9897 (v).

——— Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2738 (ii).

Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4930, 5038 (iii).

Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8308 (v).

Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4470 (iii).

Commission to Agents in Western Canada: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2436 (ii).

Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4828 (iii).

——— Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).

Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8111 (v).

Ennis, D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 3847 (ii).

Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4300 (iii).

Farmers sent to G. B. from Man.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1489 (i).

——— as Immigration Agents: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 799, 1284 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Farm Labourers, O. C. *re* Immigration Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Hickman, W. A., Immigration Agent to G. B.: Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).

Immigration Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 814 (i).

Immigrants, Money Qualifications *re* Operation of Act: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 150 (i).

Immigrants, Number received from Europe, Amount expended &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 809 (i).

——— Number from G. B., U. S. &c., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 807 (i).

Immigration into Eastern Canada: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Immigration, Number since 31st March last to present, &c.: M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 1498 (i).

Immigration Organizations, Cor. with Miss Wileman: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9376 (v).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions in Canada: M. (Mr. Lake) to adjn., 1551 (i).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Lake) 1503 (i).

——— Ruling *re* Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 1551 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 790 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1339 (i).

Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 9994 (v).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 9375 (v).

Medical Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1716 (i).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition into N. W.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5911 (iii).

——— Restrictions re: Remarks (Mr. Thorburn) 6523 (iv).

——— Treatment of, Prohibition into Canada &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 5941 (iv).

See 'Civil Service', 'Coloured' &c.

Premiums by Canadian Govt. for 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Seed Grain for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 3836 (ii).

Statistics, Publication of: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2366, 2556 (ii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Statistics, Publication of: Statement (Mr. (Mr. Oliver) 2557 (ii).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1723 (i).

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6119 (iv).

U. S. Immigration Officers residing in Can. Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1723 (i).

Imperial Conference, Attendance of Prime Minister, Opposition Compromise: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8033 (v).

Imperial Defence Conference, Additional Copies: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2215 (ii).

—— M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 944 (i). 3073 (ii).

—— Navy Defence Papers: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10467 (v).

Imperial Conference Proceedings, Cor. with Mr. Harcourt: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10338; M. to print, 10340 (v).

Imperial Conference, Minister's Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).

Imperial Conference, Precis *re* Conference: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9693 (v).

—— Information *re* Precis Rep. and Further Reps.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9690, 9783 (v).

Imperial Conference, Report *re*, Complete Rep. presented to Parlt.: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10103 (v).

Imperial Conference, Questions to be submitted by Canada: Par. from 'Morning Post' quoted (Mr. Lennox) 4298 (iii).

—— Secretariat Formation: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Foster) 7352 (iv).

Imperial Steamship Co.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Imperial Traction Co.: *See* 'B. No. 102.'

Implements, Agricultural, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1350 (i).

—— Manipulation re Duties: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1358 (i).

—— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 5634 (iii).

Indian Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 95 & 117.'

Indian River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'

INDIANS—

Annuities for Indians, Man. Sask., &c.: in Com. of Sup. 8884 (v).

Bear Indian Reserves, Medical Officer, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3223 (ii).

Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5288 (iii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4304-5 (iii).

—— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).

Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 4301 (iii).

Garden Seeds, Purchase for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1717 (i).

Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

—— Medical Attendance, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6035 (iv).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

Lafferty, Dr. J. D., Payments to *re* Indians N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6046 (iv).

Obabikong Bay and Sabiskong Indian Land, Tenders *re* Burnt Timber: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1344 (i).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages re Fires: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).

——Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1910 (i).

Reserve Lands Outside of Ry. Belt, B.C., Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2678 (ii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Rev. J. McDougall, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bradbury) 1292 (i).

—— Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).

—— Amounts received from Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).

—— Chief Justice Howell's Commission: M. for Copy of Evidence* (Mr. Bradbury) 7039 (iv).

—— Investigation by Rev. Dr. McDougall: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).

—— Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).

—— Original Document, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 8109, 8192 (v).

—— Original Documents before Royal Commission: Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8477 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8356 (v).

—— Rep. in 'Winnipeg Telegram' *re* Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3840; Explanation (Mr. Bradbury) 3841 (ii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Request by Commission for Official Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 9899 (v).

Semmens, Rev. John, Payments to *re* Indians, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6036 (iv).

Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6272 (iv).

Six Nation Indians Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).

—— Act, Demand for Repeal: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 6929 (iv).

—— *See* 'Conciliation.'

Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2927 (ii).

Industrial Training Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3463 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act, French Translation: *See* 'B. No. 132.'

Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9, 35, 117, 153, 154, 157.'

I.C.Ry., Equipment Renewal: *See* 'B. No. 156.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

Accidents, Causes of, Pars. from N. S. Newspapers: Read (Mr. Rhodes) 6676 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Stanfield) 1571 (i).

Advertising Time Tables in Conservative Papers, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).

——*See* 'Printing,'

Air Brake, Triple Valve: in Com of Sup., 5913 (iii)

Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii)

Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation *re* I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Branch Lines, Acquisition of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6768 (iv).

Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extension: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 6158 (iv).

—— *See* 'Moncton.'

Campbellton, Increased Ry. Accommodation in Com. of Sup., 5914, 5983 (iv).

Chatham, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Construction, Letter of Gloucester Farmers Union: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5985 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).

Dismissals from Nov. 1908, Number reinstated &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3666 (ii).

Drawbars for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Eastern Extension: Prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1106 (i).

Excursion Rates *re* Monument National Demonstration in Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1347 (i).

Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).

See 'Special Trains,' 'Truro' &c.

Fire Extinguishers for Passenger Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).

Fredericton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).

Freight Car Service, Complaints, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Freight Rates on Coal &c. in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6156 (iv).

Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriating Scrap Brass, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6664, 7601 (iv).

General Operations: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Grand Narrows Contract: *See* 'Macdonald' &c.

Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton Mile, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5129 (iii).

Halifax, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

Halifax Terminals, Accommodation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2647 (ii).

Halifax Docks: in Com. of Sup., 9561 (v).

Hawke, Mr. John T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

—— *See* 'Moncton.'

Hay Transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5134 (iii).

Highways Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii); 9560 (v).

Ice Contracts at Riviere du Loup, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2437, 3853 (ii).

I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).

I.C.R. and G.T.Ry. Arbitration, Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c.: (Mr. Foster) 3665 (ii).

—— Disputed Questions: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Foster) 4205 (iii).

Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7033 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Macdonald and McLellan, Construction at Grand Narrows, O. Cs., &c. *re* Claims of Contracts, M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5640 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10470 (v).

Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Mail Clerks, allowing Friends to travel in Mail Cars: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

Moncton Extension, Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworking Co., Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6157 (iv).

——— Site purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1291 (i).

——— *See* 'Builders.'

Moncton Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).

——— *See* 'Hawke.'

Moncton, Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (iii).

Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray *re* Tickets: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7031 (iv).

Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2159 (ii).

Petit Rocher, Spur, Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6156 (iv).

Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2152 (ii).

Porters: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 6339 (iv).

Printing, Amounts paid to 'Globe': Corrected Statement (Mr. Graham) 2886 (ii).

——— See 'Advertising.'

Pullman Berths: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iv).

Renewal Equipment, Cor. &c., with Aud. Gen., Stmnts. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 784 (i).

Rolling Stock,: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 8513 (v).

Rolling Stock, &c., Mileage, Value of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3668 (ii).

Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 2436 (ii).

Special Trains *re* Monument National Demonstration: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2996 (ii).

——— *See* 'Excursion.'

Steamer 'Scotia,' New Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute re Grant: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2853 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Traffic Westbound and Eastbound for five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2162 (ii)

Truro, Freight Shed Fire: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Truro Political Meeting, Excursion Train over I.C.R., Instruction to Agents, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).

——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 3343 (ii).

———*See* 'Excursion.'

Windsor Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

Working Expenses: in Com of Sup., 6338 (iv).

Interest Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 146.'

INTERIOR.

Algoma Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4673 (iii).

Aylwin Irrigation Grant, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 6158 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead, Date of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3221 (ii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1284 (i).

Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).

Dominion Lands, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 5553, 5581 (iii).

———Patents for S. E. ¼ of Section 6, Twp. 7, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Stables) 5834 (iii).

——— Sections 11, 12, 14, 22 in Twp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 980 (i).

———S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Applications *re* Entry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 1501 (i).

——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).

Dom. Lands, Timber, Natural Resources &c. of Alberta, Provl. Control of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Herron) 1500 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 2271 (ii).

Dom. Lands in Saskatchewan, Gross Receipts &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3221 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Timber and Mineral Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 2263 (ii).

Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve *re* Homestead Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3446 (ii).

Grazing Leases in Foothills, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1492 (i).

Half-Breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 1912 (i).

Half-Breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malbœuf: M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2161 (ii).

Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3282 (ii).

Homesteads, Applications, Cancellations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).

——— Infractions of Regulations, Punishment &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5561-2 (iii).

Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Homestead Entry of Mr. John Bradley, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).

Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1722 (i).

Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4112 (iii).

Homestead Regulations in B. C., Application *re* Ry. Belt: M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2855 (ii).

Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1907 (i).

Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1284 (i).

Hope Town Lots, Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3846 (ii).

——— Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3068 (ii).

Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).

Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3225 (ii).

Leech, R. E. A., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).

Manitoba Swamp Lands, Concession to Province: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6759 (iv).

New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, grants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Tayloy) 1291 (i).

———*See* 'Timber.'

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 812 (i).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).

Ruddock, Mr. R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B. C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3279 (ii).

School Lands in Alberta, Revenues from, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1488 (i).

School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 800, 1345 (i).

——— Total Acreage, Revenue from Sales: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1911 (i).

School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).

Total Acreage, Amounts realized &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1908 (i).

Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1293 (i).

Seed Grain, Advances to Settlers: in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv), 9551 (v).

——— Indebtedness, Amount *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3225 (ii).

——— Quality and Price: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8041 (v).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Applications for Irrigated Lands Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 803 (i).

Timber Licenses in New Westminster, B.C., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3222 (ii).

——— *See* 'New Westminster.'

Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex., 377 (i).

International Naval Conference, Final Protocol: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 3073 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial.'

International Fisheries Regulations, Mess. from Wash.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6504 (iv).

——— Modifications of: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1803 (i).

——— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7259 (iv).

——— Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 1654 (i).

——— *See* 'Hague.'

International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).

International Ry. Co. and International Traction Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'

International Ry. Traffic, Points of Crossing Boundary &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4466 (iii).

International Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Sir George Gibbons: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4741 (iii).

——— Names of Members, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Macdonell) 4569 (iii).

International Waterways Commission (Lake Erie) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 924 (i).

International Waterways Commission: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 6158 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3470 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3274 (ii).

——— Total Amounts paid since 1896: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3607 (ii).

'Iroquois', Str. Report *re* Wreck: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 7104 (iv).

Irrigation Rights in Boundary Rivers: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Jacques Cartier Census Enumerators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9431 (v).

James Bay Fishing Lease to Arch. McNee, Duration of, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thoburn) 4830 (iii).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

——— *See* 'Indians.'

Japan, Customs Arrangements: *See* 'B. No. 224.'

Japanese Immigration, Application *re* Special Purposes: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1339 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 790 (i).

Japanese Treaty, Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

Jardine, John, Par. in 'Daily Times' *re* Claims on Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3847 (ii).

——— Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 4670 (iii).

——— Payment to by Govt. in excess of Work performed: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5405 (iii).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 804 (i).

'John B. Young' Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2368 (ii).

Johnston, Mary Hamilton, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 140.'

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Judges appointed since 1896, Names, Residence &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8095 (v).

Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Delay in Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 7553 (iv).

——— *See* 'P. E. I.'

Justice, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 469 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i), 6160 (iv).

——— Deputy Minister acting as Counsel for outside Cases: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).

——— *See* 'Bank of Montreal.'

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 39 & 189.

Juvenile Delinquents Act, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 4383 (iii).

Kelly, Robt., Emplymt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2665 (ii).

Kentville Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Crosby) 5548 (iii).

——— Read (Mr. Rhodes) 5749 (iii).

Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, Compassionate Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).

Kettle Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'

King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 804, 1349 (i).

Kingston Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2886 (ii).

Kingston R. M. College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

——— Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Kingston Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Kirkland, Walter Harvey, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7805 (iv).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'

Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3225 (ii).

La Banque International du Canada: *See* 'B. No. 123.'

Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3801 (ii).

——— Conciliation Board: in Com. of Sup., 3378, 3399 (ii).

——— *See* 'G.T. Trainmen.'

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. King) 7 (i).

Labour Dept., Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1484 (i).
'Labour Gazette:' in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii), 6057 (iv).
——— Name on Mailing List: M. for Copy* (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1727 (i).
Labour, Hours of on Govt. Works: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Labour Strikes, Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., *re* Militia: Read (Mr. King) 10344 (v).
——— 'Point of Bayonet': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9784 (v).
——— Militia Interference: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 10345 (v).
——— *See* 'Coal Strikes.'
Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6358, 6410 (iv).
——— Tugs: in Com. of Sup., 6359, 6388 (iv).
Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Lachine Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1907 (i).
Lafferty, Dr. J. D., Payments to, *re* Indians N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6046 (iv).
Lajord Post Office, Change to Accounting Office: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iv).
Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 9994 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 796 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Lake Winnipeg Navigation: Ice-breaker, *re* Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4217 (iii).
Lanctot, Mr. A.: *See* 'Privileges and Elections,' 'Richelieu.'
Land Patents for S.E. ¼ of Section 6, Twp. 7, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5834 (iii).
——— *See* 'Southwest.'
Lands, Timber and Mineral Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).
Land, Timber, Natural Resources, &c. of Alberta, Provl. Control of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Herron) 1500 (i).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Langdon Subdivision of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1346 (i).
L'Ardoise Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
La Sauvegard Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Prime Minister's Birthday, Congratulations (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).
——— Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 9982 (v).
——— See 'Post Office, Ministers' Speeches.' 'Premier', &c.
Leach, R. E. A., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Leamington Postoffice, Cost in Detail, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 9782 (v).
"Le Devoir": *See* 'Drummond', &c.
Legal Agents, appointed by Govt. Precautions *re* acting for Private Parties: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
——— *See* 'Justice'.
Legal Expensese re Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Lethbridge, Speech of Member for Pictou: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Letter Carrier's Boots: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramway System: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1104 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2194 (ii).
Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1488 (i).
Levis Armoury and Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (i).
Levis Dry Dock, Plans filed by Sir Robt. Perks, Subsidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 712 (i).
Library of Parlt., Apptmt. of Mr. O. Souliere: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8789 (v).
——— Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 309 (i).
Lt. Governor, N.S., Apptmt. of, Cor. *re* Director of N. S. Steel & Coal Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2670 (ii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iii).
——— Names of Recipients: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3849 (ii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).

Lighthouse Agencies, Rents: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091, 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse, Construction and Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmts., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 771 (i).
Lime Kiln Crossing Boat: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).
Live Stock Industry and Cold Storage Systems: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1184; Neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).
Lloydminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 529 (i).
Lockmen Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
—— *See* 'Canals.'
Logan, Robert William, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Long Sault Dam, Cor. between Govt. and British Ambassador: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3530 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3228 (ii).
—— on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).
—— Rep. of American Commissioners, Canada's action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).
—— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'
Long Sault Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner at Cochrane, Number of Convictions before: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1568 (i).
Lumber Cargoes Regulations: *See* 'B. Nos. 210 and 212.'
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2157 (ii).
Lunenburg Postoffice, Clock Tower: in Com. of Sup., 1592, 1625 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2359, 2578 (ii).
Lunenburg Post Office Clock, Statement of Chief Architect: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 2360 (ii).
Lymburner Contracts with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
Macdonald & McLellan, Construction Contract, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10470 (v).
—— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Macleod Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3003 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9588 (v).
McClary Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
McGillivray, Judge *re* Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
McGill University, Grant *re* Applied Science: in Com. of Sup., 6445 (iv).
Magazines sent through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv,.
—— *See* 'Post Office.'
Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4301 (iii).
Mail Clerks, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mails delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii) 4667 (iii).
Mail Delivery Free in Towns &c., Conditions: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4925 (iii).
Mails, Illegal Use of for fraudulent Schemes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 802 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1356; ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1364; Statement (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mildlebro) 9538 (v).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mail Service with Allan SS Co.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4428 (iii).
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails: Remarks on M. for Sup (Mr. Emmerson) 9541 (v).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8752 (v).
Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re*: Remarks (Mr. Staples) on M. of Sup., 6201 (iv).
—— Negotiations with Dom. Govt.: M. for Cor *(Mr. Staples) 980 (i).
—— Speech of Prime Min. at Winnipeg re, Cor. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 709 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bradbury) 4207, 5035 (iii).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Man. Grain Act, Inspection &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Man. Legislative Building, Purchase of Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* B. No. 19.'
Man. Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 6505 (iv).
——— Inquiry for O. C. (Mr. Foster) 6915 (iv).
Manitoba Swamp Lands, Concession to Province: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6759 (iv).
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1348 (i).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5131 (iii).
Margaree Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Marieville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4666 (iii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

MARINE:

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 6455 (iv).
Aids to Navigation on St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 799 (i).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1909 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2438 (ii).
'Arctic' Str., Provisions: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
——— Rep. of Capt. Bernier: Inquiry for (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Bay of Fundy Buoy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 6458 (iv).
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* new House: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
——— Lightkeeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3859 (ii).
Callender Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 6497 (iv).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints of Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 661 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Barnard) 785 (i).
'Crissie Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re*: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 9247 (v).
——— Ans. (Mr. Brodeur) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9374 (v).
Declaration of London, Consideration by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5935 (iv).
——— Adoption of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Monk) 3530 (ii).
'Earl Grey' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1972 (ii).
——— Construction: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
'Eureka' Pilotage Boat, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6502-3 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).
——— Winter Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4217 (iii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iii).
——— Names of Recipients: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3849 (ii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Lighthouse, Agencies, Rents: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091, 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse Construction, Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
——— Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmts., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 771 (i).
Lime Kiln Crossing Boat: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 4048 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 7 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase of Ships: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).

Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).

Masters and Mates Examiners Certificates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5821 (iii).

Masters Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Magnetic Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Midland and Tiffin Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1724 (i).

Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2375 (ii).

Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lighthousekeeper, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3465 (ii), 5832 (iii).

Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Pensions for Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).

'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3605 (ii).

Pilotage Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).

Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9782 (v).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyards, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

—— *See* 'Sorel'

Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).

Shipbuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6484 (iv).

Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4467 (iii).

Shipping Registration: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

Shipping List: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 9690 (v).

Shipwrecks on B.C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 7257 (iv).

Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).

Sick Mariners Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9993 (v).

—— Law *re* Payment of Dues: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1904 (i).

Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).

Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Investigation into Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6758 (iv).

—— Buoys stolen, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7216 (iv).

—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7026 (iv).

—— Complaints *re* Thefts: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1088 (i).

—— Dismissal of Mr. A. Senecal: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) 5732 (iii).

—— Instructions to Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7039 (iv).

—— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9994, 10203, 10096 (v).

Sorel Shipyards: Painting Member's House

—— *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'

'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1910 (i).

Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).

Telephone for Life Stations on St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).

Thunder Bay Ice Breaker: in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).

Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2367 (ii).

U.S. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 9247 (v).

Vessels Transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3464 (ii).

Westport Signal Stations, when erected, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1091 (i).

Wharfs for Lighthouse and Coast Service Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (i).

Wireless Telegraph Stations owned by Govt., Locations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Armstrong) 1340 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6457 (iv).

MARINE—*Con.*

Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c., :Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3224 (ii).

Wrecking Plant Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Maritime Mail, Delays *re*, Representations by Board of Trade at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

——— *See* 'Postoffice.'

Maritime Road, Gaspé Shore: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6914 (iv).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Campbell) 4382 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4664 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 5630 (iii), 6119 (iv).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 9375 (v).

Marriage Laws, Parliamentary Powers, Govt.'s Intention: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8585, 10195 (v).

Marriage Laws in Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).

Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Masonic Property stolen in Montreal, Par. in 'Free Press' *re* Apology to Counsel: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Hughes) 7873 (iv).

——— Verdict of Montreal Jury, Counsel's Action: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).

Masters Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Masters and Mates Examiners Certificates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5821 (iii).

Match Factories, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1976 (ii).

Match Factories using Phosphorus, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1717 (i).

Matches of White Phosphorus: See 'B. Nos. 10 and 96.'

Mather Bridge and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1347 (i).

Medical Council Bill, Par. in 'Globe', Correction *re* (Mr. Black) 2991 (ii).

Megantic Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).

Melfort Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Magnetic Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Merchants and Employers Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official at Dalhousie, Member of Town Council: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4044 (iii).

Mergers: *See* 'Industrial.'

Mess. from His Ex., Estimates 1912, Suppl.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8534 (v).

——— Estimates, 1911: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).

Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iv).

Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Conditions: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4043 (iii).

Meteghan Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Mexico Trade: *See* 'Trade Commissioner.'

Meyer, Paulin Verena, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 145.'

Mica Exports 1900 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5290 (iii).

Mica Imports: Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4827 (iii).

Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2142 (ii).

Midland and Tiffin Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

MILITIA:

Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organization of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's connection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7340 (iv).

Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 8699 (v).

——— Number of Officers, Men, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 9352 (v).

Armouries, &c. in Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 1460 (i).

——— *See* 'Drill Halls.'

Baby Farm, Toronto, Sale of, Competition *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2155 (ii).

——— *See* 'Toronto.'

Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re*: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 3606 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii), 6057 (iv).

Bliss, Lt.-Col. D. C., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8100 (v).

B.C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B.C. Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 9248 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Coal Miners Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, 9720 (v).

—— *See* 'Labour.'

Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 9996 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4659 (iii).

—— Apptmnt. of Col. Landry: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lemeiux) 8093 (iv).

—— Cadets from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).

—— Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3608 (ii).

—— Indian Contingent, Par. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6506 (iv).

—— Names of Officers, Cadets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7105 (iv).

—— Naval Cadets, Method of Selection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9986 (v).

—— Regulations *re* Apptmt., Number, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3277 (ii).

—— Regulations *re* Selecting Corps: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4464 (iii).

—— Rule *re* Apptmts: Ques. (Mr Middlebro) 3220 (ii).

—— Selection of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4828 (iii).

Customs Duties *re* Militia: in Com of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Drill Halls, Generally, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Drill Halls, Man., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1975 (ii).

Esquimalt Fort, Removal of Guns: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3220 (ii).

Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 799 (i).

—— Negotiations *re* Transfer: Ques (Mr Paquet) 799 (i).

Eucharistic Congress, Militia in Attendance, Authorization for: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3219 (ii).

—— *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation: Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Middlebro) 9595, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

—— Compensation to: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 658 (i).

—— Number surviving, Pensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1089, 1715, (i).

—— *See* 'Veterans.'

Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase by Man. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).

—— *See* 'Winnipeg.'

MILITIA—*Con.*

French, Gen.: Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).

—— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 76 (i).

Imperial Conference, Military Adviser to, Apptmt. of Mr. S. Hughes: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 9072 (v).

Imperial Defence Committee Report: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 944 (i).

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2886 (ii).

Kingston Military College Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

—— *See* 'R.M.C.'

Labour Strike, Militia Interference: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 10345 (v).

—— Privelege, Ques. of: (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9784 (v).

—— Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P. *re* Militia: Read (Mr. King) 10344 (v).

—— *See* 'Coal.'

Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

Militia Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).

Militia and Agriculture Expenditure from 1867 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9371 (v).

Militia Dept, showing Passes by Members of Parlt.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1090 (i).

—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).

Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 3467 (ii).

Militia Officers: *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Militia Regiments, Number in Montreal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7595 (iv).

Militia Regulation governing Admission to Militia Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 1001 (i).

—— Ques.(Mr. Campbell) 1090 (i).

Militia Supplies, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4667 (iii).

Militia Surveys, Expenditure in each of last five years: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1102 (i).

Militia, Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).

Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse.: Remarks (Mr Crosby) 2261, 2265; Members' remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2262 (ii).

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 3144 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

N.B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).

Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).

Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Association, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7340 (iv).

Pensions to Veterans: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 6915 (iv).

——— *See* 'Veterans.'

Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4465 (iii).

——— Extent of Damage by Fire: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 9090 (v); Remarks (Mr. King) 9250 (v).

Rifle Associations: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

Rockliffe Rifle Ranges, Additional Land purchased: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8994 (v).

——— M. for Cor.*, 8994 (v).

Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own while in England: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1087 (i).

——— Loaned by Can. to G.B. at Bisley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1085 (i).

——— Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9781 (v).

——— Recommendation to British Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).

R.M. College, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

——— College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

——— *See* 'Kingston.'

St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2674 (ii).

Springhill Mines, N.S., Strike: Remarks *re* Militia (Mr. Blain) 2641 (ii).

Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 8583 (v).

Toronto Barracks Site (Baby Farm) Reps., Valuation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 981 (i).

——— *See* 'Baby.'

Veterans, Grants to: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).

Veterans of 1866, Compensation to: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9999 (v).

——— *See* 'Fenians.'

Winnipeg, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).

——— Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase of, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ft. Osborne.'

MILITIA—*Con.*

Winnipeg Rifle Range: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).

——— Sale of, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7343 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-11, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7038 (iv).

——— Value of Export to U.S. for March and April, 1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8790 (v).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream Shipped from Western Ont., Accommodation *re* Handling: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).

Milk River Diversion: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Milk River and St. Mary's River Boundary: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. on Bill, 9101 (v).

Milton Post Office Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1871 (i).

Mineral Deposits, Circular *re* Information by F. H. Forchet: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4305 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Capture of, Return to Can.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4384 (iii).

Mines Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1475 (i).

Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Attack *re* Speech: Personal Explanation (Mr. Hughes) 3352 (ii).

——— Res. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Miller) 3059 (ii).

Ministers of Crown, Absence on Public Business for 1908-10, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1340 (i).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, Acceptance of: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2747, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 118) 2826 (ii).

——— Explanation *re* Discussion (Mr. Boyce) 2438 (ii).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Boyce) 2150, 2254 (ii).

Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2261, 2265; Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2262 (ii).

Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 817 (i).

——— *See* 'Public Works.'

Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 9993 (v).

Minnedosa Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Roche) 3046 (ii).

Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9988 (v).

——— Speech by Sir Richard Cartwright: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 9693 (v).

Mint Operations, Implementing Information: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).
'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1724 (i).
Miramichi Bay, N.B., Dredging Contracts, Specifications, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crocket) 1340 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2556 (ii).
Mississippi, Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 9252 (v).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).
Modus Vivendi Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation &c., Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3065 (ii).
Moncton Armoury: in Com of Sup., 1623 (i).
Moncton Extension, I.C.R., Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworkng Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6157 (iv).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Moncton, Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (iii).
Moncton Station, I.C.R., Site purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1291 (i).
Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1495 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii).
Montreal Customs House Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1340 (i).
Montreal Govt. Appointments since 1st Jan., 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Gervais) 3225 (ii).
Montreal Govt. Weir: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 2065 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 984 (i).
Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Number: Remarks (Mr. M. Martin) 2647 (ii).
Montreal and Maritime Provs., Mails forwarding of: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1861 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Alterations &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1862 (i).
——— Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).
——— Mailing and Registering Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1715 (i).
Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, Excursion Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1347 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2996 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Moodie, Maj. J. D., Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5135 (iii).
Morrison, Nellie Bridgland, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).
Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1104 (i).
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Mounted Police: *See* 'R. N. W. M. P.'
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2149 (ii).
Munderloh & Co., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Murray Canal Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Murray Canal, New Scow: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).
Murray, Dr. C. A., I. C. R. Payments to *re* Tickets: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7031 (iv).
Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Napanee River Dredging, Instructions &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 981 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).
——— Ret.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).
Napierville Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt. by Govt. in Inland Revenue, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2668 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 222.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY:

Changes in Original Specifications &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Change in Structures to the amount of $10,000: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Classification, Arbitration *re*, Rep. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1490 (i).
——— Investigation, Reps.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 4677 (iii).
——— Information *re*: (Mr. Lennox) 6272 (iv), 9995 (v).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Classification: Reductions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9899 (v).

Commission, List of Members of Engineering Staff, who have resigned &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

Construction Work, Change in Concrete used, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1499 (i).

Construction Work, Estimated Quantity, Bridges, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).

Contracts, Estimated Quantities *re*: Ques (Mr. Ames) 1491 (i).

Contracts, Security Deposit, Amount of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1971 (ii).

Contract Work, Delay *re* Execution: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 6668 (iv).

Contractors, Amounts paid on Force Account, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Cost Estimated and Mileage of Fencing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1094 (i).

Customs Duties on Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8583 (v).

Defaulting Contractors, Penalties &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1281 (i).

Eastern Division, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1099 (i); correction of figures (Mr. Graham) 1293 (i).

Eastern Division, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1095 (i).

—— Overbreak, Agreement *re* Progress Estimates: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2434 (ii).

—— Section Houses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1099 (i)

Eastern Division, Total Cost to 31st Dec. 1910, inclusive of Quebec Bridge: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5130 (iii).

—— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9430 (v).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 5136 (iii).

Eastern Div., Total Cost to Dec. 1910: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2434, 3064 (ii).

—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 3144 (ii).

Expenditure, Difference in Amounts in Ret.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4827 (iii).

Expenditure, Estimated Cost of Completion of Winnipeg and Moncton Div.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1727 (i).

G.T.P. taking over Completed Sections, Provision in Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1093 (i).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).

Labour Conditions, Charges *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 8596 (v).

Land Damages, Compensation *re* Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3949 (iii).

Moncton and Winnipeg Contracts, Original Estimates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

N.B. Section, Pusher Grade: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4051 (iii).

—— Standard, Estimated Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4047 (iii).

Payments to: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 1572 (i).

Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1099 (i).

Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N.T.Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2851 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Moncton Div., Completion of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1711 (i).

Shops, Plans and Specifications for Machinery: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1569 (i).

—— Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2157 (ii).

Temiskaming and Northern Ry., Agreement *re* Running Rights: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2435 (ii).

Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5135 (iii).

Total Expenditure to 31st Dec. 1910, Estimated Cost of Winnipeg and Moncton Section: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1497 (i).

Train Hauled Filling, Payments *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Western Div., Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7591 (iv).

National Weekly Indemity Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Natural Resources, &c.: in Sask. and Alberta, Provincial Control, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).

Naval Policy of Govt.: *See* 'Address.'

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA:

Applications from Canadian and British Navy: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1339 (i).

Boot Contract, Tenders, Patterns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2675 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1723 (i).

'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1279 (i).

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA—*Con.*

'Bristol' Type, Building of Cruiser: Remarks (Mr. Nantel) 196 (i).

Canadian Navy *re* Home Rule: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1461 (i).

Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity per Day: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv). (iv).

Construction, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8355 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers. &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 9375 (v).

Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 805 (i)

Date and Port of Sailing of Niobe and Rainbow: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1091 (i).

English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1080 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1093 (i)

Expenditure *re*: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5638 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 4471 (iii)

——— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) 4659 (iii).

International Naval Conference, Final Protocol: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 3073 (ii).

Medical Examiners *re* Recruits: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 8991 (v).

Naval Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt. in'Navy': Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 793 (i).

Naval Defence Proposals: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 34 (i)

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).

Naval Defence. Govt. Proposals: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Address, 112, Amt. 133, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651 (i).

——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Amt., 228, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649 (i).

Naval Service Dept., Names of Employees Domicile, Duties assigned, Salaries, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).

Navy Act, Rules and Regulations: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1499 (i).

——— Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4665 (iii).

Navy Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (i).

'Niobe', Contracts *re* Provisions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).

——— Date of laying Keel, Repairs in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).

——— Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re*: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 530 (i).

——— statement : read (Mr. Brodeur) 664 (i).

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow', Cost to Date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 791 (i).

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA—*Con.*

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 792 (i).

——— Gun Practice, Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv)

——— Loan by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 983 (i).

—— Names of Officers: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 9090 (v).

——— Par. in Naval Annual *re* Scrapping of Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 931 (i).

——— Speed, Result of Official Trials: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).

'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price Paid, &c.: Ques (Mr. Monk) 788 (i).

——— Guns, Type, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1490 (i).

——— Listed as ineffective: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1070 (i).

——— Struck off effective List: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1081 (i).

Recruiting by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).

——— Regulations, O. C. *re* Remuneration &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).

Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 799 (i).

Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).

——— Approval of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1288 (i).

——— Preparation of Answer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1351 (i).

Ships ordered by Govt.: Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press': Remarks (Mr. Monk) 866 (i).

Tenders for Cruisers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

Total Cost of Cruisers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 791 (i).

Navigable Waters, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 178.

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2375 (ii).

Neepawa Postoffice Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition into N. W.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5911 (iii).

——— Restrictions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thorburn) 6523 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 5941 (iv).

——— *See* 'Civil Service.'

Nelson Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

Nelson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'

Netherland Loan Co., Cor. between Mr. Preston and Dom. Govt.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 3142 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5639 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 7349 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co., Investments in Canada, Rep. of Mr. W. T. R. Preston *re* : M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 776 ; Prop Res. (Mr. Monk) 781 (i).
——— Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, Cor. with Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 789 (i).
——— Statement by Mr. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2669 (ii).
N.B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
New Edinboro', N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1283 (i)
Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).
Newfoundland, North Atlantic Fisheries, &c.: *See* 'Hague.'
New Harmony Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6084 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept.: M. for Copies.* (Mr. Wallace) 5136 (iii).
——— Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5830 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7556 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Walsh *re* : Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10474; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 79) 10532 (v).
Newmarket Canal : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Newspaper Special Train, Cost of Operation : Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9982 (v).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, Grants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D.Taylor) 1291 (i).
New Westminster Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries: M. for Cor. (Mr. J D. Taylor) 2183 (ii).
Niagara Falls Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5132 (iii).
——— Regulations *re* : Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) 8890 (v).
——— Treaty Obligations, &c., Par. in Press: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8791 (v).
Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).
Nicolet Post Office, Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8789 (v).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
——— Pet. re Annex: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract re : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).
'Niobe' Cruiser, Contracts *re* Provisions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).
——— Date of laying Keel, Repairs in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).
——— Gun Practice, Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (v).
——— Names of Officers: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 9090 (v).
——— Speed, Result of Official Trials: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).
——— Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re*: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 530 (i).
——— statement: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 664 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service.'
Nominingue Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
North Atlantic Collieries, Application *re* Conciliation Board: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 3947 (ii).
——— Protest *re* Nomination on Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 4209 (iii).
——— *See* 'Labour.'
North Bay; Burk's Falls and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Arthurs) 981 (i).
——— Information *re* (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2556 (ii).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of by Govt. Assistance: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 6767 (iv).
North Shore Tax Payers and Voting at Federal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1082 (i).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2435 (ii).
Northumberland, East Riding, Opposition to Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen) 6767 (iv).
Northwest Fishing Co.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5630 (iii).
See 'Markey.'
N. W. Ter. School Lands, Complete Procedure *re* Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 800 (i).
N. W. M. Police, Coronation Contingent, Number, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 5836 (iii).

N. W. M. Police, Loss of Men on Macpherson Yukon Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7254 (iv).
Northwest Scrip to Old Settlers, Refusal of Claims &c.: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1293 (i).
North York, Challenge *re* Contest Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7220 (iv).
N. S. Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction in Digby County: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 657 (i).
Oaths of Office: B. No. 1, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, *pro forma*, 1 (i).
Obabikong Bay and Sabiskong Indian Land, Tenders *re* Burnt Timber: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1344 (i).
Objections *re* Interruptions Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (iii).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii), 6089 (iv).
Offensive Weapons: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Offensive Weapons, Pets. *re* Legislation: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 3064 (ii).
——— Sale of, Par. in Montreal Papers: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2557 (ii).
Official Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
Okanagan Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Oleomargarine, Admission of Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6504, 6668 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges Against *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. 8309; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 8309-14, Neg. (Y. 69; N. 102) 8347; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8348, Neg. (Y. 65; N. 99) 8353 (v).
——— M. for Com. *re* Investigation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8791 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8032 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8092 (v).
——— Inquiry for Meeting of Com. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9899 (v).
Ontario and Abitibi Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6157 (iv).
——— *See* 'Fisheries'
Ont., Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.: *See* B. No. 76.'
Ontario-Michigan Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Ont. and Minnesota Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B No. 109.'
Ont. Northern and Timagimi Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. Nos. 13, 22, 97.'
Orders Discharged (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4464 (iii).
Orders Dichharged: M. (Mr. Macdonell) 4464 (iii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead, Member asked to withdraw Word 'Liar' (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 5561 (iii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Oshawa Customs Collector, Retirement of Mr. Blamey: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3225 (ii).
Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'cn., Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Fowke) 5747 (iii).
Ottalie Stream, N. B., Public Works, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1287 (i).
Ottawa Buildings: Elevators &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
——— Excessive Rentals by Govt., Censure *re*: Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2271; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 104) 2358 (ii).
——— Furniture &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590, 3162 (ii), 6027 (iv).
——— Improvement Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2004, 3672 (ii).
——— Lavatories: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).
——— Lighting Contract: in Com. of Sup., 3173 (ii).
——— McGillivray's Contract: in Com of Sup., 5993 (iv).
——— Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted by: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1280 (i).
——— New Leases, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1281 (i).
——— Parlt. Grounds, Pavement: in Com. of Sup., 2593, 2602 (ii).
——— *See* 'Parliament.'
——— Pavements &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).
——— Plaza, 6507 (iv).
——— Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3170 (ii), 8872 (v).
——— Sanitary Condition of City, Rep. of Dr. Hodgetts: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5535 (iii).
——— Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement *re* Installation: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1350 (i).
——— Steel Cases: in Com. of Sup., 2582 (ii).
——— Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Alterations in Plans: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 2075 (ii); Plans laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 4824 (iii).
——— Sussex St. Deptl. Block: in Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii)
——— Victoria Museum: *See* 'Victoria.'
Ottawa City Health Conditions: Amt. (Mr. Lewis) to Com. of Sup., 6367 (iv).
Ottawa City, Typhoid Epidemic, Criticism of: Remarks: Explanation (Mr. Black) 4720 (iii).

Ottawa City Typhoid Epidemic, Pollution of City Water: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4475 (iii).
—— Prorogation of House: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4676 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Black) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' 4656 (iii).
—— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).
—— Water Supply for Parlt. Buildings, *re* Typhoid Epidemic: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2004 (ii).
Ottawa City, Woods and Canadian Buildings, Cancellation of Contracts *re* Heating and Elevators: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Cor. with Mr. Ellis and City Council: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3672 (ii).
—— Date of last Cheque paid to Imperial Realty Co. for Lighting: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1279 (i).
—— Lighting Contract with Electric Co.: in Com. of Sup., 3175 (ii).
—— Inaccurate Answer: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 999 (i).
—— Contract with Imperial Realty Co. *re* Lighting &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. S. Sharps) 3948 (ii).
—— Stmnt. *re* Discrepancy in Figures (Mr. Pugsley) 1011 (i).
—— *See* 'Public Works.'
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Ottawa River and Carillon Water Power, Leases &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 9994 (v).
Ottawa, Beaver or Steam Trawling in Northumberland Strait: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 980 (i).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2852 (ii).
Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 10337 (v).
Owl's Head Harbour, Pet. *re* Light: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3465 (ii).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Warburton) 714 (i).
Pacific and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Pacific, Northern and Omenica Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Pacific and Peace Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Pages, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Association, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7340 (iv).
Paper Imports into U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).
—— *See* 'Pulp.'
Parcel Post between Canada and G. B. Colonies, &c., Loss *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 805 (i).
Parcel Post, Express Rates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 9930 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9909 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5934 (iv).
Paris Agency: in Com of Sup., 8694 (v).
Paris Exposition, 1900, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 7602 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6768, 7023 (iv).
—— *See* 'Ottawa.'
—— Water Supply, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7345 (iv).
Parliament, Opening and Closing Dates from 1896 to 1910: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 786 (i).
—— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1805 (i).
Parliament, Opening of: Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parliament Site, Winnipeg, Reservation in Crown Grants, &c.: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. A. Haggart) 7039 (iv).
—— *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.
Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).
—— Instructions to Officials *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Rhodes) 1727 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 8535 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Parry Sound Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Pasqua's Indian Reserves, Claims for Damages re Fires: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).
—— *See* 'Indians.'
Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Patent Relief: *See* Bills Nos. 43, 165, 187, 188 203.
Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
Peace River Water Belt: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Peat Gas, Generating Electric Power, Process, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 708, 985 (i).
Pecuniary Claims Convention, *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 802 (i).
Peel County Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7247 (iv).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'

Pelagic Sealing Conference: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (v).
—— Treaty between G. B. and U. S. *re* Protection to: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3670 3769, 3839 (ii).
—— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1090 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Penny Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 221'.
Pensions for Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).
Pensions to Veterans: Remarks (Mr. G. V White) 6915 (iv).
—— See 'Militia'.
Peoples Ry. Co.: See 'B. No. 110'.
Percy Aylwin Irrrigation Grant, O. Cs.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 6158 (iv).
——*See* 'Interior'
Peterborough Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 5750 (iii).
Peterborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2603 (ii).
Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4465 (iii).
—— Extent of Damage by Fire: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 9090; Remarks (Mr. King) 9250 (v).
Petewawa Wharf: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Petit Rocher Spur, I. C. R., Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6156 (iv).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April 1910: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6267 (iv).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3605 (ii).
Pickford and Black, SS Service between Can. and W. Indies, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 4465 (ii).
—— *See* 'W. Indies.'
Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2152 (ii).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons, Imported: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1721 (i).
Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4828 (iii).
Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).
Pilotage Fees on Coal Barges: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Pilotage Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).
Pilotage Rules: See 'B. No. 155.'
Plains of Abraham, Battlefield: *See* 'B. No. 222'.
Plaza, Ottawa, Removal of Poles: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6507 (iv)
—— *See* 'Ottawa.'
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 3223 (ii).
Poachers Fishing on Pacific Coast, Par. in Victoria Daily Colonist: Remarks (Mr. Bernard) 1458 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9782 (v).
Poisons, Sales of: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Porcupine, Disasters by Fire, Aid to: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 9694 (v).
——Remarks (Mr. W. R. Smyth) 9635 (v).
—— Request for Tents, Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 9983 (v).
Pork Packing Industry, Delegation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Blain) 3530 (ii).
Portage le Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (iv).
Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
Port Credit, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
—— Public Works, Expenditures for 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5638 (iii).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1101 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Port Mulgrave, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8786 (v).
Port Perry Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 985 (i).
Post Office Act Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Post Office Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 216.'

POST OFFICE:

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie Post Office Revenues: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 980 (i).
Allan SS. Co. Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4428 (iii).
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Rhodes) 2161 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).
Austin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Aylmer Post Office Revenue for 1908-9, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 984 (i).

Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).

Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

Birch Grove Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 6073 (iv).

Bonaventure River, Quebec, and N.B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v); M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).

Canada and Japan Mail Subsidy: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1802 (i).

Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8994 (v).

Chemin Gouin Postmaster, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7038 (iv).

——— A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames, 7210 iv).

Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and Inefficient Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).

Coronation Stamps: Inquiry *re* (Mr. Armstrong) 9247 (v).

——— *See* 'Stamps.'

Collingwood Corner, Postmaster, Name Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase in Salary: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).

Curren, R. C., Gratuity *re* Post Office Service: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3948 (ii).

Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4669 (iii).

Donland Post Office, Removal of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 9994 (v).

Don Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).

Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3470 (ii).

Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8993 (v).

English Mail Service to Maritime Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8792 (v).

——— *See* 'Mails,' &c.

Escott Postmaster, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

——— Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).

——— Postmaster's Salary, Date of Increase: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).

Fergus Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Stratton) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcations, Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1566 (i).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Free Delivery of Mail: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1285 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4925 (iii).

Gaspé Mail Service, Revenue *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3854 (ii).

Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7038 (iv).

Guysborough 'Times,' Application *re* Postal Privileges: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6505 (iv).

Halifax Post Office Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).

——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).

Hall's Prairie P.O., Pets. *re* Location, Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3468 (ii).

Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8991 (v).

Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Lajord Post Office, Change to Accounting Office: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).

Langdon Subdivision of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1346 (i).

Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 9782 (v).

Letter Carrier's Boots: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).

Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramway System : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1104 (i).

Letter Carriers in New Westminster, Free Transportation on Tramways: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2194 (ii).

Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1488 (i).

Magazines sent through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).

——— *See* 'U. S.'

Mails delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii), 4667 (iii).

Mails, Illegal Use of for fraudulent Schemes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 802 (i).

Mails used Illegally for Lottery Schemes &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1356 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mails Used Illegally for Lottery Schemes, &c.: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1364; Stmnt. (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).

—— *See* 'Sheldon.'

Mail Service to Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 9541 (v).

——Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

—— *See* 'English.'

Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 9538 (v).

—— *See* 'Rural.'

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8752 (v).

Meteghan Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Ministers Speeches distributed by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9253 (v).

—— Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9071 (v).

Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Number: Remarks (Mr. M. Martin) 2647 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Mailing and Registering Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1715 (i).

Montreal and Maritime Provs., Forwarding of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).

Neepawa Post Office Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Nelson Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

New Harmony Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6084 (iv).

Newspaper Special Train, Cost of Operation: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9982 (v).

Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

—— Pet. *re* Annex: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

—— Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8789 (v).

N. S. Post Office Service, Weekly and Biweekly, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 982 (i).

Parcel Post between Canada and G. B., Colonies, &c., Loss *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 805 (i).

Parcel Post System, Express Rates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 9930 (v).

—— Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5934 (iv).

——Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9909 (v).

Parrsboro Post Office: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 8535 (v).

Peel County Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7247 (iv).

—— Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10355 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Postal Clerks, Superannuation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4284 (iii).

Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 1104 (i).

Postal Regulations, Distribution of short date Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10340 (v).

Postmasters' Association, Pets. *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

Postmaster General's Mission to Rome, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3606 (ii).

Postmasters' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4289 (iii).

—— Increase to, Classification of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5934 (iv).

Post Office Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).

Post Office Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

Post Office Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Post Office Buildings: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3954 (iii).

Post Office Collections, Revenues in Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3862 (ii).

Post Office and Customs Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4673 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

—— Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

—— Estimates *re* Mail Service, Objection (Mr. Perley) to Passing, 4296 (iii).

—— Money Orders, Printing of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1101 (i).

—— Outside Service, Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

—— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6178 (iv).

—— Overcrowding in Basement: Ques. Mr. Sproule) 6667 (iv).

—— Post Office Matters, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

—— Promotions and Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10469 (v).

—— Revenue and Expenditure: Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 10335 (v).

—— Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1568 (i).

—— Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1282 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3067 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7109 (iv).

——— *See* 'Stamps.'

Railway Mail Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4285 (iii), 6179 (iv).

——— Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

——— Accidents to, Grants *re* Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3859 (ii).

——— Compensated for Accidents, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9537 (v).

——— Examinations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).

——— Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).

——— Names and Date of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3855 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerk's Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service Bill 217."

Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4673 (iii).

Roberval Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

'Review of Reviews,' Collection of Extra Postage: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).

Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10365 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards, Manufacture of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).

——— *See* 'Mail Routes,' 'Peel,' &c.

Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 983 (i).

——— Number operating in Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1105 (i).

——— Routes, Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 983 (i).

Rural Postmasters: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).

St. Johns Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir': Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1089 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Ste. Marie de Monnoir Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6505 (iv).

Selkirk Post Office Box: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Shelburne Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Sheldon, Mr. C. D., Illegal Use of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).

——— Action of Govt. *re* Returning to Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

——— *See* 'Mails,' &c.

Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).

Stamps, New Issue by P.O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

——— Canadian Design: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 7106 (iv).

——— Condemnation *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 9990 (v).

——— Prize *re* Best Design, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 5402 (iii).

——— Refusal of Imperial Design: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6908 (iv).

——— *See* 'Coronation,' 'Quebec,' &c.

Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (iii).

Tilbury, &c., Post Office Revenue at, for 1904-10: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 807 (i).

——— *See* 'Walkerville.'

Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3466 (ii).

Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Changes *re* Specifications: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 805 (i).

Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).

U. S. Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 984 (i).

———*See* 'Magazines.'

Walkerville Post Office Building and Mail Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) *re* Staff, 2559 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).

——— *See* 'Tilbury.'

Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders re: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1103 (i).

Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used: Ques. Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Windsor, N.S., Letter Carriers, Salary: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

Potato Barrels, Standard Size: *See* 'B. No. 9.'

Potato Bushel, Standard Weight: *See* 'B. No. 153.'

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6271 (iv).

Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3067 (ii).

Precedence at Official Receptions: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (i).

——— *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 812 (i).

——— *See* 'Interior.'

Preferential Tariff Concessions granted to G. B.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Premier's Return from Conference, Reception, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9780 (v).

——— *See* 'Laurier, Sir W.'

Prime Minister's Tour through the West: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 45 (i).

Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Reciprocity and Editorials in 'Christian Guardian': Read (Mr. Thornton) 9072 (v).

P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 1501 (i).

P. E. I. and G. B., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8788 (v).

P. E. I. Ry.—Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

P. E. I. Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6923, 7553 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7428, 7803 (iv) 8355 (v).

P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 3863, 3917 (ii).

P. E. I. Supreme Court, Apptmt. of Judges: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorials, Reps., &c., *re* Survey; M. for Copies (Mr. Richards) 2176 (ii).

P. E. I. Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 2677 (ii).

Prince Rupert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8787 (v).

Printing Bureau Boilers: in Com. of Sup., 2361, 2582 (ii).

Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3606 (ii).

Printing Bureau Investigation: M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7687, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 92) 7801 (iv).

——— Distribution of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1364 (i).

——— Evidence under Oath, Printing, &c., Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2672 (ii).

——— Irregularities, Money Loss, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 794 (i).

——— Number of Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. Taylor) 708 (i).

——— Paper purchased, Inspection of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2373 (ii).

——— Investigation, Report of: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 8; M. to print, 8 (i).

——— Printing of: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1351 (i).

Printing, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 309 (i).

Private Bills: M. to extend Time (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1454 (i).

——— Second Readings: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 8641 (v).

Privileges and Elections Com., 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. German) 6756 (iv).

Privileges and Elections Com., Charges *re* Mr. A. Lanctot: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7873; Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7889, Neg. (Y. 56, N. 98) 8030 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Molloy) *re* Absence from his seat in the House, 1353 (i).

——— *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com.: (Mr. Lennox) 990 (i).

——— (Mr. Geo. Taylor) *re* Labour Strikes, 9784 (v).

——— (Mr. Best) *re* Members paying for Speeches, 1355 (i).

——— *re* Montmagny Electors, (Mr. Roy) Correction in Hansard, 1356 (i).

——— *re* Speech by Member for Dauphin as to Selection of Capital for Saskatchewan (Mr. Neely) 5620 (iii).

——— Telegram delayed, &c: (Mr. Gilbert) 1456 (i).

Privy Council, Clerkships: in Com. of Sup., 8750 (v).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

Protection Service *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).

——— *See* 'Fisheries.'

Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen's. Rep. to Committee, 527, 818; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 823; Amt. to Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 827; Agreed to (Y. 98; N. 74) 864 (i).

Public Accounts Committee: Meetings and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 309 (i).

——— Proposed Amendment (Mr. Lennox) Notice *re*, 696 (i).

Public Buildings, Erection of and Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lalor) 4319 (iii).

Public Buildings in former Estimates, Precedence over new ones: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Public Buildings: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 5541 (iii).

Public Buildings for Post Offices, &c., Number, Expenditure &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7347 (iv).

Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).

——— Total Cost for several Years: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii); Ques. of Order *re* Discussion (Mr. Pugsley) 2101; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2101 (ii).

Public Work Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Public Works, Expenditure generally: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).

Public Works promised during Western Tour: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:

Advertising Govt. Works, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).

Alien Labour Law, Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 10367 (v).

Amaguadees Pond, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 9500 (v).

Ancona Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Argyle Sound, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).

Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

Assiniboine Floods, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii).

——— River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Athens Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2088 (ii).

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Aylmer, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Banff Park Water Works: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).

Bathurst Dredging Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 803, 1285 (i).

Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2970 (ii).

——— Cor.: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3005 (ii).

——— Further Cor.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).

Belleville Docking Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Big Bay Point Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiation with U. S. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1575 (i).

Bracebridge Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Brantford Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1655 (i).

Bronte Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).

Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).

Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

——— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

——— Draping for His Maj.'s Death: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

——— Electric Power: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).

——— Rents, Engineers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).

Buildings, Que., General Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).

——— Yukon, Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3214 (ii).

Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sealey) 7341 (iv).

——— Remarks on Question (Mr. Sealey) 7348 (iv).

Calgary Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Campbellton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1905 (i).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8983 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Chatham, N.B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

——— Purchase of Site, Name of Owners: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).

Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (ii).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).

Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).

Cribbins Point Wharf: in Com of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 4383 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii).

Digby Public Works, Expenditures *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for Current Year: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).

Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 2105 (ii).

Duncan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Dunnville Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).

Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International': M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1498 (i).

East Chezzetcook Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 813 (i).

——— *See* 'Gaspereaux.'

Elbow and Bow Rivers Water Power, Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. McCarthy) 1501 (i).

Elora Post Office, Site, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 6505 (iv).

Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Essex Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2110 (ii).

Experimental Farms Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3157 (ii).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Fire Escapes for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3160 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P.W. Dept. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 2648 (ii).

Fort William Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fredericton Public Building, Pavement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

French River Dam: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).

Gananoque Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i).

Gaspereau Harbour Dredging Contracts: Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).

Gaspé Shore, Maritime Road: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Georgetown Public Building Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).

Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Water Filters &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).

Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 7806 (iv).

Halifax Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).

——— Citadel, New Quarters: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).

Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1339 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).

——— N. S., Estimates to be Voted for Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9501 (v).

Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Hartland Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).

Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 930 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge, P. E. I., Montreal, purchased, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings *re* Com: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3280 (ii).

Humbolt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Iberville Bridge Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Immigration Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 804 (i).

Kingston Postoffice Building: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Knight's Point Breakwater, P. E. I., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7805 (iv).

Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).

L'Ardoise Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).

Levis Armoury and Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (i).

Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lloydminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).

Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (ii).

Lunenburg, N. S., Dredging, Plans re: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2157 (ii).

Lunenburg, Public Building, Clock Tower: in Com. of Sup., 1592, 1625 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2359 (ii).

——— Statement of Chief Architect: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 2360 (ii).

——— Specifications *re* Tower Clock: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2578 (ii).

Macleod Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3003 (ii).

——— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9588 (v).

Maisonneuve Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).

Margaree Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Marieville Public Building, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4666 (iii).

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1347 (i).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1710, 1860 (i).

Melfort Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Condition: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4043 (iii).

Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2142 (ii).

Milton Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1871 (i).

Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 9993 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Roche) 3046 (ii).

Miramichi Bay, N. B., Dredging Contracts, Specifications, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crocket) 1340 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2556 (ii).

Mississippi, Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 9252 (v).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).

Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1623 (i).

Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1495 (i).

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i), 2567 (ii).

Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1861 (i).

Montreal Postoffice, Alterations &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1862 (i).

——— Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2149 (ii).

Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, Instructions &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wilson) 981 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).

Napierville Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).

Nelson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1283 (i).

Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).

Nomininigue Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).

North Bay, Burks Fall and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Arthurs) 981 (i).

——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2556 (ii).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2435 (ii).

N. S. Wharfs and Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).

——— Contracts *re* Constructions in Digby County: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 657 (i).

Okanagan Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Ottalie Stream, N.B., Public Works, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1287 (i).

Ottawa City, Dom. Buildings, Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590 (ii).

——— Deptl. Steel Cases: in Com. of Sup., 2582 (ii).

——— Lavatories: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).

——— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2583 Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2553 (ii).

——— Woods Building, Lighting Contract, Cor. with Mr. Ellis and City Council: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3672 (ii)

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3948 (ii).

See 'Ottawa.'

Ottawa River and Carillon Water Power, Leases, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 9994 (v).

Ottlecock Dam, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2852 (ii).

Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 10337 (v).

Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).

——— Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

——— Instructions to Officials *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Rhodes) 1727 (i).

Parry Sound Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

Petawawa Wharf: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Peterborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2603 (ii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6267 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).

Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (iv).

Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).

Port Credit Public Works, Expenditure for 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5638 (iii).

Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1101 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

Port Perry Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).

Postoffice Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

——— Inquiry for Rets,. 4567. 5541 (iii).

Postoffice Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).

Postoffice Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

Prince Rupert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of and Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lalor) 4319 (iii).

Public Buildings in former Estimates, Precedence over new ones: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Public Buildings, Plans approved by Depts. previous to Aug. 5th, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 698 (i).

Public Buildings for Postoffices, &c., Number, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7347 (iv).

Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in of Sup., 1669 (i).

Public Buildings, Total Cost for several Years: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Discussion (Mr. Pugsley) 2101: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2101 (ii).

Public Works, Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1032 (i), 5993 (iv).

——— Travelling Expenses: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8356, 9071 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Objection to Vote in full: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).

Public Works Estimates, Quebec, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com of Sup., 1639 (i).

Public Works, Expenditures generally: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).

Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'Hours.'

Public Works promised during Western Tour: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).

Public Works, Supply for: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 10354 (v).

Quebec City Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3017 (ii).

Rigaud Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 3067 (ii).

Rivière des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

——— Rep. of Engineer &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2161 (ii).

——— M. for Copy (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2162 (ii).

Rock Island Building: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).

St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).

——— Sums for Completion: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1508 (i).

St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3608 (ii).

St. Catharines Drill Hall Site: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).

St. Croix River, N.B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1348 (i).

St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i), 4666 (iii).

St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).

St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1624 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).

St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5631 (iii).

——— Quantity of Material taken out by Maritime Dredging Co. under Beacon Bar Contract: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5129 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, completed, &c.: Ques, (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).

——— Rental of Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2673, 3065 (ii).

St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1894 (i).

——— Option *re* Lands: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2677 (ii).

——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2577 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 10509 (v).

Ste. Marie Division Post Office, Defective Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10336 (v).

St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf &c., Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247, 7344 (iv).

Ste. Therese Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1715 (i).

Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).

Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditures, &c.: (Mr. Boyce) 1349 (i).

Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4825 (iii).

Sharbot Lake Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).

Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).

Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).

Summerside Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).

Swan Creek Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2159 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, Sask. and Alberta, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).

——— Post Office, Temporary Building: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 8984 (v).

Tignish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).

Tilbury Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).

Tilbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).

——— *See* 'Walkerville.'

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Toronto Barracks, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7557 (iv).

—— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2153 (ii).

—— *See* 'Militia.'

Toronto Federal Buildings, Plans of Erection: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8479 (v).

Tillsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).

Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1084 (i).

—— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9782 (v).

Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2630 (ii).

Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).

Vegreville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2633 (ii).

Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1101 (i).

Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2634 (ii).

Water Powers owned by the Dom., Legislation *re* Regulation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7803 (iv).

Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 9780 (v).

West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 811 (i).

West Dublin Bay, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).

Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).

Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

Weymouth Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).

Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).

Wiarton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 6272 (iv).

Wingham Public Building Tower Clock, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6664 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Winnipeg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018, 3029 (ii).

Winnipeg River, Water Rights, Grants, Leases, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 2162 (ii).

Wolfe Island, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

—— Protection to Road: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).

Yarmouth, Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).

—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).

Pullman Berths, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iv).

Pulp and Paper Duties, Par. in New York 'Herald': Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2638 (ii).

—— Information *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2646 (i).

—— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4468 (iii).

Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Paterson) 5126 (iii).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Pure Foods: *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Quaker Oats Co., Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 4120 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 7245 (iv).

Quarantine, Animals Health: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Quarantine, Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iv).

Quarantine Stations, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3213 (ii).

Que. Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 222.'

Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8788 (v).

Quebec Boundaries, Cor. with Ont. and Dom. Govts., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 981 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re* Contract: M. for Copies (Mr. Lennox) 713 (i).

—— Advertisement *re*: M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 1497 (i).

—— Tenders *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Lennox) 3068 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 697 (i).

—— British Empire Bridge Co.'s Deposit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9981 (v).

Quebec Bridge, Caisson, Damage to, Claims *re*:Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4045 (iii).
—— Carriage Way, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9979 (v).
—— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Emplymt. of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection: Ques. Mr. Lennox) 6663 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Construction, Information re: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4319 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Contract with M. P. Davis, dated July 27th 1903, Transfer of same to Govt, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman, Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4205 (iii).
—— Contract *re* Reconstruction: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4740 (iii).
—— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2667 (ii).
—— Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donelly) 3278 (ii).
—— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8102 (v).
—— Fair Wage Clause *re* Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6757 (iv).
—— Fair Wage Clause, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5835 (iii).
—— Financial Loan, Interest &c.: (Mr. Lennox) 4665 (iii).
Quebec Bridge and Labour Organizations: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 7039 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Members of Construction Board: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9981 (v).
—— Payment of $100,000 with Phœnix Bridge Co.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 981 (i).
—— Plans, Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6273 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Price) 7103 (iv).
—— Approval by Chief Engineer of G. T. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4826 (iii).
—— Specifications, Instructions *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lennox) 4677 (iii).
Quebec Bridge River Bed, Tests, &c., Investigations: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 658 (i).
—— Superstructure Contract, Letting of: Announcement (Mr. Graham) 6669 (iv).
—— Supervision, Amount expended: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6671 (iv).
—— Supervisor, Remuneration by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6449 (iv).
—— Tunnel Construction, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).
Quebec Civil Servants, Names of Permanent and Temporary Employees since 1st Jan. 1905, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lachance) 2376 (ii).
Quebec, Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8992 (v).
Quebec and Great Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2851 (ii).
—— Number *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2436 (ii).
Quebec Members, Revolt against extra session, Newspaper Articles: Denial of (Mr Talbot) 10096 (v).
Quebec , Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Que. and N. B. Ry: Co.: See 'B. No. 120.'
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Que. Savings Banks Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 219.'
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7109 (iv).
Questions, Answering orally or written, Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 700 (i).
Questions and Answers, Orally and Written: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 989 (i).
—— Copies given to Press (Mr. Hughes) 900 (i).
Questions answered orally: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1080 (i).
Questions, Incomplete Answers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1013 (i).
Questions and Motions proposed to be Introduced: Notice of (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1502 (i).
Questions of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Mr. Pugsley's Public Record, 10202 (v).
Ques. of Priv., Charges *re* Obtaining Lumber for Govt. Stores (Mr. Lanctot) 8695 (v).
—— *See* 'Privileges and Elections Com.'
Ques. of Privilege, Cor. *re* Connection with Riordan Paper Co. and Reciprocity (Mr. Perley) 10197 (v).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Rabies, Outbreak of, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Racial and Religious Prejudices, Liberal Pamphlets, Quotations &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Address, 531 (i).
Race Track Gambling: M. to print Evidence (Mr. Miller) 10467 (v).
Ry. Accidents, Inquests: *See* 'B. No. 2.'

Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 4, 8, 23, 78, 197.'
Rys. and Canals Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Ry. Act Amt. (1903), c. 31, Proclamation *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).
Ry. Water Belt in B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Railway Commission, Apptmt. of French Canadian: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1103 (i).
Ry. Commission's Powers: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Railway Committee: M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of House, 10190 (v).
——— M. to sit during sessions of the House (Mr. Guthrie) 9226 (v).
Ry. Employees, Forthnightly Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
Ry. Employees, Permission to Vote: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Ry. Employees, Protection: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Ry. Locomotive Boilers, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Railway Mail Clerks, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4285 (iii), 6179 (iv).
——— Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
——— Compensated for Accidents, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9537 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3859 (ii).
——— Examinations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).
——— Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).
——— Names and Dates of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3855 (ii).
Railway Mail Clerks Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service Bill 217.'

RAILWAYS:

Accidents *re* Canadian Railways, Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3922 (ii).
Accidents since 1st April, 1909, on running Trains, Construction Work, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ralph Smith) 713 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3853 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co. and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2161 (ii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 4048 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 8187 (v).
——— *See* main heading.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C. P. R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 766 (i).
——— Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision, (Mr. Bradbury) 2992 (ii).
——— Reduction of Rates, &c.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1573 (i).
Capitalization of Railways: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 5233, 5246 (iii).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Charters to Railway, Granting to by Parlt. Conditions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) on Railway Estimates, 5122 (iii).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4043 (iii).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 10196 (v).
——— *See* 'Postoffice—Parcel Post.'
Gov. General's Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Govt. Railways constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 4829 (iii).
See 'I. C. R.'
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 9371 (v).
——— *See* main heading.
G. T. Ry. Trainmens' Strike, Reinstatement of, Apptmt. of Judge Barron: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 2376 (ii).
——— Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 9692 (v).
——— *See* main heading.
Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2885 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 660 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 796 (i).
I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
International Ry. Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4466 (iii).
Level Crossings: in Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
——— *See* 'Ry. Crossings.'
Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 6505 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Manitoba and South Eastern Ry. Co.: Inquiry for O. C. (Mr. Foster) 6915 (iv).

Official Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).

P. E. I. Ry.—Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

—— Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractors, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

—— Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 7245 (iv).

Railway and Canals Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).

Ry. Commission Board: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv), 9508 (v).

—— Apptmt. of French Canadian: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1103 (i).

—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

—— Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between U. S. and Can.: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 3054 (ii).

—— Vacancy on, Apptmt. of Farmer: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).

Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

—— *See* 'Level.'

Railways Owned, Operated in U. S. and Can., Mileage, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Rutan) 6158 (iv).

Ry. Rates to Clergymen, Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2434 (ii).

Railway Rates in the West: Remarks on Address (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 98 (i).

Railway Rates, Comparison with U.S. Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6431 (iv).

Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Province and Ry. Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 696 (i).

Railways, Transportation problem: Stmnt. on M. for Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5039 (iii).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Site, C.P.R.'s Interest *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3281 (ii)

Section Men, Complaints *re* Overwork: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).

Shelters for Working Men: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).

Subsidies, Total Amount since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 3467 (ii).

—— Corrected Statement (Mr. Graham) 6196 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Surveys and Inspections, Canals and Railways: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii) 6452 (iv).

Telegraph &c., Control of Rates: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 8356 (v).

—— *See* 'Express.'

'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 788 (i).

'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Cost to Date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 791 (i).

—— Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 792 (i).

'Rainbow', Struck off effective List: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1081 (i).

—— *See* 'Naval Service.'

Rainy River Power Development: *See* 'B. No. 109.'

Rapide Plat Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Absence of Ministers during Discussion: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8358 (v).

Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Tariff: Read (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5546 (iii).

Agricultural Implements: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5745 (iii).

Agricultural and Manufactured Products of the U.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Stmnt. made by Mr. M. Clark, 4196 (iii).

Alterations &c., Better information placed before House: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4933 (iii)

American Boats through Can. Canals: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

Answers of Ministers to Questions: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4137 (iii).

Associated Boards of Trade, Ont., Res. by: Read (Mr. Middlebro) 4121 (iii).

Australia and Can., Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Berlin Board of Trade Res., Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5726 (iii).

Boards of Trade, Saskatchewan, Despatch from W. A. Shepherd: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).

Boston Speech of Min. of Militia: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 5751 (iii).

British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Ministers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

—— *See* 'Negotiations.'

British Demand for Tariff Concessions: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6574 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7210 (iv).

British Preference Trade Policy: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5619 (iii).

——— *See* ' Preference.'

British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).

Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Statistics *re*: Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce *re* Return (Mr. Perley) 6508 (iv).

Canadian Coasting Laws, affecting Grain and Hogs: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 5133 (iii).

Champ Clark, Speech of, *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3608 (ii).

——— Cor. with U. S., *re* Speech of Champ Clark; Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3954 (iii).

——— Stmnt. of Mr. Clark *re* Opposition to: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 4227 (iii).

Comparative Prices Special Rep. of: Laid on Table (Mr. King) 10468; M. to Print 10590 (v).

——— *See* 'Statistics.'

——— Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10469 (v).

Conferences, Length of Session, Names of Representatives, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7036 (iv).

——— *See* 'Negotiations.'

Correction of Figures in Speech in Hansard (Mr. Lennox) 3770 (ii).

Cor. laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii).

Cor. with G. B. and Can. *re* Negotiations &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Turcotte) 3948 (ii).

Countries affected by Treaty *re* Importations into Canada (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4131 (iii).

Creston Fruit and Produce Association, Res. from: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 4119 (iii).

Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, Denial of Stmnt. of Minister of Customs (Mr. Armstrong) 4570 (iii).

——— Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) from Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario (Mr. Lalor) 4223 (iii).

Debate: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).

———Resuming of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5939 (iv).

See 'Obstruction.'

Denial of Stmnt. of member for Cape Breton (Mr. Northrup) 5035 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Quotations made by member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) 5410 (iii).

Dufferin Board of Trade Res.: Read (Mr. Black) 5547 (iii).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Editorial in Montreal 'Star': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4139 (iii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, and Govt. Ownership of Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1504 (i).

——— Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry.: Denial of Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1574 (i).

——— Control of Hudson Bay Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1508 (i).

——— Representations to the Govt., Printing &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1454 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print Speeches, 3054 (ii).

——— Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 6908 (iv).

Farmers and Manufacturers Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4663 (iii).

Farmers Interests, Assurance of member for N. Oxford: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 5541 (iii).

Farm Products imported from other Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3668 (ii).

Favoured Nations, Importations from: Ques (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4111 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4113; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 4114 (iii).

——— Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4134, Reply (Mr. Fielding) 4134 (iii).

——— Favoured Nation Treaty Countries, Names of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4665 (iii).

Fishing Bounties, Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 6670 (iv).

Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2886 (ii).

Fleming Grain Growers' Association Res.: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5550 (iii).

Free Trade Offer by U. S., Pres'dt. Taft's Speech *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5293 (iii).

French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8097 (v).

Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3283 (ii).

Fruit Duty, Res. from B. C. Inland Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Burrell) 3377 (ii).

——— Tel. read from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B. C. (Mr. Burrell) 3770 (ii).

——— *See* 'Summerland.'

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Fruit Duty, Tel. from Mission City Agricultural Ass'cn: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3955 (iii).

Fruit Growers Association, B. C., Protest *re* Duty: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3373 (ii).

Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Com. on Ag.: Remarks (Mr. Schell) 2992 (ii).

Fruit Growers' Association, Burlington, Res. from: Read (Mr. Henderson) 4122 (iii).

Fruit and Vegetables Amt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sealey) 7666 (iv).

——— *See* 'Vote.'

Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegates, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3529 (ii).

——— Report of Proceedings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Print, 3952 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Burrell) 6120 (iv).

——— French Editions: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v).

Hamilton Cotton Co., Stmnt. of Employees: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 5747 (iii).

Interruption of Speakers, Denial of Stmt. *re* member for East Hastings, 5029: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5032 (iii).

——— Interruptions not Relevant: Remarks Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7527 ,iv).

——— Objections *re* Interruptions: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (iii).

Kentville Board of Trade, Res.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) 5749 (iii).

——— Read: (Mr. Crosby) 5548 (iii).

Letter from Market Gardeners: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 4130 (iii).

Letter read by Member for Saltcoats, Giving Name of Writer: Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7264 (iv).

Lord Strathcona's Telegram *re* Reported Interview: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5126 (iii).

——— Explanation (Mr. Goodeve) 5210 (iii).

——— Mess. from Associated Press : Read (Mr. Fielding) 5292 (iii).

Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 5545 (iii).

Minister's Visit to Washington, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 4566 (iii).

——— *See* 'Negotiations.'

Negotiations between U. S. and Can.: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 48 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 72 (i).

Negotiations at Washington: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i), 2271 (ii).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Negotiations at Washington: Further Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 2070 (ii).

——— Instructions to Mr. Bryce: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4140 (iii).

——— *See* 'Conferences.'

——— Reported Draft of Proposals: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2065 (ii).

——— Submission to Hse. for Ratification: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1805 (i).

Negotiations by Mr. J. A. Macdonald of 'Globe' at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) *re* Speech at St. Catharines, 2560 (ii).

——— Attack of Ministerial Association, Ottawa: Personal Explanation (Mr. Hughes) 3352 (ii).

——— Editorial in 'Globe': Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2743 (ii).

——— Letter of J. A. Macdonald in Stratford 'Herald' *re* Visit to Washington: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4299 (iii).

Newspaper Reporters and Announcement of Treaty, Par. in Winnipeg 'Free Press' *re* Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 2642 (ii).

North York, Challenge *re* Contest: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7220 (iv).

Obstruction, Articles in Press *re*: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 9999 (v).

——— M. to adjn. debate (Mr. Best), Obstruction, &c., 9885 (v).

Oleomargarine, Admission of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6668 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6504 (iv).

Opposition to Pact: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 5739 (iii).

Opposition in Northumberland, East Riding: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen) 6767 (iv).

Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'on. Res.: (Mr. Fowke) 5747 (iii).

Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) M. (Mr. King) to print, 10590 (v).

Par. in Moosejaw 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2639 (ii).

Par. *re* Quaker Oats Co.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 4120 (iii).

Peterborough Board of Trade Res.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 5750 (iii).

Pets. Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

——— Inquiry for Pets. (Mr. Foster) 2439, 3057 (ii).

Preferential Tariff Concessions granted to G. B.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

——— *See* 'British.'

Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Editorials in 'Christian Guardian': Read (Mr. Thornton) 9072 (v).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Private Cor.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2985 (ii).

Private Correspondence produced, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 10197 (iii).

Procedure in the House *re* Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5752 (iii).

Protests *re*: laid on Table (remarks) 3951 (iii)

Protocols, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2555 (ii).

Pulp and Paper Duties: Information *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2646 (ii).

——— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4468 (iii).

——— Par. in New York 'Herald': Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2638 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Cor. *re* Connections with Riordan Paper Co. and Reciprocity (Mr. Perley) 10197 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen *re* Vote, 3343 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., Resolutions *re*: M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Fielding) 2440, Schedules laid on Table, 2465, 2477 (ii).

Debate:

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2497; (Mr. Monk) 3284; (amt.) 3289, Neg. (Y. 72; N. 97) 3292; (Mr. Fielding) 3289; (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3294; (Mr Paterson) 3316; (Mr. Foster) 3327, 3530; (Mr. Neely) 3563; (Mr. Burrell) 3579, 3611; (Mr. Guthrie) 3629; (Mr. Lennox) 3681; (Mr. Warburton) 3709 (ii); (Mr. Armstrong) 3737 (ii); (Mr. Kyte) 3956; (Mr. Sproule) 3980, 3995; (Mr. Lemieux) 4005; (Mr. Monk) Amt. *re* Loyalty, 4051; (Mr. Fielding) Denial re Annexationist, 4054; (Mr. Lemieux) Denial *re* Annexationist, 4054; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4057; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4058; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4062; (Mr. Fielding) 4073; (Mr. Macdonell) 4078; (Mr. Devlin) 4082; (Mr. Ames) in Com. on Res., 4083; (Mr. M. Clark) 4143; (Mr. Blain) 4167; (Mr. Molloy) 4183; (Mr. Sifton) 4385; (Mr. Fisher) 4409; (Mr. German) 4482; (Mr. Carvell) 4496; (Mr. Middlebro) 4535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4741; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4771; (Mr. Templeman) 4811; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4830; Amt. 4844, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 111) 4875 (iii); (Mr. Fielding) 4845; (Mr. Foster) 4852; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4856; (Mr. Northrup) 4861; (Mr. Guthrie) 4868; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4873; (Mr. Harris) 4877; (Mr. Miller) 4937; (Mr. Goodeve) 4969; (Mr. McKenzie) 5014, 5260; (Mr. Bradbury) 6680 (iv); (Mr. Ralph Smith) 6709; (Mr. Broder) 6739; (Mr. Cash) 6952; (Mr. Jameson) 6966; (Mr. Hunt) 7006; (Mr. Thornton) 7040; (Mr. Devlin) 7064; (Mr. Crothers) 7077; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 7110; (Mr. Hughes) 7126; (Mr. Sexsmith) 7224; (Mr. MacNutt) 7262; (Mr. Lancaster) 7281; (Mr. Robb) 7328; (Mr. Edwards) 7393; (Mr. Beauparlant) 7450; (Mr. Wright) 7461, 7481; (Mr. Turcotte) 7506; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7517; (Mr. Sealey) 7530, amt. 7547; (Mr. Henderson) 7633; (Mr. Allen) 7661 (iv); (Mr. Nantel) 8130 (v); (Mr. Turriff) 8148; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 8162; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8244; (Mr. Schaffner) 8281 (v); (Mr. Magrath) 8373; (Mr. A. Haggart) 8389; (Mr. Arthurs) 9646; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9673; (Mr. U. Wilson) 9727; (Mr. Porter) 9745; (Mr. Macdonell) 9938; (Mr. Smyth) 9966, 10146; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 10151, 10310; (Mr. Donnelly) 10456; (Mr. Beattie) 10533; (Mr. Maddin) 10550; (Mr. Kidd) 10572 (v).

Resolutions, Presenting of, Reading &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5948; (Mr. Speaker) 5948, Rule Read (Mr. Foster) 5953 (iv)

Ret., Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1652 (i).

Ret. Suppl.: Laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 4383 (iii).

Saskatchewan Boards of Trade, Res.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5751 (iii).

——— Saskatchewan Municipalities, Telegrams: Read (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5534 (iii).

Speech of Min. of Ag. in Montreal: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv)

Statement in White Book, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 10193 (v).

Statistics, Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 6508 6675 (iv).

Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Canada: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, (Mr. Perley) 6769; (Amt.) Neg. (Y. 64; N. 98) 6837 (iv).

——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Ques. (Mr. Perley) 6839 (iv).

Statistical Tables of Prices: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6840; Accepting as Read, and Printing in Hansard (Mr. Hughes) 6840 (iv).

Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7037 (iv).

Statistics, Further Inquiry for from Trade and Commerce Dept.: (Mr. Perley) 6508, 6675 (iv).

——— Tabulated Statement: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2985, 3059 (ii).

——— Trade Statistics, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2737 (ii).

Statistics from U. S., Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4931 (iii)

——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4471 (iii).

——— Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6673 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Summerland Farmers' Institute, &c.: Read (Mr. Burrell) 5549 (iii).

Summerland 'Review', Editorial re Fruit Growers: Read (Mr. Paterson) 4123 (iii).

——Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Minister of the Crown 4124: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).

Swift Current Board of Trade, Res. from: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4119 (iii).

Talking Between Ministers during Debate: Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7292 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations &c., Prime Minister's Remarks in the West: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 65 (i).

Tel. from Min of Fin. to High Commissioner: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3274 (ii).

Tel. of Senator Cummins *re* Manufactured Products: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4115 (iii).

Trade with other Countries affected: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3667 (ii).

Trent River Paper Co. Res.: Read (Mr. Porter) 4117 (iii).

Tupper, Sir Charles, Letter from, Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) Reference to Previous Debate, 8252; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) read, 8277; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 8279 (v).

Vote on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Personal Explanation (Mr. German) 4929 (iii).

Vote on Amt (Mr. Monk): Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Wallace) 3461 (ii).

Vote *re*, Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lortie) 3953 (iii).

Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt.: 'Globe' Report *re* Explanation (Mr. Lennox) 7602: (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7619 (iv).

—— Original Document: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7668; Letter from Hansard Reporter: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 7675; Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7675; Explanation (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7670 (iv).

Western Farmers Interests: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 5543 (iii).

—— *See* 'Farmers.'

Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. from: Read (Mr. Lalor) 4121 (iii).

Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6264 (iv).

Yarmouth Farmers' Association, Res. from: Read (Mr. Law) 4122 (iii).

Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Site, C. P. R's. Interest *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3281 (ii).

Restaurant, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 469 (i).

—— *See* 'House of Commons.'

Restigouche Riparian Association: *See* 'B. No. 176.'

Returns, Delay in Preparation: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 7554 (iv).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5733 (iii), 8093 (v).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7256 (iv).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 2150 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Rhodes) 1001 (i).

Returns, Notice to Members: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 5938 (iv).

Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3017 (ii).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total for 1890-1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9992 (v).

'Review of Reviews', Collection of Extra Postage: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 158.'

Revised Statutes, French Translation: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

'Rexall', Registration by United Drug Co. in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4672 (iii).

Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling: Notice of Motion (Mr. Nantel) 4566 (iii).

—— Labour: M. for Com., 4654 (iii).

—— *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'

Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192.'

Rideau Canal, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

—— Lockmen, Increase of Pay: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

—— Removal of Stumps: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).

Rifle Associations: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

Rigaud Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 3067 (ii).

Riordon Paper Co. and Reciprocity: *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Riparian Rights in Boundary Waters: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

—— M. for Copy (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2162 (ii).

—— Survey, Rep. of Engineer &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2161 (ii).

Robertson, Lorne Forbes, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Roberval Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).
Robichaud, Wm., Compensation *re* Fine: in Com. of Sup., 6105, 6159 (iv).
Rock Island Building: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Additional Land purchased: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8994 (v).
—— M. for Cor.*, 8994 (v).
Rolling Stock, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 8513 (v).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 799 (i).
—— Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).
—— Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1288 (i).
—— Speech, Meaning of Word 'Faction' Preparation of Answer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1351 (i).
Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own while in England: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1087 (i).
—— Rifles loaned by Can. to G. B. at Bisley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1085 (i).
—— Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9781 (v).
—— Recommendation to British Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).
R. M. College, Additions &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
R. N. W. Mounted Police, Coronation Contingent: in Com. of Sup., 8752 (v).
—— Death of Inspector on Northern Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
—— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
—— Pay and Allowance, &c: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 8101 (v).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N. T. Ry. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2851 (ii).
Ruddock, Mr. R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B. C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3279 (ii).
Rules of House, Amendment *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10470 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10365 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards manufacture of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).
—— Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 983 (i).
—— East Elgin, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 983 (i).
—— Man:: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1105 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).
Rural Postmasters: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9995, 10095 (v).
St. Andrews Dam, Bridge &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).
St. Andrews Dam, Sums for Completion: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1508 (i).
—— Correction in Stmnt. (Mr. Bradbury) 1650 (i).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Fish Ladders &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P. Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3608 (ii).
St. Catharines Drill Hall Site: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).
St. Charles Rifle Range, Winnipeg, Sale of, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7343 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
St. Croix River, N. B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1348 (i).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i), 4666 (iii).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly Flag: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7553, 7687 (iv).
—— *See* 'Flags.'
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2674 (ii).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).
St. John, N. B., Drill Hall, Contract *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1624, 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5631 (iii).
—— Quantity of Material taken out by Maritime Dredging Co. under Beacon Bar Contract: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5129 (iii).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John River, Navigation Rights: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
St. John River Vally Ry., Lease to Govt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
St. Johns, Que., Postmaster, refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir': Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1089 (i).

St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1894 (i).
——— Option *re* Lands: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2677 (ii).
——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2577 (ii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 10509 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light and Power &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3468 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault Rapids: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2887 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Dams, Diversion of Channel: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3058 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U.S. Senate: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4210 (iii).
——— Protests *re* from Dom. Govt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4210 (iii).
——— Further Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3058 (ii).
——— Legislation at Washington, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3282 (ii).
——— Letter from Mr. J. Wesley Allison: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3767 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3839 (ii).
——— *See* 'Long Sault.'
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyards, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
——— See 'Sorel.'
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).
——— Depth at Low Tide below thirty feet: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1718 (i).
Ste. Marie Division Postoffice, Defective Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10336 (v).
Ste. Marie de Monnoir Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).
St. Mary's River Diversion: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
St. Ours Locks, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).
Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 2436 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repair, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7344 (iv).
St. Peter's Canal, C.B., Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8103 (v).
——— Answer to Ques.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iv).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve: Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).
——— Amounts received from Sales, &c.: Ques. Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).
St. Peters Indian Reserve, Chief Justice Howell's Commission: M. for Copy of Evidence* (Mr. Bradbury) 7039 (iv).
——— Instructions to Rev. J. McDougall, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bradbury) 1292 (i).
——— Amounts received from Sales &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints, &c.: Ques. Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
——— Original Document, Cor, &c.: Read (Mr.
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8477 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8356 (v).
——— Rep. in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3840; Explanation (Mr. Bradbury) 3841 (ii).
——— Request by Commission for Official Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 9899 (v).
Ste. Therese Postoffice, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1715 (i).
Sadler, Maggie Florence, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Sand supplied to Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair: Ques. (Mr. Edwards 5406 (iii).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2853 (ii).
Saskatchewan Boards of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5751 (iii).
Saskatchewan Capital City: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Neely) 5620 (iii).
Saskatchewan Municipalities, Telegrams *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5534 (iii).
Saskatchewan Postoffices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6505 (iv).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Upper Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
——— Concrete Walls: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).
——— Lock Gates, Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Labour Strike: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in 'Sault Express', 6359 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 6365 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6186 (iv).
Saunderson, Pauline Winslow, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 181.'

School Lands in Alberta, Revenues from, &c.: Ques (Mr. McCarthy) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1911 (i).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1908 (i).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Scugog River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).
Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c.: (Mr. Boyce) 1349 (i).
Seal Fisheries, Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9594 (v).
——— Cor *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10196 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10337 (v).
——— *See* 'Pelagic'.
Secretariat at London: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 1506 (i), 5836 (iii).
——— *See* 'Imperial Conference.'
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).
Secret Commissions: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Sections 11, 12, 14, 22 in Twp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 980 (i).
Security Trusts Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Seeds and Farm Weeds: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).
Seed Grain for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 3836 (ii).
Seed Grain: in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv), 9551 (v).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount still owing by Farmers: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3848 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3225 (ii).
Seed Grain, Quality and Price: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8041 (v).
Seeds, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Selkirk Exhibition: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9076 (v).
——— *See* "Winnipeg.'
Selkirk Postoffice Box: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (v).
Selkirk Route, Welland Canal: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Semmens, Rev. John, Payments to *re* Indians, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6036 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2680 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) re Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate Amendments to Public Bills, Consideration of: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3815 (ii).
Senate Chamber, Expenditure for Decorating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1100 (i).
Senate of Canada, Cost for each year from 1896 to 1911: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1339 (i).
——— Correction in Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1453 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1805 (i).
Senate Messenger: in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iv).
Senate, Preparation of Address to His Ex.: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Senate of Canada, Reform of: Prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4506 (iii).
Senate Stationery: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) in Com. of Sup., 6337 (iv).
Senate Vacancy from P. E. I., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 2072 (ii).
Sessional Clerks, House of Commons: in com. of Sup., 6167 (iv)
——— Application *re* Increase of Salary: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5404 (iii).
——— Names, Age, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 980 (i).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4825 (iii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1491 (i).
Sewage, Disposal of. *See* 'B. No. 122,' also 'Ottawa City.'
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3607 (ii).
Shafting imported, Quantities and Values since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 7593 (iv).
Sharbot Lake Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).
Sheep and Lambs imported into Canada from U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).
Sheet Steel Co., Emplymt. of Men *re* Ice Blockades, Remarks (Mr. Broder) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Shelbourne Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Sheldon, C. D., Action of Govt., re Returning to Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong 6200 (iv).
——— Illegal Use of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
——— *See* 'Mails.'
Shipbuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6484 (iv).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4467 (iii).
Shipping Registration: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Ships, Load Lines: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Shipwrecks on B. C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 7257 (iv).
Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).
Sick Mariners' Dues: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Sick Mariner's Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9993 (v).
——— Law *re* Payment of Dues: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1904 (i).
Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6272 (iv).
Six Nation Indians Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Small Pox Epidemic, Sanitary Condition of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7252 (iv).
——— *See* 'Ottawa', &c.
Smelt Fishing in N.S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9984 (v).
Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 5965 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Sorel Shipyard, Buoys stolen, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7216 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7026 (iv).
——— Complaints *re* Thefts: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1088 (i).
——— Dismissal of Mr. A. Senecal: Remarks Mr. Blondin) 5732 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 10096, 10203 (v).
——— Instructions to Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7039 (iv).
——— Investigation into Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6758 (iv), 9994 (v).
Sorel Shipyards: *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
——— Leaks and Trimming Slopes: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).
——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
——— Protection Works, Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6273 (iv).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
S. African Parlt, Rep. of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 1580 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
South Grey Appointments: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3344 (ii).
South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Applications *re* Entry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 1501 (i).
——— *See* 'Lands.'
Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 926 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Pianos: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).
——— Purchase of Birds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).
——— Purchase of Glassware: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).
——— Purchasing Gramophone Records: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 269 (i).
Speaker of House of Commons, wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 705 (i).
Speech of Min. of Ag. on Reciprocity in Montreal: Ques. of Prv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv).
Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9071, 9253 (v).
Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 4236 (iii).
——— Further Information: Stmnt. (Mr. King) 2740 (ii).
——— Present Condition: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6362 (iv).
——— Remarks *re* Militia (Mr. Blain) 2641 (ii).
——— *See* 'Labour.'

Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).
Stamps, New Issue by P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Stamp Vending Machines: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1910 (i).
Stapleton, Dalton Mabel, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Canada *re* Reciprocity: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, (Mr. Perley) 6769; Amt. Neg. (Y. 64; N. 98) 6837 (iv).
——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Questioned (Mr. Perley) 6839 (iv).
Statistical Tables of Prices *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6840 (iv); Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (Mr. Hughes) 6840 (iv).
——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4471 (iii).
——— Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Perley) 6508, 6675 (iv).
——— Special Rep. Comparative Prices, Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10469 (v).
——— Special Rep. M. (Mr. King) to print, 10590 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 10590 (v).
——— Special Rep. of Comparative Prices laid on Table (Mr. King) 10468; M. to Print, 10590 (v).
——— Stmnt. in White Book, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 10193 (v).
Statistics, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2737 (ii).
Statistics from U.S., Information re: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4931 (iii).
——— U. S. Govt. Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6673 (iv).
Statutes, French Edition, Corrections in Translation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8088 (v).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).
Steamer 'Scotia,' New Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
Steamship Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 4046 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Prohibiting: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3074 (ii).
——— 'Wren' and 'Croquette', Registration in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4046 (iii).
Steel Bounties, Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5936 (iv).
——— See 'Iron.'
Steel Company of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 9690 (v).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Subsidies *re*: M. for Memorials* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3948 (ii).
——— Intention of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6613 (iv).
Sterling Trusts Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Stone Cut, Duty between U. S. and Can., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1287 (i).
Strathcona Public Building; in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 8583 (v).
Suburban Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).
Summerland Farmers' Institute, &c. Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Burrell) 5549 (iii).
Summerland 'Review,' Editorial *re* Fruit Growers: Read (Mr. Paterson) 4123 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Minister of the Crown 4124. Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).
Summerside Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1609 (i).
Superannuation *re* Postal Clerks: in Com of Sup., 4284 (iii).
Supply Bills: See 'Bills Nos. 128, 160 and 225'
Supply: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com, 695 (i).
Supply for Public Works: Remarks (Mr Owen) 10354 (v).
Supply Schedules, Proportion of Votes Presented (Mr. Fielding) 9566 (v).

SUPPLY—
Committee—
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 6184 (iv).
Dairying Industry, &c., 6234 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 9089 (v).
Exhibitions, 3775 (ii), 9076 (v).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c., 6185 (iv).
Health of Animals, 5955 (iv).
Patent Record, 6184 (iv).
Seed Control Act, 6213 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, 6262 (iv).
Year Book, 6184 (iv).
Charges of Management:
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 6059 (iv).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 1474 (i), 5954 (iv).
Customs, 1048 (i), 5992 (iv).
Depts., Generally, 1486 (i).
External Affairs, 1472 (i).
Gov. Gen's. Sec's. Office, 1013 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 1486 (i).
Indian Affairs, 4725 (iii).
Inland Revenue, 1047 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Civil Government—*Con.*

Interior, 4726 (iii).
Justice, 1014 (i).
Labour, 1484 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 1463 (i).
Militia, 1020 (i).
Mines, 1475 (i).
Post Office, 4280 (iii), 6062, 6068 (iv).
Privy Council Office, 1013 (i), 8750 (v).
Public Works, 1032 (i), 5993 (iv).
Railways and Canals, 1473 (i).
Secretary of State, 1472 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 1485 (i).

Customs:

Salaries, &c., 5993 (iv).

Dominion Lands:

Salaries, &c., 5552, 5581 (iii).

Dominion Police:

Gratuity to Constable Shore, 6161 (iv).

Fisheries:

Building Fishways, &c., 6659 (iv).
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 6661 (iv).
Compensation to Wm. Robichaud, 6105, 6159 (iv).
Fresh Fish Transportation, 6092 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6661 (iv).
Licenses, 6160 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 6661 (iv).
Protection Service, 3807 (ii).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 6613 (iv).

Geological Survey:

Explorations, 9551 (v).

Immigration:

Agents' Salaries, &c., 5165 (iii).
Contingencies, &c., 5196 (iii), 6047 (iv).
General Vote, 4739 (iii).
Seed Grain, 3836 (ii), 6047 (iv).
Winnipeg Hospital, 5208 (iii).

Indians:

Alberta, 6046 (iv).
North West, 6036 (iv), 8884 (v).
Nova Scotia, 6036 (iv).
Quebec, 6035 (iv).

Justice:

Exchequer Court, 6160 (iv).

Labour Dept.:

Combines Investigation Act, 4280 (iii).
Conciliation, &c., 3378, 3393 (ii), 6057 (iv).
Labour Gazette, 4229, 4232, 4241 (iii).
Technical Education Commission, 3801 (ii).

Legislation:

House of Commons, 6167, 6175 (iv).
Printing, Stationery, &c., 6175 (iv).
Senate, 6166 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:

Agencies, Rents, &c., 6454 (iv).
Aids to Navigation, 6455 (iv).
Allowance to Mrs. Kerr, 6091 (iv).
Construction of Lighthouses, 6470 (iv).
Ice Breaking, 6500 (iv).
Lifting Buoys at Amherstburg, 6091 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamer, 6546, 6550 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing, 6545 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, 6455 (iv).
Pensions to Pilots, 6091, 6533 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service—*Con.*

Repairs to Maritime Road, 6542 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 6454 (iv).
Signal Service, 6502 (iv).
Steamer 'Eureka', 6502 (iv).
Telephone Reporting Stations, 6538 (iv).
Trade to the Orient, Report on, 6092 (iv).
Wharf Repairs, 6538 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:

General Vote, 6058 (iv), 8752, 8788 (v).

Marine Hospitals:

Shipwrecked Seamen, 6572 (iv).
Sick Seamen, 6566 (iv).

Militia:

Allowances, 8514, 8528 (v).
Customs Duties, 6054 (iv).
Military College, 6054 (iv).
Winnipeg Rifle Range, 6053 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Banff Waterworks, 6052 iv).
Can. National Parks, 6049 (iv).
Dom. Forestry Convention, 6052 (iv).
Imperial Conference, Expenses, 8679 (v).
Members' Contingent to Coronation, 8679 (v).
Paris Agency, 8694 (v).
Pelagic Sealing Conference, 8678 (v).
The Hague Tribunal, 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).

Mounted Police:

Coronation Contingent, 8752 (v).
Pay of Force, 8598 (v).
Subsistence, Forage, &c., 8599 (v).

Ocean and River Service:

'Arctic,' Str., 6089 (iv).
Cattle Inspection, 5828 (iii).
Compensation to Major Moodie, 6089 (iv).
Examination of Masters and Mates, 5821 (iii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5811 (iii).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, 5826 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 5829 (iii).
Registration of Shipping, 5826 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 5822 (iii), 6090 (iv).
Schools of Navigation, 5823 (iii).
Winter Mail Service, 5828 (iii).
Wrecking Plants, 5829 (iii).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 4296 (iii), 6073, 6179 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 6182 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 6178 (iv).

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:

Archives, Ottawa, 5993 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers:

Port Arthur, &c., 5994 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., 6021 (iv).

Marine Department:

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 6554 (iv).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:

British Columbia, 3012-3018 (ii).
Generally, 3156-3161 (ii), 6026 (iv).
Manitoba, 2969, 3018-20, 3029-3054 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—*Con.*

Buildings—*Con.*

New Brunswick, 1603-1624 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1581-1603, 1625-1639 (i), 9500-09 (v).
Ontario, 2088-2150, 2361, 2582-2594, 2602-2638, 3156 (ii), 6033 (iv), 9551 (v).
Quebec, 1639, 1665-1682, 1685-1710, 1860-1903 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 3161-3180, 3186-3218 (ii), 6027 (iv), 8872 (v).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2970, 3001-3012 (ii).
McGill Scholarships, 6445 (iv).
Railway Commission, 6427 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, 6452 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers:

Nova Scotia, 6029-6033 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Decorations *re* Coronation, 9565 (v).

Telegraph Lines:

B. C., 6033 (iv).
Sask. and Alta., 6033 (iv).

Quarantine:

Salaries, &c., 5979 (iv).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 6187 (iv).

Railways and Canals:

Canals:

Chambly, 6356, 6408 (iv).
Cornwall, 6409 (iv).
Farran's Point, 6409 (iv).
Galops, 6410 (iv).
Generally, 6452 (iv).
Lachine, 6357, 6410 (iv).
Murray, 6410 (iv).
Quebec Canals, 6388, 6411 (iv).
St. Ours, Lock, 6395 (iv).
St. Peters, 6418 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6397, 6416 (iv).
Soulanges, 6389 (iv).
Rapide Plat, 6413 (iv).
Rideau, 6413 (iv).
Trent, 6419, 6453 (iv).
Welland, 6397, 6425 (iv).
Williamsburg, 6408, 6426 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Arbitrations and Awards, 6427 (iv).
Gov. Gen's. Car, 6445 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry., Govt. Director, 6448 (iv).

Railways:

Intercolonial Railway, 5913-5930 (iii), 5983, 6338 (iv), 8513, 9560 (v).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 6352 (iv).

Scientific Institutions:

Astronomical Surveys, 9546 (v).
Magnetic Observatory, 6557 (iv).
Meteorological Service, 6563 (iv).
Surveys of Dom. Lands, 9547 (v).

Steamboat Inspection:

General Vote, 6572 (iv).

Trade and Commerce:

Chinese Immigration Act, 6058 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 6059 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 6059 (iv).

Unprovided Items, 6160 (iv).

Surveys and Inspection for Canals and Railways: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii), 6452 (iv).

Surveys, Militia Expenditure in each of last five years: Ques. (Mr. Nantel 110? (i).

Sussex Street Govt. Property, Names of Owners, Prices paid: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 6666 (iv).

—— *See* 'Ottawa.'

Sutherland, George Mackay, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 218.'

Swan Creek Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1723 (i).

Swift Current Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4119 (iii).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2159 (ii).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Appointment of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (iii).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Applications for Irrigated Lands Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 803 (i).

Tariff Negotiations &c., Prime Minister's Remarks in the West: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 48 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 65 (i).

Tariff Resolutions, Par. in Moosejaw 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2639 (ii)

—— See 'Reciprocity.'

Taylor, Mr. Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).

Technical Education Commission: in Com. of Sup., 3801 (ii).

—— Completion of Work: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1661 (i).

—— Progress *re*, Total Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1721 (i)

Telegraphs Act Amt.: See 'B. No. 116.'

Telegraphs and Cable Service,: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9636 (v).

—— See 'Parcel Post,' &c.

Telegraph Cos.' Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Telegraphers Board of Conciliation I. C. R. Statute re Grant: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2853 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, Sask. and Alberta, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Telephone Co.'s Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Telephones, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).

Telephones for Life Saving Stations on St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7806 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Smyth) 10532 (v).
Thibaudeau, Mr. Frank, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 8100 (v).
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Interest paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 814 (i).
Three Rivers Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Three Rivers Postoffice, Temporary Building: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 8984 (v).
Thunder Bay Ice Breaker: in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).
Tignish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).
Tilbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).
Tilbury Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Tillsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster, B.C., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3222 (ii).
Tipping System, Abolition of: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Imports and Exports from and to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).
Tobacco Production, Encouragement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7557 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2153 (ii).
——— See 'Militia.'
Toronto Barracks Site (Baby Farm) Reps. Valuation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 981 (i).
Toronto Federal Buildings, Plan of Erection: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8479 (v).
Toronto Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 175'
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2367 (ii).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3466 (ii).
Toronto Postoffice, Addition to, Changes *re* Specifications: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 805 (i).
Tower Clock, Parlt. Buildings, Complaint *re*: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 1624 (i), 6187 (iv).
Trade and Commerce Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).
Trade Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Trade Commissioners for Canada, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2156 (ii).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Mr. Bouley's Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8993 (v).
——— See 'Can. and Mexico SS. Subsidy.'
Trade Imports and Exports between B. N. A. Possessions and U. S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4383 (iii).
Trade Relations with Germany, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8403, 8534 (v).
Transcontinental Ry., Commissioners' Rep. Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
——— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9430 (v).
——— *See* 'Natl. Transcontineneal Ry.'
Translator for H. of C., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7015 (iv).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Transportation—Georgian Bay Canal as a Waterway: Amt. (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 5137; Ruled out of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5163 (iii).
Transportation Problem, Stmnt. on M. for Sup., (Mr. Graham) 5039 (iii); Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 5103 (iii).
——— *See* 'Canals', 'Railways', &c.
Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1340 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3954 (iii), 8356 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Murphy) 4568 (iii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Tips, &c.: on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7432 (iv).
Treasury Board, Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5136 (iii).
Treasury Board Minutes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4659 (iii).
——— *See* 'Farmers Bank', &c.
Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7022 (iv).
Trent Canal, Floods by Damages: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
——— Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Trent River Paper Co., Res. *re* Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Porter) 4117 (iii).
Truesdell, Frances Whittington, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 183.'

Trussed Concrete Steel Co. of Can., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Trusts: *See* 'Industrial.'
Truro Freight Shed Fire: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Truro Increased Accommodation I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
Truro Political Meeting, Excursion Train over I. C. R., Instruction to Agents, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
——— Rates on I. C. R.: Explanation (Mr. Graham) 3343 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Turkeys: *See* 'Blackhead.'
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
Unclaimed Balances in Banks: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, Govt. Representative, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2672 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Combines Act, Govtl. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) 4300 (iii).
U. S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, Subjects of Extradition: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 707 (i).
U. S. Consuls, Names, Fees &c. residing in Can.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1727 (i).
U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6119 (iv).
U. S. Immigration Officers residing in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1723 (i).
U. S.—Japanese Treaty: Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Foster) 7256 (iv).
U. S. Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 984 (i).
U. S., Reciprocity with: *See* 'Reciprocity.'
U. S. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 9247 (v).
U. S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U. S. Courts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 4342 (iii).
U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Armament of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7026 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6362 (iv).
——— Information from Official Sources, Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6611 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1571, 1805 (i), 2556 (ii), 5629 (iii).
——— Manœuvres at Chicago, Permission of Can. Govt. *re* passing through Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6116 (iv).
——— Permission to Traverse Canals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7253 (iv).
Universal Life Assurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
University of Saskatchewan, Land Endowment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4111 (iii).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) 10100 (v).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Unprovided Items, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2630 (ii).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1084 (i).
——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9782 (v).
Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3066 (ii).
Vancouver Chinese Immigration Frauds: *See* 'Immigration.'
Vancouver Customs Entries by Robt. Kelly, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 713 (i).
Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3469 (ii).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).
Vegreville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4209 (iii).
Verdict of Montreal Jury *re* Masonic Property stolen: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).
——— *See* 'Masonic.'
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).
Vessels Registered in Canada, Lists: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 9690 (v).
Vessels Transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3464 (ii).
Veterans of 1866, Compensation to: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9999 (v).
Veterans, Grants to: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Victoria Electoral Div., Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 7602 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Victoria Museum, Ottawa, Cor. *re* Foundation: Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes) 7666 (iv).

Victoria Meseum, Ottawa, Cracking of Tower, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 5937 (iv).
——— Cracking of Walls: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 9252 (v).
——— Expenditures *re*, Space allotted &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1975 (ii).
——— Inspection *re* Defects: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 7349 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, on Stmnt. of Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10455 (v).
——— Inquiry for Stmnt. ((Mr. R. L. Borden) 10096 (v).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 9900, 10142 (v).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 7210 (iv).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Walkerville Postoffice Building and Mail Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) *re* Staff, 2559 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
——— *See* 'Post Office—Tilbury.'
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2633 (ii).
Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1101 (i).
'Wanda' Yacht, Appraising by Customs, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4678 (iii).
——— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4300 (iii).
——— Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5933 (iv).
——— Length, Motive Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5834 (iii).
——— Valuation of: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5623 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Complaints *re*, Investigation by Com. on Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) 6905 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
Water-Carried Freight, Value, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6671 (iv).
Water Investigations *re* Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Waterloo Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2634 (ii).
Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Water Powers, Conservation of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
Water Powers owned by the Dom., Legislation *re* Regulation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7803 (iv).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 9780 (v).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence: See 'Long Sault.'
Water in Ry. Belt, Peace River, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Water and Sewage Pollution: See 'B. No. 131.'
Water Supply to Parliament Buildings, Rep. of Agriculture Dept.: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 5401 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2553 (ii).
——— See 'Ottawa.'
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Members, Reps. O. Cs.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 1339 (i).
Waterways Commission, International: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Waterways Treaty: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695; in Com. on Res., 867 (i).
Waterways Treaty Bill, Govtl. Intention: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 8895 (v).
——— Inquiry for Plans (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3681 (ii).
——— *See* 'International Waterways', &c.
Ways and Means: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 695 (i).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Welland Canal, Enlargement, Change of Route, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
——— Enlargement, Memorial, Pets, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Hodgins) 1500 (i).
——— Jane St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
——— Stone Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Wentworth, Number of Govt. Appointments since 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 2162 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2557 (ii).
Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1103 (i).
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 811 (i).
West Dublin Bay, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Western Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Western Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board, Settlement, &c.: Remarks on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9696 (v).
——— Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9070 (v).
——— See 'Coal.'
Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 799, 1284 (i).
Western Farmers Interests *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 5513 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

West Indies and Halifax SS Service, Arr ngements *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4674 (iii).
—— Specifications *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4925 (iii).
West Indies Trade with Canada: on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Foster) 6274 (iv).
West Indies Trade, Imports, &c., Total Value: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Westport Signal Stations, when erected, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1091 (i).
Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).
Weymouth Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).
Wharfs for Lighthouse and Coast Service, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
Wharfs. N.S., Contracts *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).
Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6267 (iv).
Whip, Chief Opposition, Retirement of Mr. Geo. Taylor: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
Whitemouth River Fishway: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Wiarton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 7601 (iv).
Williamsburg Canal, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).
—— Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
—— Lockmaster's House: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
—— Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
—— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
Windsor Branch, I.C.R. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).
Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 6272 (iv).
Windsor, N.S., Letter Carriers, Salary: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).
Wingham Public Building Tower Clock, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6664 (iv).
Winnipeg Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).
Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Lalor) 4121 (iii).
Winnipeg Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3018, 3029 (ii).
Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 708 (1).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).
—— *See* 'Selkirk.'
Winnipeg Rifle Range: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
Winnipeg River Water Rights, Grants, Leases &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 2162 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 3955 (iii).
Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Apptmt. of Keeper &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2678 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1340 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6457 (iv).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. Nos. 41 and 116.'
Wolfe Island Customs Official, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8099 (v).
—— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
—— Protection to Road: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).
Woods Building: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Wood, Carriage by Water: *See* 'B. No. 210 & 212.'
Wood Island Life Boat Dimensions, Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3224 (ii).
Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List *re* Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6264 (iv).
Working Expenses, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of Living, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3065 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
Yarmouth Board of Trade: Res. Reciprocity, Read (Mr. Law) 5550 (iii).
Yarmouth Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Yarmouth Farmers' Association, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Law) 4122 (iii).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Yukon Buildings, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3214 (ii).
Yukon Territory Ordinances: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 8 (i).